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

G 2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102) (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students demonstrate technical accounting knowledge of the principles of managerial and financial accounting

SLO 2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113) (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17)
Students display knowledge of financial accounting

SLO 3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210) (G: 2) (M: 18, 19, 20)
Students demonstrate technical and analytical accounting knowledge in cost and managerial accounting

SLO 4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310) (G: 2) (M: 21, 22, 23, 24)
Students demonstrate technical and analytical accounting knowledge in accounting information systems

SLO 5: Taxation (ACCT 4510) (G: 2) (M: 25, 26, 27)
Students demonstrate technical and analytical accounting knowledge in personal and corporate taxation

SLO 6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610) (G: 2) (M: 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
Students display knowledge of Audit and Assurance

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 74.83%. There were some discrepancies between acct 2101 sections (approximately 2,000 students take the course each year) so we are moving to a model that adds a third large section in the fall to reduce the number of different instructors teaching the course. Students struggled with journal entries and calculations involving budgets. Both require significant student time outside of class

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

**Target for O1: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)**
Mean score of 70% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 71.37%. Coverage of material appears to be appropriate with the exception of relevant variable analysis. Students need more guided learning experiences specific to this topic. There were some discrepancies between acct 2101 sections so we are moving to a model that adds a third large section in the fall to reduce the number of different instructors teaching the course.

**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

**Target for O1: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)**
Mean score of 70% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 71.18%. The weak link in this learning objective is revenue recognition. More practice is needed to counteract what students “think they know” when they enter acct 2101. There were some discrepancies between acct 2101 sections so we are moving to a model that adds a third large section in the fall to reduce the number of different instructors teaching the course.

**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

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**
Mean of 65% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Mean score ranged from 76% to 85%.

**M 5: Prepare financial statements (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)**
Prepare the financial statements of a business with no complex transactions

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**
Mean score of 65% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Mean score ranged from 80% to 94%.

**M 6: Recognize Revenue (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)**
Recognize revenue for a variety of business models

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**
Mean score of 65% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Mean score ranged from 73% to 81%.

**M 7: Time Value of Money (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)**
Apply time value of money concepts to financial accounting measurements

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**
Mean score of 65% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Mean score ranged from 65% to 79%.

**M 8: Current Assets (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)**
Identify, analyze and record the current assets of an enterprise

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**
Mean score of 65% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Mean score ranged from 65% to 79%.
**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**

Mean score of 80% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The mean student score of 83% has increased from the previous period's 77%. It is difficult to pinpoint any changes that contributed to this improvement. It may be because of a small increase in class time associated with teaching about inventory cost flow assumptions.

**M 9: Operational Assets (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)**

Identify, analyze and record the operational assets of an enterprise

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean score of 80% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The mean student score of 84% has decreased from the previous period's 92%. The cause of the decrease in scores associated with operational assets is likely due to the removal of a significant group problem that was previous done during class (1.5 hours) that has now become optional outside of class due to classroom time constraints. Student performance continues to be at acceptable levels.

**M 10: Investments (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)**

Identify, analyze and record the investments of an enterprise

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean score of 80% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

The mean student score of 69% has increased from the previous period's 64%. The assessment questions are not robust enough to make a definitive statement.

**M 11: Liabilities (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)**

Identify, analyze and record the current and long-term liabilities of an enterprise

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean score of 80% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The mean student score of 81% has stayed the same as the previous period's 81%. No significant changes have been made to these sections and students continue to perform adequately.

**M 12: Recording Lease Contracts (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)**

Identify, analyze and record the lease contracts of an enterprise

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean score of 80% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The mean student score of 87% has increased from the previous period's 81%. The assessment questions are not robust enough to make a definitive statement.

**M 13: Record deferred tax assets and liabilities (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)**

Record the deferred tax assets and liabilities of a business using professional accounting standards

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean of 70% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score on exam questions was 77%. As a result of implementation of action plan from 2011-12, student performance on loss carrybacks and carryforwards improved to 72%.

**M 14: Record Pensions (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)**

Record the pension expense and liability of a business using professional accounting standards

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)**
### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

As a result of shifting of lease chapter to ACCT 4112, the pensions chapter was now covered. Mean score on exam questions was 65%. Students had difficulty calculating the balances in Net Gain or Loss – AOCI. Mean score on questions related to this concept was 60%. Students also had difficulty calculating pension expense (mean score 62%).

### M 15: Record Shareholders Equity (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)

Record the journal entries and prepare the shareholders equity section of a balance sheet

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean of 70% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score on exam questions was 80%

### M 16: Advanced Statement of Cash Flows (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)

Prepare an advanced level statement of cash flows with complex transactions

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean score of 70% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Mean score was 68.6%. Data is only from one out of two instructors. The other instructor was not able to cover the chapter in class due to lack of time.

### M 17: Apply theory, standards and judgment (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)

Apply financial accounting theory, professional standards and judgment to record business transactions

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

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

Mean score of 70% or higher.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score on case was 80%. Facts of the case needed explanation in class. Students knowledge of the operations of a business was lacking. Also knowledge about where to find basic accounting and stock price information about a company was lacking.

### M 18: Develop performance measures (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)

Develop appropriate financial and non-financial performance measures for effective planning, evaluation and control of organizations' business processes.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)**

Mean score of 65% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score was 66%.

### M 19: Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)

Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems and methods by considering the unique context of specific product and service organizations.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)**

Mean score of 73% or higher

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Mean score was 69%.

### M 20: Structure and model business problems (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)

Structure and model business problems to evaluate alternatives, conduct sensitivity analysis on assumptions, and analyze outcomes to determine causes and variances.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)**

Mean of 65% or higher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: Query Databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That students query databases to provide insights about business operations and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam score for WheelsNow case: 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean increased from 63% to 67%; mean is above the target of 65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Design Business Processes (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design business processes and represent them with documentation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam score for 24-Seven part 1 case questions: 72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least-squares mean of 72.7 adjusted for student GPA was 6% better than in the prior year. It was not significantly different from the target. The case was enhanced this year with the addition of quizzes on all activities leading up to the exam. Students responded well to the quizzes and asked for practice quizzes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: Design and implement databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam score on BloomScape case questions: 62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least-squares mean of 73.4 adjusted for student GPA (16% better than in the prior year, significant at p = 0.0001) was significantly above (p = 0.0001) the target. The gain from the prior year can be attributed to two factors: students had practice quizzes and quizzes to prepare for the exam and students took the exam in pairs of similarly performing students. The paired experience prompted students to think more deeply about their responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: Evaluate internal and design controls (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate internal control and design controls to mitigate risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam score for 24-Seven part 2 questions: 62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least-squares mean of 59.1 (9% more than the mean in the prior year) was not significantly different from the target. The case was enhanced this year with the addition of quizzes on all activities leading up to the exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 25: Identify Tax issues (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 75% or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 26: Select and Apply Tax Laws (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Mean score was 76%

M 27: Make Investment Decisions using Tax Law (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)
Make investment decisions requiring knowledge of the tax law and its effect
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for 05: Taxation (ACCT 4510)
Mean score of 75%

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Mean score was 77%.

M 28: Differentiate among the various types of auditing (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Differentiate among the various types of auditing and the procedures applied on the financial statements audits and audits of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for 06: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Mean of 75% or higher

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Mean score was 93%. Prior rate was 82.62%; therefore there was an 18% increase. The mean is above the target. Two new approaches likely led to the improvements observed. First, professors now dedicate some class time to modeling how to analyze questions and share time management strategies on exams. Second, we have adopted a new textbook, which provides effective explanations for the homework exercises and problems. In particular the text explains why the incorrect objective responses are not accurate. These explanations help students to develop their critical and analytical thinking skills. We plan to continue modeling solution strategies and analytical thinking during class sessions.

M 29: Evaluate the components of audit risk (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for 06: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Mean score of 75% or higher

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Mean score was 92%. Prior rate was 76.19%; therefore there was a 17% increase. The mean is above the target. Two new approaches likely led to the improvements observed. First, professors now dedicate some class time to modeling how to analyze questions and share time management strategies on exams. Second, we have adopted a new textbook, which provides effective explanations for the homework exercises and problems. In particular the text explains why the incorrect objective responses are not accurate. These explanations help students to develop their critical and analytical thinking skills. We plan to continue modeling solution strategies and analytical thinking during class sessions.

M 30: Apply the opinion formulation process (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for 06: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Mean of 75% or higher

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
Mean was 61%. Prior rate was 54.84%; therefore there was a 6% increase. The mean is below the target. We note some improvement in achievement of this objective; however, we recognize that substantial improvement on this objective is still required. We will add in-class activities to model problem solving on this objective. We expect that use of the new textbook that models critical and analytical thinking for audit issues will also contribute to continued improvement on the learning objective.

M 31: Understand and evaluate the auditor’s responsibility (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Understand and evaluate the auditor’s responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for 06: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Mean score of 75% or higher

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Mean score was 77%. Prior rate was 58.81%; therefore there was an 18% increase. The mean is above the target. Two new approaches likely led to the improvements observed. First, professors now dedicate some class time to modeling how to analyze questions and share time management strategies on exams. Second, we have adopted a new textbook, which provides effective explanations for the homework exercises and problems. In particular the text explains why the incorrect objective responses are not accurate.
### 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, 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 make them more "user friendly" by including some mini-tutorials along with the more common question & answer format for office hours. 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

#### 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

#### Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Mean score of 75% on Alchemy case. Student scores on memorandum. Improvement of 5% in mean score for CTW quizzes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 99% Alchemy Assignment: Student scores on the memorandum. Improvement in CTW as demonstrated by quizzes: Comparison of performance on the 1st CTW quiz (taken during the 5th/6th week of the semester) vs. the 2nd CTW quiz (taken in the 14th week of the course). Summer sessions use the date equivalent of the 5th/6th week and 14th week. Quiz questions are equivalent in difficulty. (Target rate of 5%). Actual improvement rate was 13%. We will continue to emphasize the importance of critical thinking and writing in auditing and accounting. We will model effective critical analytical thinking strategies for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emphasized ambiguity; however, this hindered the students' learning of technical concepts. We will focus in 09-10 on improving students’ abilities to model business problems and analyze causes of variances as student performance in these areas lags expectations. Instructors will devote more class time and develop additional assignments in these two areas in order to help students master these concepts.

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

ACCT4210
See Action Plan for Measure 8

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

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

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

ACCT4510

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

Delete Course and Revise Curriculum
In ACCT4410, students performed below target in a significant number of sub-learning outcomes pertaining to Measures #26 and #27. ACCT4410 relies a lot on the material learnt in ACCT4110. You cannot analyze certain parts of the financial statements if you don’t know how to prepare or understand those parts of the financial statements. Since ACCT4110 omitted many important topics, students were ill-prepared for ACCT4410 on these topics and performed poorly on them. The above two issues indicate an urgent need to revise the curriculum to include more financial accounting. Given that there is a course similar to ACCT4410 at the graduate level (ACCT8700) we plan to eliminate ACCT4410 and replace it with an additional 3 credit class in financial accounting.

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

Delete Course and Revise Curriculum
In ACCT4410, students performed below target in a significant number of sub-learning outcomes pertaining to Measures #26 and #27. ACCT4410 relies a lot on the material learnt in ACCT4110. You cannot analyze certain parts of the financial statements if you don’t know how to prepare or understand those parts of the financial statements. Since ACCT4110 omitted many important topics, students were ill-prepared for ACCT4410 on these topics and performed poorly on them. The above two issues indicate an urgent need to revise the curriculum to include more financial accounting. Given that there is a course similar to ACCT4410 at the graduate level (ACCT8700) we plan to eliminate ACCT4410 and replace it with an additional 3 credit class in financial accounting.

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

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

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

Revise Curriculum
See Action Plan for Measure 18

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Finished  
Priority: High  
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
**Emphasis on selected topics**
Revenue theory, analysis of discontinued operations, cash flow statement, cash versus accrual basis, revenue recognized using installment method, and using PV/FV will be emphasized during 2010 since those were the lowest percent correct on the cumulative final exam. Instruction will include providing more homework in these areas and spending more class time on these topics. A "Digital Tutor" (short instructional video) will be added on Installment Method Accounting to improve the learning outcomes for this harder topic. Further, students will be given more guidance on how to get started on Jag & Elk to help them get a quick start on the project.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Nathan

**Add in-class activities**
Prior rate was 54.84%; therefore there was a 6% increase. The mean is below the target. We note some improvement in achievement of this objective; however, we recognize that substantial improvement on this objective is still required. We will add in-class activities to model problem solving on this objective. We expect that use of the new textbook that models critical and analytical thinking for audit issues will also contribute to continued improvement on the learning objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Smith

**Case facts need explanation**
Facts of the case needed explanation in class. Students knowledge of the operations of a business was lacking. Also knowledge about where to find basic accounting and stock price information about a company was lacking. Continue to explain the facts of the case in class and guide students on where to find accounting and finance information about a company.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Nathan

**Collaborate with other instructors**
Collaborate with all 4112 instructors to create a more robust set of assessment questions for all objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Blunck, Swenson and Fang

**Develop practice questions**
Develop practice questions

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Borthick

**Develop practice questions**
Develop practice questions

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Borthick

**Develop practice questions**
Develop practice questions

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Design Business Processes (ACCT 4310) | Outcome/Objective: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Borthick

Develop practice questions
The case on which the exam is based 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. The case was enhanced this year with the addition of quizzes on all activities leading up to the exam. Students responded well to the quizzes and asked for practice quizzes.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Develop practice questions for students
Responsible Person/Group: Borthick
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Develop practice questions
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Query Databases (ACCT 4310) | Outcome/Objective: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Borthick

Do modeling and analytical thinking in class
We plan to continue modeling solution strategies and analytical thinking during class sessions.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluate the components of audit risk (ACCT 4610) | Outcome/Objective: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Smith

Do modeling and analytical thinking in class
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Differentiate among the various types of auditing (ACCT 4610) | Outcome/Objective: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Smith

Get data from all sections
As noted- not all sections are included in this report. Get 100% reporting from all sections moving forward.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Current Assets (ACCT 4112) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Blunck

In-class activities and new text
We will add in-class activities to model problem solving on this objective. We expect that use of the new textbook that models critical and analytical thinking for audit issues will also contribute to continued improvement on the learning objective.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Apply the opinion formulation process (ACCT 4610) | Outcome/Objective: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Smith

Include all sections
As noted- not all sections are included in this report. Get 100% reporting from all sections moving forward.
Incorporate LearnSmart
Incorporate McGraw-Hill's newly developed LearnSmart, an interactive study tool that adaptively assesses students' skill and knowledge levels.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark

Incorporate LearnSmart
Incorporate McGraw-Hill's newly developed LearnSmart, an interactive study tool that adaptively assesses students' skill and knowledge levels.
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Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
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Incorporate LearnSmart
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Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Clark

Incorporate LearnSmart
Incorporate McGraw-Hill's newly developed LearnSmart, an interactive study tool that adaptively assesses students' skill and knowledge levels.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Clark

Incorporate LearnSmart
Incorporate McGraw-Hill's newly developed LearnSmart, an interactive study tool that adaptively assesses students' skill and knowledge levels.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Clark

Incorporate LearnSmart
Incorporate McGraw-Hill's newly developed LearnSmart, an interactive study tool that adaptively assesses students' skill and knowledge levels.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Clark

Instructor collaboration
Collaborate with all 4112 instructors to create a more robust set of assessment questions for all objectives

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
More HW, video tutorials

We adopted a new textbook starting in AY 2012-2013. This is the only systematic change from AY 2011-2012. It does not seem to have had a significant impact on the first two assessment objectives; however, it may have contributed to the significant increase in performance on the last objective. We will prepare Excel versions of the homework that uses random numbers so that students can get plenty of practice with the homework and with Excel. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Ron Guymon

More practice problems

Make up more sample problems with different permutations and combinations of Gain or Loss on AOCI.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Record Pensions (ACCT 4113) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

More robust set of assessment questions

Collaborate with all 4112 instructors to create a more robust set of assessment questions for all objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Blunck, Swenson, Fang

More sample problems

Make up more sample problems with different permutations and combinations

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Reallocate time to cover Advanced SCF

One instructor did not cover the topic. The other instructor covered the topic but rushed through it. Either the chapter should be covered well or not at all.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Review Basic SCF

Spend some time in class reviewing Basic SCF from ACCT 4111.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Nathan

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.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Structure and model business problems (ACCT 4210) | Outcome/Objective: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Accountancy PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST

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

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

Goals
G 1: Discipline knowledge - evaluate research
Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research.

G 2: Discipline knowledge - conduct research
Students should be able to conduct and present original research in collaboration with faculty.

G 3: Research competence
Students should be able to conduct original research individually.

G 4: Placement
Most graduates will accept positions at institutions where the research skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.

G 5: Teaching competency
Develop a high level of competence in conducting university level teaching.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Comprehensive exams (G: 1) (M: 1)
Successful completion of comprehensive examinations as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.

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

SLO 3: Collaborative research activity (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students will conduct research with faculty in order to develop their research skills and experience with the publication process.
SLO 4: Research presentations (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.

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

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

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

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

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive exams**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the students taking comprehensive exams in the past five years, 83.3% have passed.

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

**Target for O2: Critical evaluation of research**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All current students have taken Critical Analysis seminar in each year of the first three years of their programs. Workshop participation has increased since we adopted the policy of having students sit in the first row and presenters call on them first. We also initiated a procedure during the Spring 2013 semester to have students formally (written before the seminar) vet their questions in Critical Analysis seminar - this has resulted in a better quality of questions from the students, which in turn suggests improved confidence and ability in performing critical analysis of research.

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

**Target for O3: Collaborative research activity**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the six students currently beyond their third years, 3 have active research projects with faculty. 50% is below our target of 75%. Of the six graduates in the past six years, three have had research in the publication process - this represents 50%, which is at target. Two students had these papers published before graduation, and the third student's paper was published within a year of graduating.

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

**Target for O4: Research presentations**

All students beyond the second year will have presented their research at internal workshops. 50% of graduating students will have presented a research paper at a research conference.
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students beyond the second year have presented their research projects internally. Of the six students who have graduated in the past six years, 4 (67%) have presented research at conferences. This exceeds our target of 50%.

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

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
100% of the graduates in the past six years have defended their dissertations in the first attempt. Of the six students currently on ABD status, five on track to defend their proposals and final defense. One student has delayed her final defense and is in peril of not completing her dissertation.

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

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the six students who graduated in the past six years, four have placed at research institutions. At 67%, this is above our target.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students who have entered the program in the past five years have completed the teaching seminar in their first semester, before teaching their first course.

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 minimim 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All graduates in the past six years have taught at least one upper-level course. Of the six students at ABD status, five have taught an upper level course. This is above our target of 50%. All students who have taught beyond their first course have attained an overall effectiveness rating of 4.2; in fact all have mean effectiveness scores of at least 4.2 for this reporting year. This exceeds our target for 60% of students to achieve that target.

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

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the six students who graduated in the past six years, all have placed at institutions with AASCB accreditation. This exceeds our target of 80%.

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
**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 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.

Based on our analysis in last reporting cycle, the SOA actively sought to recruit two new senior faculty members and four-five junior faculty. The current competitive state of the accounting market left us short of these goals. We will continue to actively pursue faculty who have left SOA have committed to continue their teaching-related target (set at 60% of the students) to attain an overall mean of 4.2 on their SEIPs. This suggests that our efforts to encourage mentorship and early intervention are paying off. Second, we have improved the research collaboration with faculty for our first and second year students. A continuing concern we've been trying to address is how to improve student/faculty research collaboration. Our efforts to stimulate research early on appear to be paying off: of our six first and second year students, four have active projects with faculty that should be in the publication process before the enter the job market. At 67%, this is a higher proportion than our current ABD status students (at 50%).

**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 had two major achievements this year. First, continuing with the trend from last year, ALL our students are now meeting our teaching-related target (set at 60% of the students) to attain an overall mean of 4.2 on their SEIPs. This suggests that our efforts to encourage mentorship and early intervention are paying off. Second, we have improved the research collaboration with faculty.

**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 more active and confident in the research workshops. The requirement to formally vet written questions in Critical Analysis Seminar, in conjunction with the procedure that students are called on first, has resulted in much higher quality and volume of student participation. We placed one student this year. Although he opted for Florida International for family reasons, he had an offer from Nanyang Polytechnic University - this indicates that our students are being very well trained and are in demand by some of the best institutions.

**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?**

A continuing challenge has been getting students more involved in research. We have made great strides this year! Unfortunately, we will have some attrition of senior faculty next year. As a result of this, three of our first and second year students decided to pursue other options. Evidence of the quality of students and the training they have received is that the ones who decided to pursue other programs all placed very well: University of Florida, Georgia Institute of Technology, and Nanyang Polytechnical University.

**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.

**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.
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Actuarial Science BBA
(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.

### 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
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of life contingencies
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Structure and solve problems

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

**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**
### 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:** Terminated
**Priority:** High

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

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
**Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang and MAS Assessment Group
**Additional Resources:** None

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2012-2013 African American Studies Assessment of Core**
*As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST*

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

### Mission / Purpose

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

### Goals

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

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 2: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing.
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Analytic (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will be able to make connections between the African American experience and larger events in the community and world.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Service Learning Papers (O: 1, 2)
Students engaged in community service activity and wrote reflection papers based on their experience. The reflection paper assesses student learning based on their ability to analyze and communicate core course concepts. The analytic rubric is a five-item scale where a rating of 5 indicates that the paper reflects a careful reading and understanding of the material. Additionally, the paper focuses on a careful critique of the material, as opposed to a restatement of what the author has stated; 4= Same as 5 above, but paper lacks a careful critique of the material; 3= Same as 4 above, but paper over generalizes and/or does not use material from the reading to support conclusions; 2= Paper simply restates what the author has said, but ignores careful critique of the material; and 1= Paper relies primarily on rhetoric (personal expression) and generalized arguments. The communication rubric is also a five-item scale where a score of 5 reflects a paper that is clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Paper is typed, no greater than 12 point font, double-spaced, no more than one-inch margins, and minimum three full pages of text. Reference cited page is included if sources other than those assigned are used; 4) Same as 5 above with some minor (2 – 4) punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; 3) Same as 4 above with no more than 6 punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; 2) Paper has some lack of clarity as well as several punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; and 1) Paper is confusing or unclear in structure and includes several punctuation, grammar and syntax mistakes. Reference cited page is not included when sources other than those assigned were used.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Analytic skills. Target met. From the sample presented 100% the students reached the benchmark. Students demonstrated a careful reading and understanding of the material. Their papers provided a careful critique of the material, as opposed to a restatement of what the author stated.

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Target met. From the sample presented 100% of the students reached the benchmark. Students communicated clearly in writing with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Papers were typed, using 12-point font, double-spaced, no more than one-inch margins, with a minimum of three full pages of text. References were cited appropriately.

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**

**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 course was writing intensive with students receiving ongoing feedback and support to produce an exemplary outcomes in both analytic and communication skills. The department will evaluate if all sections of this course should incorporate this standard. These accomplishments fulfill last years action plans.

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

Unable to answer, the instructor for the course assessed is no longer employed by the 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?**

Unable to answer.

**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 has reduced the number of course deliverables in favor of increasing the quality of student performance. No changes have been made since last year's CTW report.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
No changes have been made since last year’s report. Core faculty will be meeting with affiliate and adjunct faculty teaching 2010 to standardize key student learning outcomes and 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.  
No changes have been made since last year’s report. Core faculty will be meeting with affiliate and adjunct faculty teaching 2010 to standardize key student learning outcomes and assessments.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Final Research Paper (O: 1, 2, 3)

The final research paper in each course (AAS 3975 - Research Methods and AAS 3980 Concepts and Theories) is used as the assignment for assessing student learning outcomes. Each course assignment requires students to integrate, synthesize, and interpret concepts relevant to theory and research. The assessment rubric for each of the three areas is as follows:

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

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

Target for O1: Analytic skills

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

AAS 3975: Target met. 100% of the students’ papers reflected a skillful collection of data required for research. The paper reflected a careful reading and understanding of social science and humanities research. Papers included a strong critique of ideas and theories and their application to social, cultural, political and economic lives of African American people. The papers reflected a general understanding and application of interdisciplinary scholarship. AAS 3980: Partially met – 72% of students scored 3 or better. A majority of the students’ were able to analyze key theoretical concepts that inform the research, clearly state a hypothesis, demonstrate an understanding of relationship between the lived experiences of African Americans and the Global African community, and apply data to understand the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent.

Target for O2: Communication skills

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

AAS 3975: Target met. 100% of the papers sampled were clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Papers generally used appropriate (APA) writing style required for course. Citations were appropriately included to leave no room for charges of plagiarism and references were included appropriately according to required style. AAS 3980: Target met – 81% of students scored 3 or better. A majority of the students’ were able to produce a clearly written paper with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax, use appropriate (APA) writing style required for course; cite appropriately leaving no room for charges of plagiarism with minor grammatical or syntax mistakes.

Target for O3: Acquisition of knowledge

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

AAS 3975: Target met. 100% of the papers sampled clearly articulated key concepts and theoretical views that informed the research. Papers included clearly stated hypotheses. Papers reflected use of multiple levels of data acquisition (primary, secondary, etc.). Papers demonstrated an understanding of the relationship between the lived experiences of African Americans and the Global African community. Papers applied an application of data to understanding the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. AAS 3980: Target not met – While a majority of the student (63%) of students scored 3 or better, the benchmark was not met. A majority of the students were able to articulate key concepts and theoretical positions and clearly state a hypothesis. However, students struggled to provide multiple levels of data acquisition (i.e. primary, secondary, etc.).

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 Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
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.

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.

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.

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).

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.

Applied Mid-term Examination
Action taken. The instructor is considering offering an applied mid-term examination where students apply the key terms of the
course to a research topic. This will allow students to improve their analytic skills and demonstrate their acquisition of research knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Final Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquistion of knowledge

Implementation Description: Instructor will create an on-line mid-term.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Applied Mid-term Examination
Action taken. The instructor will offer an applied mid-term examination where students apply the key terms of the course to a research topic. This will allow students to improve their analytic skills and demonstrate their acquisition of research knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Final Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Analytic skills

Implementation Description: The instructor will create an online mid-term exam.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Students demonstrated mastery in analysis, communication, and acquisition skills in AAS 3975 - Theories and Concepts. These outcomes affirm last years' action plan.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern from the entry level to the exit class?
Students are better able to grasp theories and apply them to the lived experiences of people of African descent.

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?
Students' ability to analyze empirical research and identify new areas of research needs improvement. Assistance in alternative instruction methods would be useful.

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 has given our program a systematic method for identifying successful and unsuccessful pedagogical practices. No changes have been made since last year's CTW report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No changes have been yet. However, a curriculum committee has been formed to discuss student learning outcomes and 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.
No changes have been made to the educational degree program. The curriculum committee will convene to reflect on the existing student learning outcomes in the context of the curriculum.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 African American Studies MA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Goals

G 1: Theory and Application
At the master’s level, African American Studies contributes to the university’s broader mission of encouraging theoretical and applied inquiry by engaging in original research that examines ways in which ethnicity and racial identity affects historical, social, and cultural
experiences of African-descended people. In so doing we prepare our students to engage in culturally relevant scholarship that improves the life circumstances of African-descended people.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1)**

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

**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 Research Methods teaches first year graduate students how to critically analyze, synthesize, and deconstruct empirical literature to communicate the central tenets of a research problem/opportunity as it pertains to a social issue affecting the African American community. The Mock Review of the research proposal is the experience by which student learning outcomes are assessed for this course. Students’ research proposals are rated by two external reviewers. External reviewers are AAS faculty and/or researchers in a related discipline. Two external reviewer conduct a blind review of a single research proposal. Each reviewer critiques the proposal on its strengths and weaknesses in seven areas relevant to research methodology: The abstract, introduction, literature review, theory/concept, significance, methodology and human subjects. Each proposal also receives an overall impact rating. All ratings range of 1 to 9, where 1=exceptional and 9=poor (see Table 1). The goal of this assignment is to give students constructive feedback on the primary components of the research proposal and its merit in advancing the body of knowledge in the field of African American Studies. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, CO4 and SLO2, SLO3, SLO5. Students are assessed on their ability to communicate and analyze research concepts. These learning outcomes are linked to the following components of the proposal: Communication /Literature Review and Analytic /Theory and Concepts. Table 1. AAS 6010 Mock Review Rating Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional (A+/100)</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding (A/ 95)</td>
<td>Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent (A-/ 90)</td>
<td>Very strong with only some minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good (B+/89)</td>
<td>Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good (B/85)</td>
<td>Strong but with at least one moderate weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory (B-/80)</td>
<td>Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair (C+/79)</td>
<td>Some strengths but with at least one major weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal (C/75)</td>
<td>A few strengths and numerous weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor (C-/70)</td>
<td>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Analytic**

AAS 6010: 80% of the students will score 3 or better on the student learning outcomes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Partially met: 77% of students were able to explain and appropriately apply a theory/concept to their proposed research, state its relevance to topic, and discuss potential contributions to African American Studies.

**Target for O2: Communication**

AAS 6010: 80% of the students will score 3 or better on the student learning outcomes

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Met: 88% of the students were able to summarize the germinal and seminal literature related to their research, identify major themes, discuss strengths and weaknesses, highlight gaps in the body of knowledge, and state a clear hypothesis.

**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
Concept Paper (non-graded)
Action taken: A one-page concept paper (non-graded) has been added to the course to help students operationalize and integrate the theoretical tenets and methodological choices into their research proposal (see Research Proposal Concept Paper Guidelines). APPENDIX A: Research Proposal Concept Paper Guidelines Write a Concept Paper based upon a synthesis of the annotated bibliography assignment. The more descriptive information you provide to the questions below the better feedback you will receive in developing your proposal. For the concept paper, please limit the concept paper to 1 page. Research Purpose: Briefly, state the purpose of your study. Specific Aims: What are the specific aims of the research? What will you accomplish/know? Problem/Background: Explain why the literature leads you to think this topic needs study. Research Questions/Hypotheses: Derived from the background literature, what model will guide your hypotheses and what hypotheses will you test? Theory/Concept: What theory/concept will guide your hypotheses/ research question? Why is it most appropriate? Significance: What is the payoff to African American Studies? Study Design/Approach: What is the study design that will enable testing your hypotheses/ research question? Exploratory/ Descriptive/ Explanatory? Sample (N, age range, gender, race, inclusion/exclusion criteria), measures, procedures, etc. Analysis: What analytic approach will ensure a fair test based on your hypotheses/research question? What are the power considerations (e.g., expected sample size, power, expected effect sizes, etc.)? Human Subjects: What are the primary human subject issues or concerns?

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 have shown improvement in their ability to critique empirical research. This outcome supports the communication student learning outcome from last year’s report.

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’s have improved in their ability to identify major themes, discuss strengths and weaknesses in the body of knowledge and articulate a clear research hypothesis.

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?
Areas of improvement in application of theoretical concepts in research and develop appropriate research plans. A one-page concept paper (non-graded) has been added to the course to help students operationalize and integrate the theoretical tenets and methodological choices into their research proposal (see Research Proposal Concept Paper Guidelines). 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?
CTW has allowed our program to identify critical areas in student learning and create areas of support, both in and outside of the classroom. For example, we have added a Thesis Bootcamp as a annual activity to prepare students for the thesis production process.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No changes have been made to 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.
Several changes have been made to the program, as a result of the assessment findings. For example, the Mock Review assignment in AAS 6010 Research Methods uses AAS faculty as external reviewers to help students hone in on discipline specific objectives.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Anthropology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
**Mission / Purpose**
The Anthropology Department participates in the general education core curriculum by offering its signature course, Anth 1102: Introduction to Anthropology. The course elucidates the comparative study of humanity across time and space by offering (1) a holistic understanding of human diversity that requires the study of biological, archaeological, social/cultural, and linguistic anthropology; (2) a cross-cultural and comparative study of humanity; and (3) a consideration of human problems within historical, environmental, political-economic, and sociocultural contexts. Students are given an overview of anthropological research strategies, theories, and practices. Topical foci include human evolution, primate behavior, human variation, prehistory and complex societies, global-local articulations, ideology and power, migrants, immigrants, and refugees in the world system, urban processes and populations, identity politics in multicultural societies, and social reform. The course is an option to satisfy Area E of the core curriculum because contemporary and past cultures and societies, and their precursors, are covered in global and local contexts.

**Goals**

**G 2: Application of anthropological perspectives on contemporary social phenomena**
Students should understand the applicability and application of the holistic, biocultural anthropological approach to complex phenomena and contemporary issues among human societies, with particular attention to human diversity.

**G 1: Biocultural evolution of humans**
Students are expected to understand the linkages between human biology and culture in an evolutionary framework. This is a core element of the anthropological perspective on humanity and a main orientation of the Department of Anthropology at GSU.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Natural Selection (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**
Students demonstrate understanding of the mechanism of natural selection in evolutionary change. This is significant in understanding human evolution and apprehending the role of adaptation in modern human variation, allowing students to critically engage with issues of human biology and their historical and social implications.

**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 are able to critique the concept of race as a biological category, utilizing the multifaceted anthropological approach. 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 problematize 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: Natural selection inventory (O: 1)**
Students respond to a standardized inventory on natural selection. See attached document.

**Target for O1: Natural Selection**


**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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 correctly identify the non-biology of race, and demonstrate understanding of the cultural construction of race.


Targets: 0% unsatisfactory 80% satisfactory or superior

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met


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
Project 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

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?

Measures were revised, in accordance with review suggestions. In the next cycle, the department will maintain the focus on the anthropological critique of race, and consider another topical focus of foundational importance for assessment.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

The data reinforce current practices and emphasis on the biocultural approach.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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 are grounded in four-field, holistic and comparative anthropology. This means that they 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 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 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)
Students identify, apply and critique anthropological theory, methods and knowledge, appropriate to the subfield.

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.
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
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 3: Competence in oral and written communication (G: 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students interpret and produce competent and discipline-appropriate communication in speech and writing.
### 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. Students report on their data collection and analysis culminates in a report in which they 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Content knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Students communicate in clear, organized, grammatically correct prose, appropriate to the discipline

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 the concept of culture and its study b. Identify, design and conduct one instance of 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 Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 25 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 25 and 30 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication: Scores between 30 and 45 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 45 and 50

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

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

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

**Standard Associations**

- 0 unsatisfactory submissions
- 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating ethnographic ability
- 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating competency in data collection and analysis
- 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior critical analysis and interpretation of material remains, to reconstruct lived experience
- All submissions show competency in communicating archaeological knowledge

**Ranking**: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 30 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 30 and 40 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication: Scores between 40 and 45 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 45 and 50 (max)
acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 25 and 30. 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 30 and 35. 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 35 and 37.5 (max) Target: 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior ability to construct an ethnographic narrative in proper English prose.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

n=25 Unsatisfactory: 0 Fair: 0 Good: 24 Scores ranged from 36 to 37.5 demonstrating ability to communicate in solid English prose, appropriate to the discipline.

M 3: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
1. Poor - 0 students 2. Fair - 7% 3. Good - 14% 4&5. Excellent/Outstanding - 79%

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
1. Poor - 0 students 2. Fair - 7% 3. Good - 14% 4&5. Excellent/Outstanding - 79%

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

Clarify 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

---

**Monitoring and advisement**
Failure to fully meet the goal was a result of a student failing to turn in the exercise. Faculty will monitor and advise students closely.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Archaeological Methods - Garbology project | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

---

**Monitoring and modification**
The target for Excellent and Outstanding students was achieved, however 2% fell below the target ranking of 3 for all students. This is a very small percentage, and may be circumstantial, however the faculty will monitor and advise students closely in this cycle. The faculty is also considering modifications to the assignment to promote student success.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Low

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

---

**Writing consultation**
The target for Excellent and Outstanding students was achieved, however 2% fell below the target ranking of 3 for all students. Students will be monitored and directed to writing and communication resources, including the writing center and writing consultants.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Low

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

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Measures and targets were refined in accordance to review suggestions. An integrated rubric was utilized for ANTH 2020, ANTH 2030 and ANTH 2010.

**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 new course on linguistic anthropology will be added to the BA curriculum. Measures and outcomes will be constructed for the 2013-2014 cycle.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Anthropology MA**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Anthropology offers a Master of Arts in Anthropology. Graduate education in anthropology emphasizes research and teaching on urban contexts, processes, and populations. Students receive rigorous training in local, regional, and global transformations, quantitative and qualitative research methods, and theories of nature, society, and culture. In addition to intellectual maturity, students gain practical skills, including proposal writing, project development, field research, 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 firmly ground their research in a broad and relevant body of anthropological knowledge in their field of study. They demonstrate competence in a) theory, b) field/area of study and c) appropriate methodologies.

**G 2: Contributing to Anthropological Knowledge and Practice**

Students produce original research in their specific subfield, demonstrating competence in the practice of anthropology.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Synthesizing knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students 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 design, conduct, analyze and present original research in writing and orally. The work of design, data collection in the field, analysis and write-up is 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**

Students in their 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
In the 2012-2013 cycle, 12 third semester graduate students passed all three portions of 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. 1 student was 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In the 2012-2013 cycle, a total of 7 students reached their final semester in the program. All 7 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)

Refining learning outcome assessment of comprehensive exam

Anthropology is a highly diverse discipline, encompassing biology and culture in the past and present. This precludes a homogenous approach to learning outcomes assessment. While the format of the comprehensive exam is the same for all students, the nature of the questions and the particular foci they address are highly particular to the subdiscipline (biological, archaeological, cultural or linguistic anthropology), and to the research interests of each student. In order to render student learning assessment in more detail, therefore, the faculty will discuss other potential reporting options in this cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: MA comprehensive exam | Outcome/Objective: Synthesizing knowledge

Refining learning outcome assessment of MA papers

Anthropology is a highly diverse discipline, encompassing biology and culture in the past and present. This precludes a homogenous approach to learning outcomes assessment as research and writeup varies considerably in both form and content for each subdiscipline (biological, archaeological, cultural or linguistic anthropology), and according to the research interests of each student. In order to render student learning assessment in more detail, therefore, the faculty will discuss other potential reporting options in this cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: MA thesis or practicum paper | Outcome/Objective: Producing Original Research

While the format of the comprehensive exam is the same for all students, the nature of the 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
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(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.

SLO 5: Written Communication and Editing Skills (M: 6)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
Our data for this measure is incomplete, as we are missing data from one section of the relevant course (AL 3021) taught by a GTA in this cycle. However, based on the data that we do have, on 76.4% of the students in Introduction to Linguistics performed well enough on the final examination to exhibit mastery of core areas of linguistic study. The target for this measure was not met, and this objective is addressed in an action plan for this cycle.

M 2: Final Papers in AL 3031 Language in Society and AL 4151 Communication across Cultures (O: 2)
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Throughout the year, across the various sections offered of AL 3031 Language in Society, 91% of students were judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on their final papers in the area of "Identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives", and 95.7% met the target for "Shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem". In AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, 90.6% of all 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 in this measure.

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.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
In AL 4012 Morphology & Syntax, 80% of students met the target for this measure by demonstrating competence in linguistic analysis on their final exams. In AL 4011 Phonetics & Phonology, however, only 22 out of 30 students, or 73%, scored above a 70 on the final. This target has been partially met, and the correlating objective will be addressed in an action plan for this cycle.

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.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Across all sections of AL 3041 Second Language Acquisition during this cycle, 92% of students scored 70% or higher on a written assignment demonstrating linguistic analysis skills. Note that students who did not turn in a paper and received a zero on the assignment are not included in this calculation. However, if they were, the target would still be met with more than 80% of students demonstrating competence.

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) 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.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
For the rubric item "Presents convincing arguments based on data", 85.1% of students in all AL 3031 classes scored either "competent" or "sophisticated", and 90.6% of AL 4151 students scored at least competent. For the rubric item "Draws reasonable conclusions", 89.4% of students in AL 3031 and 90.6% of AL 4151 students demonstrated competency. This target was met across all criteria.

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.

Target for O5: Written Communication and Editing Skills
On final papers in CTW courses, at least 80% of students will be judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all relevant criteria on the rubric.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In AL 3031 Language in Society, 41 out of 47, or 87.2% of students across all sections, demonstrated competency on the rubric item "Presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion". In AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, 30 out of 32, or 93.8% of students across all sections, earned ratings of either "competent" or "sophisticated" on their final papers in this area. This target was met across all criteria.

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

**Increasing research-related activities in courses**

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** With primary research now required in all AL CTW courses, the second aspect of this action plan has been implemented. With regard to exposure to published research, syllabi for all required AL major courses will be solicited and examined for incorporation of foundational and current publications in course readings. Findings will be reported in the next cycle.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

**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

**Add an AL course to the Core**

The department of Applied Linguistics does not currently have a lower level course that counts in areas A-E of the university core curriculum, despite the applicability of several of our introductory courses to these areas. Our goal is to propose to the faculty senate the addition of AL 2102 Languages of the World or another of our 2000 level courses to the university core, in order to better serve the undergraduate student body (by offering a variety of electives to meet core requirements) and to recruit more students to study languages and Applied Linguistics (in support of the Strategic Initiative to globalize the university and our department goal of an increased local footprint).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

**Scaffolding for Linguistic Analysis Courses**

Over the past few years, our faculty has noticed an increasing level of unpreparedness in our linguistic analysis courses, starting with the first AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics and progressing through AL 4011 Phonetics & Phonology and AL 4012 Morphology & Syntax. Some years, the targets for measures related to Objective 1: Knowledge of Core Areas of Linguistics and Objective 3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure are barely met. During the 2012-2013 cycle, Measure 1 (Objective 1) was Not Met and Measure 3 (Objective 3) was Partially Met. To address this issue, faculty decided this year to add a prerequisite to AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics in order to provide much needed background knowledge that some students are missing in this course. In this way, scaffolding can be provided for the students, with information and skills can be introduced in the new sophomore level course AL 2021 Introduction to English Linguistics, reinforced in the junior level AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics, and further developed in the senior level courses AL 4011 and 4012. Students should be more successful in the later courses as a result of this scaffolding, and the Measures 1 and 3 should reflect this improvement over the next couple of cycles.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The curriculum for the new AL 2021 Introduction to English Linguistics course has been developed and will be implemented for the first time in the fall of 2013. An exemption exam has also been developed so that more competent or knowledgeable students may skip AL 3021 and move straight into AL 3021. 
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

**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 our faculty made quite a few revisions to the assessment process, including new and updated learning outcomes that align better with our undergraduate curriculum and related measures with more validity. No new changes were made this year, as we are waiting to see the results of the recent changes before making additional revisions.
**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 unsatisfactory achievement on Student Learning Outcome #1, on Core Areas of Linguistics across the past four years (with the target met on the measure for this outcome only one out of the four years), the faculty decided to restructure the curriculum in several major courses to provide more scaffolding and allow students time to gradually build knowledge and skills over multiple semesters. Previously, with little or no preparation, students began their area G coursework with a junior level course called AL 3021 Intro to Linguistics. This course had no prerequisites, and many students struggled to master the highly technical content of the curriculum. Beginning in the next cycle (2013-2014), there is a new sophomore level prerequisite to prepare students for AL 3021, as well as an exemption exam to allow students with sufficient background knowledge to waive the new required class and move straight into AL 3021. We hope that better preparing students to study the core areas of linguistics by providing a basic introduction in a lower level course will increase success on the associated student learning outcome and allow the target to be met for this measure in the future. Now, students who already have the necessary groundwork will not be held back by students lacking background knowledge in AL 3021, and many students who would have failed AL 3021 will be supported with additional training before entering this "gateway" course. Farther down the road, as students take upper level analysis courses like AL 4011 Phonetics & Phonology and AL 4012 Morphology & Syntax, this new scaffolding system should continue to positively affect student performance on Student Learning Outcome #1.

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Students become effective teachers of adult language learners.**

Students will become effective teachers of adult language learners, informed by relevant linguistic theory and knowledge of current conceptions of best classroom practices.

**G 2: Students become critical consumers of linguistic and pedagogical theory and research.**

Students will have the foundational knowledge of linguistic and pedagogical theory and research needed to critically assess their value and usefulness for the students' own professional growth as applied linguists in language learning settings.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Teaching methodology (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies the basic principles of ESL/EFL learning and teaching methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Professional development (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflectively engages in professional development activities as a means of promoting personal professional growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Technology (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses technology effectively in research and teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively in both written and oral language in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Connecting theory and practice (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes and critiques theory and practice of L2 teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Cultural knowledge (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses cultural knowledge in second language learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
M 1: Oral presentation of Master's paper (O: 4, 5)
During their final semester, students make a formal oral presentation of their Master's paper. Two faculty members rate the paper for clarity, organization, effective use of visual aids, and overall presentation.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target for O4: Technology
90% of students will score "good" or "excellent" on their use of technology in presentations.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% of students scored good or excellent on their use of technology in presentations.

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
91% of the students scored good or excellent on the overall scores for their presentations.

M 2: Teaching performance and videotapes (O: 2, 5)
Students are videotaped teaching a lesson to their peers in AL 8900: Practicum, a required course in the program. The instructor rates the students on a rubric evaluating teaching effectiveness (outcome 1) and oral communication (outcome 5).
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O2: Teaching methodology
90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

M 3: Survey of graduating students (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Students who graduated between Summer 2008 and Spring 2009 were asked to complete a web-based survey investigating their perceptions of how confident they feel about the areas covered in the learning outcomes.
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements
Target for O1: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "knowledge of linguistic systems of English".

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on knowledge of linguistic systems of English.

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on teaching methodology.

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
86% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on professional development.

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on technology.

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
86% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on cultural knowledge.

**M 4: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
96% of students were rated excellent or good in writing and formatting/referencing.

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
91% of students were rated excellent or good in connecting theory to practice and scholarship.

**M 5: Classroom-based experience forms and reflections (O: 2, 6)**
Students are required to complete 90 hours of classroom-based experience (CBE) during their program. Advisors certify that their advisees have completed this requirement by submitting two documents each semester: a form signed by the student’s supervisor certifying that the CBE has been completed, and a reflective essay in which the student draws connections between the CBE and what has been learned in coursework.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed this requirement.

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed this requirement.

**M 6: Professional development activities (O: 3)**
Students are required to participate in two professional development (PD) activities each semester they are in the program. They document this experience by submitting a reflective essay about each PD activity to their advisor.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed this requirement.
## 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:** In-Progress  
- **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:** Finished  
- **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:** Finished  
- **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:** Finished  
- **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

## Classroom-based experience

The completion “classroom-based experience forms and reflections” measure will be replaced by a classroom-based experience supervisor evaluation. Using a rubric, teaching supervisors will observe and evaluate classroom performance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Classroom-based experience forms and reflections | Outcome/Objective: Teaching methodology

**Implementation Description:** A rubric has been created and distributed to current students, who will request classroom observation/evaluations from their teaching supervisors.

## Classroom-based experience

The completion “classroom-based experience forms and reflections” measure will be replaced by a classroom-based experience supervisor evaluation. Using a rubric, teaching supervisors will observe and evaluate classroom performance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Classroom-based experience forms and reflections | Outcome/Objective: Connecting theory and practice

**Implementation Description:** A rubric has been created and distributed to current students, who will request classroom observation/evaluations from their teaching supervisors.
Connecting theory and practice: Confidence level

All efforts to encourage connections between theory and practice appear to have not been quite successful enough in heightening confidence in making such connections. The MA Committee is planning to add a teaching philosophy statement to the MA portfolio as a required component. Students will be asked to explicitly state how theory informs their language teaching philosophy.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Professional development activities

This completion measure will be replaced by an evaluation of student professional development reflections. The eight professional development activity reflections that students write will be holistically evaluated by MA advisors using a rubric to rate ability to connect engagement in professional activities with current or future professional practice.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Professional development activities | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

Professional development confidence

Workshops are planned on professional development topics such as writing up research, giving poster presentations, and writing conference proposals.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

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 decided to eliminate two measures: number of presentations/publications and syllabi, both of which tell us little about what students actually learn. We have also decided that this most recent completed cycle, 2012-2013, will be the last for which we report “completion” data, percentage of students who completed their classroom-based experience and professional activity requirements. For the next cycle, students will need to obtain teaching supervisor evaluations of their classroom performance as teachers. Professional activity reflections will be rated by MA advisors, who will assess students’ ability to articulate how their engagement in particular professional activities helps them develop as applied linguists.

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 capstone project for the MA degree, an MA portfolio, will now include a teaching philosophy statement, in which students will be expected to connect linguistic and other relevant theory to their evolving notions of the type of teacher they hope to be. Our teaching practicum course, a core course in the program, will offer guidance in the development of teaching philosophy statements.
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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: 1, 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: 1, 2, 4)**

Graduates will communicate effectively in speech and writing.

**SLO 4: Career planning and development (M: 1, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Qualifying exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The purpose of the Qualifying Exam is for the PhD student to demonstrate theory and content knowledge, research and methodology competence, and communication skills, as well as to develop a plan of study. It consists of a Qualifying Paper and a meeting with a faculty committee (the 'exam' proper). The Qualifying Paper is an empirical paper that is completed in a course during their first year in the program. The goals of the meeting with the faculty are to discuss the paper and to advise the student on a plan for the rest of their program.

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

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

Students’ Qualifying Exams are evaluated using a rubric. Theory and content knowledge as demonstrated in the Paper is rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The paper suggests an incomplete understanding of the literature assigned for the course for which the paper was written; it may have frequent lapses and/or substantial gaps in coverage), "Meets expectations" (The paper demonstrates a solid understanding of the literature assigned for the course for which the paper was written, but may not go substantially beyond that literature), or "Exceeds expectations" (The paper demonstrates an excellent understanding of the relevant literature and goes beyond the readings for the course for which the paper was written). At least 90% of students will score "Meets expectations or "Exceed expectations" for theory and content knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students (2 total) scored "exceeds expectations" for theory and content knowledge.

**Target for O2: Research methodology competence**

Students’ Qualifying Exams are evaluated using a rubric. Research methodology competence as demonstrated in the Paper is rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The methodology is not clearly explained or is inappropriate with respect to the research question(s), or the paper lacks a clear research question), "Meets expectations" (The study addresses a clear research question using appropriate methodology, which is explained clearly in the paper), or "Exceeds expectations" (In addition to the criteria for meeting expectations, the paper demonstrates awareness of alternative methodologies for investigating related questions). At least 90% of students will score "Meets expectations or "Exceed expectations" for methodology competence.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students (2 total) scored "meets expectations" for research methodology competence.

**Target for O3: Communication skills**

Students’ Qualifying Exams are evaluated using a rubric. Written communication skills are evaluated in the Paper and speaking communication skills are evaluated in the Exam proper. Written communication skills as evaluated in the Paper are rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The paper has problems with clarity and/or organization), "Meets expectations" (The paper is generally well written and organized), or "Exceeds expectations" (The paper is well written and organized; in terms of writing it could be publishable with revisions). Speaking communication skills are evaluated in the Exam as "Does not meet expectations" (The student has difficulty answering questions about their research or their future), "Meets expectations" (The student responds to questions convincingly and appears to be prepared to answer challenging questions). At least 90% of students will score at least "Meets expectations" for both the written and speaking components of their Qualifying Exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students (2 total) scored at least "meets expectations" for both the written and speaking components of their Qualifying Exam. (One student scored "exceeds expectations" on the written component and the other did on the spoken component.)

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

Students’ Qualifying Exams are evaluated using a rubric. Career planning and development as demonstrated in the Exam is rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The student has unrealistic or poorly thought out plans for the future), "Meets expectations" (The student has generally feasible short-term (during the PhD program) and long-term career plans), or "Exceeds expectations" (The student has well-articulated, specific short-term and long-term career plans). At least 90% of students will score "Meets expectations or "Exceed expectations" for career planning and development.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students (2 total) scored at least "meets expectations" for career planning and development.
### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of students (2 total) scored "meets expectations" for career planning and development.

### M 2: Comprehensive examinations (O: 1, 2, 3)

The Comprehensive Exam (CE) consists of three examination questions, which the student has three 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

88% of graduate students beyond their second year presented at least one paper at a conference, with nearly all of those presenting multiple papers (76% of all graduate students beyond their second year presented two or more 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

33% of the students (i.e., one of the three) who graduated during the year had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper; the one student had published multiple papers.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
33% of the students (i.e., one of the three) who graduated during the year had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper; the one student had published multiple papers.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
33% of the students (i.e., one of the three) who graduated during the year had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper; the one student had published multiple papers.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
33% of the students (i.e., one of the three) who graduated during the year had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper; the one student had published multiple papers.

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 one undergraduate course.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students who graduated had taught at least 4 semesters at GSU; 100% had taught at least 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: Finished
- 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
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: Finished
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

We have changed one of our measures from a qualifying paper to a qualifying exam to match our changes to program requirements. In addition, the old measure was simply the percentage of students who passed the exam (as measures of theory & content knowledge as well as of research methodology competence). The new measure is a rubric, with assessments of the students' performance on those two outcomes plus written & oral communication skills and career planning & development. The rubric scores provide much more specific information on the students' actual strengths and weaknesses in various areas. We have also changed one target. Formerly we had a target that 90% of our students would teach at least two undergraduate courses in applied linguistics. However, since some students have funding through fellowships or assistantships outside the department, it was not practical for all (or nearly all) graduate students to teach two courses in our undergraduate program. Therefore we changed the target to (still 90%) teaching at least one course in our undergraduate program. (We have maintained the target of having 100% of students teach at least 4 semesters at GSU.) In the coming year, we will develop a rubric to assess the dissertation so that we have more specific information about our students at that stage.

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

In the last two years we have not met our target for students having at least one peer-reviewed article or book chapter published or in press at the time of graduation, and we are now monitoring students' publications pre-graduation. Thus, we now know that 58% of students (including first year students; 68% excluding them) have one such paper already. This year we will try additional advising and opportunities to co-author in order to help the other students gain relevant experience.
Knowledge of art criticism and theory and facility in applying theory and critical thinking to visual analysis. In accordance with our goals, this outcome works to measure students' sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills.

SLO 2: Contemporary contextual knowledge (M: 1, 3)
Informed of contemporary art and its relationship to the history of the discipline. In accordance with our goals, we use this measure to understand students' understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts.

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. In concert with our stated goals, we use this outcome to judge how prepared students are to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world and how prepared students are to engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Assessments were available for five students. Two were rated as exemplary (4/4), 3 were rated as accomplished (3/4). On average, the student data available shows that the goal of 3.5 for this outcome was met.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Assessments were available for five students. Two were rated as exemplary (4/4); three were rated as accomplished (3/4). On average, the goal of 3.5 for this outcome was met.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
Five records were available for assessment. Two students were rated exemplary (4.4), two were rated accomplished (3/4), and one was rated developing (2/4). On average, the goal of 3.5 for this outcome was only partially met. The weakness of the student rated developing skewed the overall number lower. Given the small sample size for this reporting period, it is difficult to draw strong conclusions about larger outcome patterns.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
Five records were available for analysis this period. Two students achieved a rank of exemplary (4/4), two achieved a rank of accomplished (3/4), and one was rated developing (2/4). On average, the desired score of 3.5 for this outcome was partially met. The ranking of one student as developing prevented the full execution of this outcome goal. Given the small sample size for this reporting period, however, it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from this data.

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.

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.

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.

**Target for O4: Professional practice**

With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

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

**Formation of 3-D program**
The Ceramics area and Sculpture area will join to form a 3-D program. This will allow students from both disciplines to enroll in the same Directed Study and Graduate Seminar course under the direction of one faculty member. By forming a larger critical mass of students, they will experience richer and more diversified feedback in their group critiques as well as more exposure to the possibilities of creative problem solving in their studio practice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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

**Graduate Program Review**
As the needs and expectations of students and the university change, it is clear that our MFA graduate program needs to change to meet new demands. We have begun this process by streamlining internal processes and are working toward a redesign of the graduate program. The School of Art is scheduled for a faculty retreat Spring 2014 in which we will discuss seminar structures, new classes (e.g. professional practices, thesis writing).
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Art and Design Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

Goals
G 1: Critical thinking
Students will gain broad knowledge of World art history and demonstrate critical-thinking relative to the study of the visual arts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical thinking in core (G: 1)
"Critical Thinking" outcomes in Art History Core Courses: students develop critical thinking skills through the evaluation and analysis of visual and textual material. The following discipline-specific critical thinking outcomes relate to the General Education "Critical Thinking" outcomes: 1. Students formulate pertinent questions relevant to the evaluation of a work of art or an art historical problem (Gen Ed "Critical Thinking" Outcome #1). 2. Students discern differences and similarities between works of art through the application of aesthetic, contextual and historical knowledge (Gen Ed "Critical Thinking" Outcomes #1 and #2). 3. Students formulate informed opinions about the value of an art historical interpretation (Gen Ed "Critical Thinking" Outcome #3). 4. Students apply knowledge read in their course book and learned in class to solve art-historical problems associated with material not explicitly covered in lectures (Gen Ed "Critical Thinking" Outcome #4).

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We did not make any changes to our assessment process since last year's report. We are not planning to make any changes 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.
The data tells us that we are continuing to incorporate critical thinking in the core courses, and that we are basically on target with our goals. We have not made any revisions to the courses since last year. We have a long term goal of using TAs to lead smaller classes and/or discussion groups that might enable us to introduce different types of critical thinking assignments into the core courses. However, until that goal is achieved, we do not plan to make any changes to the curriculum.

Annual Report Section Responses
Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
We have no major accomplishments to report, other than the fact that we have stayed on track with the goals we previously
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 have no anticipated challenges facing us next year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Art Education BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

Goals
G 1: Visual Arts Literacy
Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills so that they may effectively relay ideas and responses in visual, oral, and/or written communication as they relate 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 (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Student understands the close connections between motivation and engagement and knows how to develop learning experiences using effective teaching strategies including technology that build learner self-direction and ownership of learning. 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. [Related to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standard #3: The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.]

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.

SLO 2: Instruction (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Student is able to plan and assess developmentally 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. [Related to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standard #8: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.]

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.

SLO 3: Instructional Resources (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Student can create and utilize teaching tools such as PowerPoint 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 his/her competencies and growth. [Related to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standard #8: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.]

**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.

**SLO 4: Professionalism (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Student has demonstrated an 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. [Related to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standard #9: The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.]

**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)**

Learning outcomes for undergraduate Art Majors with a Concentration in Art Education are evaluated on the basis of: final student teaching portfolios, which consist of measures for content knowledge, lesson planning, classroom management, instructional strategies, classroom and student behavior management, assessment skills, and professional attributes; summative evaluation of student teaching internships; and supervisor observations in the field. Checklists and rubrics are utilized to assess particular aspects of student performance, such as lesson planning, use of technology, professional dispositions, and final portfolio. The degree of student mastery of each learning objective is also evaluated by assigning points to final course grades for each seminar covering the above described content, then determining an average score for all students enrolled in each course. The following ranking system is used: 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very Good, 5-Excellent.

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 3/5 (Good). The aim is for an average score of 4/5 (Very Good).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in AE 4750 were assessed for this objective. Number of students evaluated for this goal: 20 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 19 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3/5 We are aiming for an average score of: 4/5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.37/5

**Target for O2: Instruction**

The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3/5 (Good). The aim is for an average score of 4/5 (Very Good).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in AE 4760 were assessed for this objective. Number of students evaluated for this goal: 20 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 19 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3/5 We are aiming for an average score of: 4/5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.26/5

**Target for O3: Instructional Resources**

The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3/5 (Good). The aim is for an average score of 4 (Very Good).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in AE 4770 were assessed for this objective. Number of students evaluated for this goal: 20 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 19 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3/5 We are aiming for an average score of: 4/5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.6/5

**Target for O4: Professionalism**

The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3/5 (Good). The aim is for an average score of 4 (Very Good).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in AE 4780 were assessed for this objective. Number of students evaluated for this goal: 20 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 19 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3/5 We are aiming for an average score of: 4/5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.54/5

**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.
Increase student field experience hours
Increasing student field-experience hours prior to student teaching not only allows more hands-on experience for students, but also gives faculty more insight 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 members also work with different local community art programs to provide pre-service art teachers with teaching practice. 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 insight into student performance and identify students who may need extra coursework or field experiences to prepare for student teaching. However, this opportunity is optional for students and is not required by the Art Education program. The Art Education program is planning to submit a catalog change in Fall 2013 (for official implementation in Fall 2014) so that teaching practice before official student teaching will be required for all pre-service art teachers. By doing so, the Art Education faculty can examine Art Education majors' professionalism, instruction, and instructional resources. These three domains are still the focus for the art education program.

Student Data
We need to streamline the collection and maintenance of student records (particularly those pertaining to the evaluation of student teachers while they are taking student teaching courses) for assessment purposes.

Lesson Planning Skills
While we have already implemented more field experience hours to allow students greater opportunities to practice what they are learning -- and to give faculty more insight into student "readiness" -- we recognize the need to reinforce lesson planning skills in the methods coursework prior to student teaching.

Refining Goals for Student Learning
Learning goals will be refined to align with the mission statement of the School of Art and Design, which is currently being modified, and to better illustrate what we would like our students to be once they complete the program.

Revision of Average Score Goal for All 4 Learning Objectives
As the average score goal of 4/5 has been surpassed for all 4 learning objectives in each of the last 3 years, we need to consider whether that average score goal needs to be raised.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Though the sample size for this measure was low (3 students) and we cannot draw significant statistical data from it, we exceeded our stated goal. Our goal for this outcome was 4 and all three students scored 5.

Target for O2: Research skills in critically analyzing evidence

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

As with Goal 1, the sample size for this outcome is too small to draw statistically significant findings. That said, our stated goal was 4 and the three students assessed for this year scored 5, exceeding our expectations.

Target for O3: Written Communication Skills

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

As noted in goals 1 and 2, the sample size for this outcome is too small to draw statistically significant conclusions. As with the other two goals, our stated target was 4 and all three students exceeded that by scoring 5s.

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.
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 changes in assessment but we have followed our action plan and have carefully monitored, and will continue to monitor, our MAEd candidate's progress and encourage them toward completion.

**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 appear to indicate that the changes brought about by our action plan last year are bearing fruit.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Art History BA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive, and accessible undergraduate education in 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 they relate 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 (G: 1, 2) (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.

**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.
- 8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 4.2 Highlight the arts and media.
- 5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 1, 2, 3) (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 judgements about the validity of rival claims about art.

**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.

**SLO 3: Research Skills (G: 1, 2, 3) (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.
**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.

**SLO 4: Written Communication Skills (G: 1, 2) (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 formal 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 connection with AH 4990: Art History Capstone or in consultation with their principal advisers in the course of their final semester (or last 15 credit hours of study). This year, the portfolio consisted of a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, an advanced writing project involving art historical research, a research response paper, a critical analysis paper, and an art history experience paper. The portfolio requires students to submit a paper from the beginning of their Art History studies and one from the end, and this "book-ending" approach provides us with a solid grasp of each student's improvement, or lack thereof, across time. Knowledge of Content is evaluated 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. Critical Thinking Skills are evaluated based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. Research Skills are evaluated based on review of any research-based exam questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. Written Communication Skills are evaluated based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. The degree of student mastery of each Learning Objective is evaluated according to the following scheme: 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very Good, 5-Excellent.

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 3/5 (Good), while our aim is an average score of 4.5/5 (Very Good-Excellent).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Number of students evaluated for this goal: 15 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 15 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.33 (Prev. Year: 3.91) The outcome score for Objective 1, Knowledge of Content, saw 100% student achievement, and an increase average from last year's 3.91 to 4.33. This increase reflects the Art History area's continued insistence on more rigor in its course work. For Art History, Knowledge of Content includes the ability to identify information like artist, title, and date with 100% accuracy as well as knowledge of art historical terms. In early classes (such as the surveys) student often struggle with learning how to memorize and report this information. As the Art History area increases its expectations regarding student performance, it places more weight on this foundational information and demands higher performance from students, especially majors. The Art History area's target for this objective is unchanged – we are working toward 100% student achievement and an average score of 4.5.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**

Evaluation based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. The minimum score for successful completion of this goal is 3/5 (Good), while our aim is an average score of 4.5/5 (Very Good-Excellent).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Number of students evaluated for this goal: 15 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 14 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.2 (Prev. Year: 3.65) The outcome score for Objective 2, Critical Thinking Skills, also saw an increase from last year's 3.65 to 4.2, along with a 93% achievement rate (last year's achievement rate was 88%). The increase may be the result of the area's emphasis on critical thinking in each of its 3000- and 4000-level courses. As with our other statistics, we lack sufficient longitudinal data to perform in-depth analysis. The Art History area's target for this objective is unchanged – we are working toward 100% student achievement and an average score of 4.5.

**Target for O3: Research Skills**

Evaluation based on review of any research-based exam questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. The minimum score for successful completion of this goal is 3/5 (Good), while our aim is an average score of 4.5 (Very Good-Excellent).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Number of students evaluated for this goal: 15 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 14 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 3.76 (Prev. Year: 3.74) The outcome score for Objective 3, Research Skills, increased slightly from the previous year’s score of 3.74 to 3.76, with a 93% achievement rate (last year’s achievement rate was 88%). This still falls well short of our goal. As part of our continuing effort to improve our students’ Research 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 increase in outcomes for Objective 2, it appears that this has 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.

**Target for O4: Written Communication Skills**

Evaluation based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. The minimum score for successful completion of this goal is 3/5 (Good), while our aim is an average score of 4.5/5 (Very Good-Excellent).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Number of students evaluated for this goal: 15 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 14 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 3.95 (Prev. Year: 3.66) The outcome score for Objective 4, Written Communication Skills, climbed from last year’s 3.66 to 3.95. While the increase is encouraging, we are still disappointed given our focus in recent years on improving our students’ writing. We hope to see greater improvement. 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.

**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 evaluate 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: Finished
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Graduation portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication Skills

**Implementation Description:** AH 4990 has been adopted as the capstone course for the major, though it will be sometime before we have a critical mass taking completing the course. Therefore, we project that within two years we can effectively use it as a measure.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Glenn Gunhouse, John Decker, Kimberly Cleveland, Maria Gindhart, Melinda Hartwig, Susan Richmond, Akela Reason

**AH 3000 - Intro to Art History Methodology**

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

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Graduation portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** 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**

Now that AH 3000 and AH 4990 have been taught for multiple years and by multiple instructors, the effectiveness of these courses needs to be assessed, with the subsequent implementation of ways to improve them.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Graduation portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication Skills

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty in the Art History Area who have taught AH 3000 and AH 4990.
Content Knowledge and Critical Thinking Skills
The outcomes for Objective 1 (Knowledge of Content and Critical Thinking Skills, 3.85 and 3.58 respectively) are lower from the previous academic year. While the students we evaluated are meeting most of our goals, the faculty and course content is more rigorous, requiring more out of students. Our goal is to turn out art history graduates who could go on to any top graduate program in the US. Our concern last year was the somewhat inflated scores based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, which -- since submission of the graduation portfolio was essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted were not be a representative sample. This year we solved the problem by offering graduating majors a new capstone course (AH 4990), and required all to submit a graduation portfolio. This resulted in a more representative sample of work that included a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, and an advanced writing project involving art-historical research, a research response paper, a critical analysis paper, an art analysis paper, and an art history experience paper. We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breadth of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Written Communication Skills
The outcomes 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking 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
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: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Graduation portfolio
  - Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
  - Knowledge of Content
  - Written Communication Skills
- Responsible Person/Group: Art History Faculty

1000-Level Survey Experimentation

In order to increase Knowledge of Content (Objective 1) in our 1000-level survey courses (AH 1700, AH 1750, and AH 1850), which serve as the foundation for our upper-level classes, we would like to experiment with smaller sections for the FLCs and for Honors students to see if more personal attention translates to better student performance. We would also like to explore whether we could assign GTAs to those courses to work with students.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Graduation portfolio
  - Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Content
- Implementation Description: The Art History area will discuss the best course of action and discuss it with the Associate Director and Director of the School of Art and Design.
- Projected Completion Date: 10/2014
- Responsible Person/Group: Art History area
- Additional Resources: We may need more funding for PTIs and/or GTAs.

Fine Arts Library Liaison

Students in AH 3000, AH 4990, and many of our 4000-level classes have library sessions with Fine Arts Library Liaison Nedda Ahmed, and we want to continue to facilitate our students' access to research materials and instruction.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Graduation portfolio
  - Outcome/Objective: Research Skills
- Implementation Description: The Art History faculty, or representatives thereof, will meet with Nedda Ahmed to discuss strategies to best tailor library sessions to the abilities and needs of our students.
- Responsible Person/Group: Art History area

Refining Goals for Student Learning

Learning goals will be refined to align with the mission statement of the School of Art and Design, which is currently being modified, and to better illustrate what we would like our students to be once they complete the program.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

WAC Classes

Due to the success we have had with our two CTW classes (AH 3000 and AH 4990), we want to explore whether offering more WAC courses in Art History would further improve Critical Thinking Skills, Research Skills, and Written Communication Skills. Several Art History faculty currently offer WAC courses, but we want to consider whether doing so more systematically would improve student achievement.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Graduation portfolio
  - Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
**Research Skills**

**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. Students who graduate from the program come away with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills that prepare them for Ph.D. work, careers in college teaching, in museums, and in related areas such as publishing, galleries, and auction houses.

**Goals**

**G 4: Written Communication**

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

**G 1: Knowledge**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of artistic traditions across a range of times and places. Student will be 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.

**G 2: Critical Thinking**

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply a range of art historical methods (i.e., formal analysis, semiotics, criticism, etc.), to apply appropriate methods to the analysis of particular works of art, and to make reasoned judgments about the validity of rival claims about art.

**G 3: Research Skills**

Students will demonstrate ability 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Demonstrated knowledge of the field.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking (G: 2)**

**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).
2.4 Enhance a research culture.
2.5 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
2.6 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 3: Research Skills (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)

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).
2.4 Enhance a research culture.
2.5 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
2.6 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 4: Written Communication skills (G: 4) (M: 4)

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).
2.4 Enhance a research culture.
2.5 Create a Georgia State Faculty Fellowship Program.
2.6 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).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Knowledge of content (O: 1)
Faculty review of knowledge as indicated in thesis and coursework, using the attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 2: Research (O: 3)
Faculty assessment of research using attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O3: Research Skills
We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
The sample size for this metric (Gathering of Evidence) was small, only 5 students, which is not particularly useful for establishing significant statistical trends. These students achieved an average of 4.4 for this measure -- we were aiming for 4.5. While we did not meet our goal exactly, our students did meet our minimum standard for this outcome/objective, which was 3.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Instituted Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH8010)

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

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

### 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Research  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Written Communication Skills  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** Art History Faculty

### Curriculum Redesign/Rethink

Given the outcomes for 2013, the area will need to meet and determine what changes to sequence as well as content and level are necessary to bring outcomes in line with stated goals.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Area meeting to assess needed program changes and implement as necessary.
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 increased our targets from last year (from 4 to 4.5). As we have had only partial success in these goals, we will keep them at 4.5 for the coming academic year. We plan to follow our post NASAD action plan and offer more graduate only courses to help our students with their research and writing skills. Starting 2015, we also plan to use our methodology course (AH 8010) as part of screening students to identify potential weaknesses in research and writing abilities. This should allow us to identify students in need of remedial training and get them up to speed before the thesis is underway. One potential downside to this is that, due to course minimum requirements (i.e. 12 MA students to "make" a class), we are currently only able to offer the methods class every other year, which means that some students will go longer without intense diagnoses. We are teaching methods Fall 2013 but had not compiled this data in time to build such assessment into the course -- we will have to wait until 2015.

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 data has shown us that our students have weaknesses in their research and writing skills. The move toward more graduate only courses (currently underway) should help as should using our methods class to assess student ability (in 2015). To that end, we will need to rethink and revise our curriculum to take this into account.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Art Studio BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

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 communications as they relate 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: Technical skills (G: 1, 3) (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 (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Students demonstrate conceptual and critical thinking skills in their approach to their studio work. They have the ability to investigate and research their individual ideas with a focus on content. Conceptual skills are manifested in the level of sophistication in their studio work as well as in the quality of their participation in critical discussions and the critique process.

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

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

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

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Gateway (Foundations) Portfolio and Statement (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Gateway Portfolio of Artwork from first year foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses including written essay that details information about the student’s portfolio of art and why the student has chosen this art discipline.

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

**Target for O1: Technical skills**
Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Accomplished), 4 (Exemplary).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 113 students assessed for their technical skills in their applications to the studio major, 28 or 25% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 54 or 48% as 2 (developing), 27 or 24% as 3 (accomplished) and 4 or 4% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 2.06 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 113 students assessed for conceptual skills, 36 or 32% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 56 or 50% as 2 (developing), 20 or 18% as 3 (accomplished) and 1 or <1% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 1.88 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 113 students assessed for historical and contemporary knowledge, 58 or 51% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 47 or 42% as 2 (developing), 7 or 6% as 3 (accomplished) and 1 or <1% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 1.57 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 113 students evaluated for professional preparation, 44 or 39% were assessed as 1 (beginning), 43 or 38% as 2 (developing), 21 or 19% as 3 (accomplished) and 5 or 4% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 1.88 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 2.5.

**M 2: Final Portfolio, Artist’s Statement, Resume and BFA Senior Exhibition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Final Portfolio submitted containing 15-20 examples of studio work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950 including artist’s statement evidencing knowledge and understanding of 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 3.5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 85 graduating students assessed for their technical skills, 0 or 0% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 14 or 16% as 2 (developing), 44 or 53% as 3 (accomplished) and 27 or 32% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.15 on a scale of 4, which is 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 85 graduating students assessed for their conceptual skills, 0 or 0% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 21 or 25% as 2 (developing), 37 or 44% as 3 (accomplished) and 27 or 32% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.07 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 85 graduating students assessed for their historical and contemporary knowledge, 2 or 2% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 15 or 18% as 2 (developing), 47 or 55% as 3 (accomplished) and 21 or 25% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.02 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 85 graduating students assessed for their professional preparation, 0 or 0% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 20 or 24% as 2 (developing), 32 or 38% as 3 (accomplished) and 33 or 39% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.15 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

**Refining Goals for Student Learning**
Learning goals will be refined to align with the mission statement of the School of Art and Design, which is currently being modified, and to better illustrate what we would like our students to be once they complete the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2012-2013 Astronomy PhD**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**
Coming Soon

**Goals**

**G 1:** Coming Soon
Coming Soon

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 4)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

**O/O 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 3, 4)**
Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report their research. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

**O/O 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

**O/O 5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Astronomy Ph.D. students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge. Areas of required knowledge are: i. at least two of the core physics areas, classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. ii. fundamental astrophysics and astronomical instrumentation and techniques. iii. stellar atmospheres, stellar structure and evolution, the interstellar medium, extragalactic astronomy, and relativistic astrophysics and cosmology. All Ph.D. students shall be able to demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

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

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Four students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 3.9 out of 5.0.

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

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

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.
**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

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

Normal 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were evaluated at the time of their PhD defense in 2012-2013.

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

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**

The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the Ph.D. students in astronomy. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in the PhD in Astronomy program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

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

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

*Measure: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills*

*Measure: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills*

*Motivations and Implications of Research | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking*
**Measure:** Qualifying Exam 2 | **Outcome/Objective:** Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills

**Measure:** Research Advisor Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration in Scientific Research

**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:** 05/2012

**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

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

---

**New Assessment and Reporting System**
Collection and reporting of assessment data for the program has been irregular and inefficient leading to incomplete assessment data and reports. Newly re-formed department standing committee on assessment will re-evaluate the assessment and reporting system. Greater involvement from graduate directors will be sought in new assessment plan.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Responsible Person/Group:** John Wilson

---

**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?

Collection and reporting of assessment data for the program has been irregular and inefficient leading to incomplete assessment data and reports. Newly re-formed department standing committee on assessment will re-evaluate the assessment and reporting system. Greater involvement from graduate directors will be sought in new assessment 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.

Since data has been irregularly collected in the past year, no significant data-driven changes have been made to the degree program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification**

*As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 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.
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.

**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**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 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.
The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn.

G 2: Can effectively teach diverse learners.
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

G 3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Student demonstrates understanding of learning. (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn and develop over a period of time, by providing learning opportunities that demonstrate a child's intellectual, social, and/or behavioral development/growth.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**SLO 2: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners. (G: 2) (M: 2)**
The teacher plans for and uses assessment in instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student needs, the community and curriculum goals.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher demonstrates understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Performance Evaluation (O: 1)**
Final grade in EXC 7941 (Practicum in Special Education) using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest. Note that A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D or F = 1.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
For Fall 2012-Summer 2013 with an N of 5, 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 grade in EXC 7130 (Assessment for Instructional Planning) using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest. Note that A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D or F = 1.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
For Fall 2012-Summer 2013 with an N of 11, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the rubric with a range of 3-4 and a mean of 3.82.

**M 3: Comprehensive Exams (O: 3)**
Up to Spring 2013: To demonstrate mastery of the critical content in the M.Ed. program, a case study will be used to assess student competencies. The case study will contain formal and informal assessment information. Students will be asked to a) make a categorical eligibility recommendation with an explanation and rationale; b) select annual goals, short-term objectives, and instructional objectives for the subject of the case study; and, c) describe a general classroom behavior management system to support academic and social/emotional development. Exams are scored with a rubric with a scale of 1-4, with 4 representing the highest score. Students must earn “3” or “4” on all but one of the items within each section (an average score of 3 or above) to pass the section. Students are allowed one “2” rating in a section. A rating of “1” in any section will result in a failing evaluation for that section. From Summer 2013 - present: To demonstrate mastery of the critical content in the M.Ed. program, students will be asked to respond about the academic and/or behavioral difficulties that pupils with learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, or mild intellectual disabilities commonly experience across a variety of educational settings throughout their P-12 career. Specifically, for these pupils, students will be asked to: describe the population; describe academic, behavioral, or secondary transition/education intervention/strategy/method to improve outcomes for specific characteristics and/or skill deficits/excesses that might be exhibited by pupils; synthesize the research literature (minimum of 2 studies) on the effectiveness of the intervention/strategy/method; describe how a teacher would implement this intervention/strategy/method in a school environment, including the infusion of technology, collaborations with other teachers and/or family members, and effects on the learning environment; describe how a teacher would monitor the effectiveness of the intervention/strategy/method from baseline through intervention phases; and describe how the teacher may differentiate (change their instruction) this intervention/strategy/method for a non-responder. Exams are scored with a
rubric with a scale of 0 (did not meet) to 2 (met). Students must meet 16 out 20 indicators (80%) to pass the exam.

The Target for O3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

90% of students will score at or above 3 out of 4.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

For Fall 2012-Spring 2013: with an N of 12 total students, 10 (or 83.3%) scored at or above 3 out of 4. For Summer 2013, with an N of 3, 100% scored at 80% or better on the rubric with a range of 16 indicators met. Taken all together, 13 out of 15 (87%) of students met this target, which is approaching our goal of 90%

**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 a) 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

**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?

Beginning in Summer 2013, the program instituted a new comprehensive exam format, questions, and rubric that is more reflective of the curricula changes and updates which have been made. Three students took the exam in Summer 2013, and all three passed. Program faculty will continue to monitor students' responses to the new exam format during 2013-2014, and modify the questions and rubric as needed.

**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 the data from those students who have taken the new comprehensive exam is promising, it is preliminary at best. We will continue to monitor students' responses to the new exam format during 2013-2014, and modify the questions and rubric as needed.
Goals

G 1: Area D
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: Content in Biology (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to recall basic content in Biology, including but not limited to: history, conventional metabolic pathways, structure/function of cells, structure/function of human physiology, and how these topics pertain to real-world applications.

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

SLO 3: Application of the Scientific Method (M: 3, 4)
Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability to formulate a hypothesis, perform background research, design appropriate experiments to address biological questions, and analyze the results of the experiment.

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

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content in Bio 2200 (O: 1)
The skin is an effective barrier to pathogens in which of the following ways? A. The salt content of the skin is high. B. The surface cells continually fall off making it difficult for pathogens to gain a foothold. C. Sebum and sweat contain substances that inhibit the growth of most pathogens. D. All of above
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Content in Biology
80% of students

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
93% answered correctly

M 2: Microbiology BIO2300 content (O: 1)
Which is true regarding the three central metabolic pathways? A. They form high energy bonds that can be used to synthesize ATP. B. They form intermediates that can be oxidized to generate reducing power. C. They form precursor metabolites. D. All of the choices are correct.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Content in Biology
75%

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
76%

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
76%

M 3: Analysis in BIO2200 (O: 3)
Removing rats from urban European areas has been one strategy for reducing bubonic plague. Which is the best reason for this strategy being effective?
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method
75%

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
89%
**Mission / Purpose**
To critically think about and communicate Biology. Students will be able to recall basic concepts in Biology, think critically and evaluate Biological claims, and communicate these concepts both in writing and orally.

**Goals**

**G 1: Area D**
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: Content in Biology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)**
Students will be able to recall basic content in Biology, including but not limited to: history, conventional metabolic pathways, structure/function of cells, structure/function of human physiology, and how these topics pertain to real-world applications.

**SLO 5: Basic field/lab techniques (M: 5, 11)**
Students will be able to perform basic techniques used in biological research which are applied in a laboratory setting and, in some cases, in outdoor settings such as during data collection.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Communication**
Students will be expected to be able to express ideas about biological content both orally and in writing.

**O/O 3: Application of the Scientific Method (M: 5, 10)**
Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability formulate a hypothesis, perform background research, design appropriate experiments to address biological questions, and analyze the results of the experiment.

**O/O 4: Analysis (M: 2, 4, 9, 10, 11)**
Students will be able to execute basic problem solving skills and data analysis in Biology.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Animal Biology MP Question (O: 1)**
Multiple choice question on the final exam. Students were asked to evaluate the correct order of appearance of different traits in vertebrate evolution.

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

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
70% answer question(s) correctly

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
70% for one section and 84% for another section
M 2: Animal Biology MP Question (O: 1, 4)
Multiple choice question on the final exam. Students were asked to evaluate the key features of life on land for amphibians.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
70% of students get the answer correct

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Section 1: 72% answered the question correctly Section 2: 83% answered the question correctly

**Target for O4: Analysis**
70% of students answer correctly

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Section 1: 72% answered the question correctly Section 2: 83% answered the question correctly

M 3: Animal Biology MP Question (O: 1)
Multiple choice question on the final exam. Students were asked to indicate the function of the secondary palate in crocodiles.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
70% of students answer correctly

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Section 1: 69% answered the question correctly Section 2: 98% answered the question correctly

M 4: Animal Biology MP Question (O: 1, 4)
Multiple choice question on the final exam. Students were asked to compare characteristics of avian and non-avian reptiles.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
70% of students answer correctly

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Section 1: 75% answered the question correctly Section 2: 62% answered the question correctly

**Target for O4: Analysis**
70% of students answer correctly

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Section 1: 75% answered the question correctly Section 2: 62% answered the question correctly

M 5: Animal Biology MP Question (O: 3, 5)
Students designed and conducted an experiment investigating the behavior of terrestrial isopods. Working in groups of up to 4, students listed different cues that might be used by isopods to remain within the leaf litter. All of the groups then worked together under the guidance of their TA to design an experiment to test the importance of one of these cues for determining where isopods are found. As part of this exercise they generated hypotheses, designed methods for testing their hypotheses, identified and implemented appropriate controls, predicted outcomes for the experiment, and collected and analyzed the data.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method**
80%

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
All of the groups across three sections of the lab course (13/13 groups) successfully designed and completed their experiments within the lab session.

**Target for O5: Basic field/lab techniques**
80%

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
All of the groups across three sections of the lab course (13/13 groups) successfully designed and completed their experiments within the lab session.

M 6: General Biology Final (O: 1)
Which of the following experimental requirements was necessary for Pasteur to disprove spontaneous generation?
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Content in Biology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: General Biology Final (O: 1)**

Matching the following people to their contribution toward the advancement of microbiology:

1. Jenner - disproved spontaneous generation
2. Fleming - antiseptic surgery
3. Leeuwenhoek - first to observe and accurately describe prokaryotic microorganisms
4. Pasteur - developed and documented the first vaccination procedure against smallpox
5. Lister - discovered penicillin

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

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**

70%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matching the following people to their contribution toward the advancement of microbiology 79% 1. Jenner a. disproved spontaneous generation 2. Fleming b. antiseptic surgery 3. Leeuwenhoek c. the first to observe and accurately describe prokaryotic microorganisms 4. Pasteur d. developed and documented the first vaccination procedure against smallpox 81% 5. Lister e. discovered penicillin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: General Biology Final (O: 1)**

Bacillus anthracis causes the deadly disease anthrax. Organisms of the genus Bacillus may form endospores. This bacterium would be suitable for biological warfare because endospores are:

- a. centrally located within the bacterial cells.
- b. multilayered structures.
- c. difficult to stain.
- d. resistant to high temperatures, UV light and desiccation.

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

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**

70%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Genetics Final (O: 4)**

What the assessment was:

- using recombination frequencies between genes to determine the physical map of genes located on the same chromosome
- students must analyze this data to draw a correct physical map and then determine how many linkage groups are represented by the recombination data

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

**Target for O4: Analysis**

For 70% to earn 6 points out of 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46% received full credit (12 pts) 46% received partial credit (4-8 pts) 8% received no credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: Cell and Mol Bio in class activity (O: 3, 4)**

Students were asked to determine the mechanism of disease for a case study

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

**Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method**

- 80% of the students were expected to participate in the group activity and use their knowledge of aerobic respiration to determine the cause of disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students participated in the critical thinking of the scientific problem they were presented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Analysis**

- 90% of students were able to participate in an analytical discussion of the in class assignment

**M 11: Lab Technique in Cell Biology (O: 4, 5)**

Students were expected to determine, using molecular tools, if a sample contained protein or DNA

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

**Target for O4: Analysis**

- 85%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students were able to correctly determine if a sample had DNA or protein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Basic field/lab techniques**
Findings 2012-2013 - Target:  Met
90% of students were able to correctly determine if a sample had DNA or protein

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

Create activity on avian/non-avian reptiles
Animal biology instructors will meet to discuss how to better teach the characteristics of avian and non-avian reptiles

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Animal Biology MP Question
- Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology

- Responsible Person/Group: Amy Horner

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
We have made some great accomplishments from last year. Primary is the addition of several new CTW courses that will fulfill the second CTW requirement. We have added the following courses: BIOL4250 Cell Cycle and Cancer - CTW BIOL4282 Tumor Immunology - CTW BIOL4280 Immunology and Infectious Diseases - CTW This has provided the department to offer almost enough senior level CTW courses to be able to allow most of our graduating students to finish with their degree in a timely fashion.

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.
Our biggest challenges are making sure we can accommodate all of the students for their second CTW course. With the increase in enrollment, we face a conundrum in the sense that we have a difficult time offering enough CTW courses. It is projected that we have over 600 graduating seniors per academic year, which means that we need 24 sections of each CTW per academic year. Currently, we offer 18 sections, 432 students, of the first CTW class BIOL3810 but only about 144 seats in the upper level CTW per academic year. We do not want students to be unable to graduate only because of not being able to get into the second CTW.
Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

We have a good measurement system for the first CTW but because we have several upper division CTW, we don't have a standardized assessment of these courses. This is a goal we have started working on.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

We have begun to clearly emphasize communication. This was something that was not delineated originally but now is becoming more clear for each CTW class.

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

Therese M. Poole has been on the CTW leadership team. She is also on the Signature experience committee. It is the committee's hope that many of the signature experiences can also be CTW classes.

International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

The Biology Department offers several Study Abroad programs: 1. Argentina (virology), 2. Italy (Environmental Science), 3. Taiwan (Microbiology). We also have students from China or Taiwan come for the Summer Institute (4 weeks in summer) and now have two Chinese professors working with our students this semester (BIOL1110 and 1120). In addition, we have a 2+2 program with several universities in China. Currently, we have graduated 4 of these students and have 3 more students in progress. We hope to continue these interactions and increase them to other countries.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

We have several initiatives towards major/minor courses starting in their freshman year. We use the new DegreeWorks system as well as looking at "red flags" on a student's evaluation. The department is reaching out to the newly formed advisement center to make sure that we are all on the same page and that these advisers are aware of opportunities for biology majors. We have been able to secure funding, either through the Dean's Office or through RPG funds, to get more Supplemental Instruction (SI) for several of our "at-risk" classes. We feel that many students have been helped by the SI sessions.

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 have several initiatives to outreach to the community. 1. BioBus - mobile biology laboratory that goes to elementary, middle, and high school students, providing guided experiments in science. 2. FOCUS (Fostering Our Communities Understanding of Science) - students spend 4-8 hours per week at middle or high schools conducting demonstrations or experiments in biology. In addition, they spend 2 hours per week learning teaching pedagogy with teachers in the College of Education. 3. This is not an official GSU-affiliated partnership, but many of our students volunteer at Grady Hospital.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Biology MS**

(Assessment Data as of 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Mission of the Department is: a. to provide students with a foundation of scientific literacy in biology necessary to be successful in relevant in academic and professional schools as well as occupations in private industry; b. to increase the understanding of biological processes through innovative research programs.

**Goals**

**G 1: Scientific Professionals**

There are two tracks: 1) non-thesis, which emphasizes scientific literacy and course content; and 2) thesis, which emphasizes scientific literacy, course content and research. Successful students in both tracks will be scientifically literate and possess the ability to synthesize information and formulate logical arguments that can be communicated through written and oral presentations. In addition, successful thesis students will formulate hypotheses, design and perform experiments and analyze and interpret their results. This research will be performed in the laboratories of graduate faculty members.

**G 2: Critical Thinkers**

Students will be able to reason and think critically.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Scientific Literacy (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology.

**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**

2.1 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.
3.2 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).

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).

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

---

**SLO 2: Conduct Research (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Demonstrating skills of scientific professionals, students will be able to apply scientific principles via performance of a laboratory or literary based paper.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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.

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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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

The thesis is the capstone assignment. These capstone provides 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.

**Target for O2: Conduct Research**

100% of students conducting laboratory research should complete certification online course.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students successfully completed the course.

**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 capstone provides 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
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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**

Successful students will be effective and efficient scientific professionals. There are four disciplines: Applied & Environmental Microbiology, Cell Biology & Immunology, Molecular Genetics Pathogenesis & Immunity, and Neurobiology & Behavior. Each discipline seeks to provide core fundamental skills that are relatable to specific scientific research areas.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**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.

As enrollment numbers increase, the faculty may have more capstone reports to review in addition to current workloads.

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

Directors and/or staff are to partipate on the University's Graduate Council Committee.

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

March 31, 2012, the very first Center for Diagnostics and Therapeutics (CDT) Conference was held. Two students participated in the event as follows: Vaishali Pannu (Ritu Aneja, Advisor) "Generation of High-Grade Spindle Multipolarity by Centrosome Hyperamplification and Declustering: a Novel Chemotherapeutic Approach" and Morgan Cook (Julia Hilliard, Advisor) "Design of a Therapeutic Target that Alters p38 Regulation of Cellular Factors are Important for B Virus Infection." Also, a Biotech Symposium was held February 2013, which collaborated with Nanjing University of China. The following GSU professors held scheduled presentations for the event: Yuan Li "Inflammation Research and Collaboration for Funding Leverage", Tim Bartness "Bidirectional Communication between the Brain and Adipose Tissue", Susanna Greer "Control of Gene Transcription and Epigenetic Regulation", Didier Merlin "Intestinal Inflammation and Drug Delivery Design", and Jiang-Dong Li "Regulation of Inflammation and Development of Novel Anti-inflammatory Therapy".

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

Collaborative research efforts are in progress with Nanjing University of China. Such research efforts are to aid in the University’s strategic plan via international collaborations as well as provide grant and academia related opportunities. In addition to research, study abroad programe provide cultural and academic advancements, as students learn concepts in other countries. Some internationally taught classes consists of students that are international students and current University students, which allots for communication from different perspectives.

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

The MS program provides assistantship opportunities that fund tuition and provide a stipend for many of the students that are enrolled in the program. Assistantships are in areas such as research, teaching, and community educational endeavors. Students must maintain a certain gpa and number of credit hours; this promotes retention, progression, and graduation of students.

**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).

The Biology Graduate Student Association actively provides promotes community services via events such as the Atlanta Food Bank service event. Also, collaborative laboratory research is conducted in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control, other universities, and area hospitals.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Biology PhD**

(Include 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**

Successful students will be effective and efficient scientific professionals. There are four disciplines: Applied & Environmental Microbiology, Cell Biology & Immunology, Molecular Genetics Pathogenesis & Immunity, and Neurobiology & Behavior. Each discipline seeks to provide core fundamental skills that are relatable to specific scientific research areas.
SLO 1: Experimental Design (G: 1) (M: 2)

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

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.

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.
3.4 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.

SLO 2: Scientific Inquiry and Research (G: 1) (M: 2)

Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology.

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.

SLO 3: Scientific Communication (G: 1) (M: 2)

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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 2: PhD Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3)

Students must prepare, submit and orally defend an NIH-style research proposal. The examination process follows a specific timeline:

1. Students must submit a pre-proposal in which they state the nature of the problem, present their hypothesis, and briefly describe their experimental design. The pre-proposal is evaluated by a 3-member faculty committee who either grant their approval or make suggestions.
2. After the pre-proposal or a revised pre-proposal has been approved, students have two months to complete the full proposal. During this time period, they receive mentoring from their Committee in the form of 1-2 meetings in which they present their progress on developing the proposal and receive suggestions from the Committee.
3. Students submit their completed proposals and orally defend them before their Committees. The Committee then makes one of the following assessments of student performance:
   a) Pass (satisfactory performance on both the written and oral parts of the examination);
   b) Qualified Pass (satisfactory performance on the written proposal, but deficiencies noted in the oral defense);
   c) Conditional Pass (certain parts of the written proposal must be revised); or
   d) Fail (unsatisfactory performance on both the proposal and the oral defense). Students who Fail the examination twice are subject to expulsion from the Ph.D. program.

Target for O1: 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 2012-2013 - 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 19 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these 15 (79%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 3 (16%) received either a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending and one student (5%) failed the exam for the second time. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Partially Met Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 7 (38%) 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.

Target for O2: Scientific Inquiry and Research

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 2012-2013 - 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 19 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these 15 (79%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 3 (16%) received either a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending and one student (5%) failed the exam for the second time. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Partially Met Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 7 (38%) 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.

Target for O3: Scientific Communication

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 2012-2013 - 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 19 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these 15 (79%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 3 (16%) received either a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending and one student (5%) failed the exam for the second time. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Partially Met Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 7 (38%) 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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Action Plan
Description: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Action Plan
Description: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Action Plan
Description: 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.
**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?

**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. M2: 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.

**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 has revealed areas where the program may be strengthened and improved. We are instituting a rubric that will be completed by all of the examiners. (see appendix 2).

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**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.

As the number of students increase, the funding may not be present to support all of the students.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

Instructional Learning has been modified to include 7 core courses available to all candidates of the PhD program. Previously, there were only 2 core curriculum courses for students to select per discipline. However, some students needed background coursework from other areas in order to be more productive in the PhD program.

**University-wide Committee Participation**—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate). Program Directors and/or Staff may attend Graduate Council Meetings.

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

March 31, 2012, the very first Center for Diagnostics and Therapeutics (CDT) Conference was held. Two students participated in the event as follows: Vaishali Pannu (Ritu Aneja, Advisor) "Generation of High-Grade Spindle Multipolarity by Centrosome Hyperamplification and Declustering: a Novel Chemotherapeutic Approach" and Morgan Cook (Julia Hiliard, Advisor) "Design of a Therapeutic Target that Alters p38 Regulation of Cellular Factors are Important for B Virus Infection." Also, a Biotech Symposium was held February 2013, which collaborated with Nanjing University of China. The following GSU professors held scheduled presentations for the event: Yuan Li "Inflammation Research and Collaboration for Funding Leverage", Tim Bartness "Bidirectional Communication between the Brain and Adipose Tissue", Susanna Greer "Control of Gene Transcription and Epigenetic Regulation", Didier Merlin "Intestinal Inflammation and Drug Delivery Design", and Jiang-Dong Li "Regulation of Inflammation and Development of Novel Anti-inflammatory Therapy".

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

Collaborative research efforts are in progress with Nanjing University of China. Such research efforts are to aid in the University’s strategic plan via international collaborations as well as provide grant and academia related opportunities. In addition to research, study abroad programs provide cultural and academic advancements, as students learn concepts in other countries. Some
internationally taught classes consists of students that are international students and current University students, which allots for communication from different perspectives.

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

Currently, the PhD program supports doctoral students for more than 5 years which aids in the retention of students.

**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).

The Biology Graduate Student Association actively provides promotes community services via events such as the Atlanta Food Bank service event. Also, collaborative laboratory research is conducted in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control, other universities, and area hospitals.

---

**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) 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 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average score was 3.50. The target was met. Our program is very practical in nature and we are generally successful in helping students relate the subject matter to real business issues.

### M 2: Model Building Ability (O: 2)

In developing a model students will be measured on their ability to a) identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics, b) identify key independent variables and their metrics, c) manage data collection, cleaning and transformation, and d) develop and validate a model.

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

### Target for O2: Model Building Ability

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 2 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from MGS 8150. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in MGS 8150 each time the class is offered. Learning Outcome 2 Model Building Ability Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Identifying the dependent variables and appropriate metrics Can clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about measurement Unsure about the dependent variable Does not understand the connection between the issue at hand and the dependent variable ii. Identifying Key independent variables and their metrics Can clearly identify the independent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about measurement Unsure about the independent variables Does not understand the connection between the dependent and the independent variables iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning, transformations Accurate and thorough preliminary analysis of the data Most parts of preliminary analysis done well Skipped or misunderstood some aspects of data preparation Poor understanding of the need to examine data carefully before modeling. iv. Model Development and validation Clear demonstration of a viable model and results from a validation. Possibly accurate model, not validated sufficiently Some errors in model building Model inappropriate or has too many errors

## Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average score was 3.70. As with the previous year, we believe that MS students who are quantitatively strong tend to choose this area, and do well as a result. We can make the curriculum a little more challenging for them, but must do so without at the same time expecting the same of MBA 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

### Target for O3: Understanding of Techniques

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 3 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from across the curriculum. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in every course where it is applicable during the academic year Learning Outcome 3 Understanding of Techniques Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Regression Analysis Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. ii. Time Series Forecasting Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. iii. Factor/Cluster Analysis Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. iv. Discriminant Analysis or Logistic Regression Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied.

## Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average score was 3.40, meeting the target. Once again, we believe the depth of mathematical treatment can be increased for the MS program.

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

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

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

### Target for O4: Software Skills

Inaccurate work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score was 3.30. While students do well typically, SAS is a difficult software package to learn for most students. Some lab sessions can perhaps be added as an aid. Ideally, there should be a course in programming for MS students.

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

**Continual Improvement Actions**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
<th>Implementation Status: In-Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 05/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: BA Faculty Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To Hire New Faculty**

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

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

**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.

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

**Faculty Hiring**

New faculty member hired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2012-2013</th>
<th>Implementation Status: Finished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: One new NTT faculty member hired to start in Fall 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 04/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fast Track MS program**

Creating a research focused MS program in analytics that is interdepartmental in nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2012-2013</th>
<th>Implementation Status: In-Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: The MS in analytics program was developed under the leadership of the Associate Dean, Dr. Rich Phillips. Assuming it is approved, it should begin in 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 08/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: College wide committe, with representation from our department.</td>
<td></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 assessment process remains the same.

**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 associate dean led a committee of faculty from various departments in the college to design a research focused MS in Analytics that would add more depth in the program for MS students, addressing the need identified over the past few years. The multidisciplinary program would add more programming, mathematics, and application datasets for students to gain mastery over the subject.

---

**Georgia State University**

**2012-2013 Chemistry Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical Thinking Assessment in the Core**

Area D Critical Thinking Assessment for Chemistry Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. 1) The American Chemical Society provides national-level exit exams for all the area D courses within the chemistry program. A representative faculty committee for area D was formed in 2004 and 8 questions from each test were chosen as questions that would require critical thinking. The faculty voted that a 2/8 would demonstrate appropriate critical thinking skills. The expected outcomes were based on the Department of Chemistry Learning Outcome rubric submitted to the Provost’s office prior to Fall 2004. 2) A rubric was developed to assess critical thinking skills demonstrated in the laboratory reports required for these courses.

**G 2: The Nature of Science**

The core area D deals with the nature of science.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

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

**SLO 3: ACS questions (G: 2)**

Specific questions from the ACS exams for 1151, 1152 1211 and 1212 were used to determine the students knowledge of the nature
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.

Standard Associations

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

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
Goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 6.2 out of 8.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students averaged 6 out of 8

M 2: ACS exam in 1152 (O: 1)
ACS results of 8 critical thinking questions off of Chem 1152 exam
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry
Goal was 4/8

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students averaged 4.1 out of 8.

M 3: ACS Exit exam in 1211 (O: 1)
Students got 4/8 on 1211 ACS exit exam on critical thinking problems
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry
Goal was 4/8

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students averaged 4.3 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students averaged 5 out of 8

M 5: Laboratory Reports in 1211 and 1212 (O: 2)
Assessment of Critical thinking in laboratory report for 1211 and 1212 students 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
87.2 % were adequate
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Pre-lab lecture**

Improve the understanding of what is taking place in this particular laboratory with clearer theory during pre-lab lecture.

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

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

- **Measure:** ACS Exit exam in 1211
- **Outcome/Objective:** Solving Problems related to chemistry

**Emphasize quantitative skills**

Students who enter these course tend to have weak practical mathematical skills.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** More practical math problems on worksheets and pre test materials

### 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

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Chemistry BS**

(As of: 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)
G 1: Critical Thinking
Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. Upon Graduation students will be able to take and analyze real world data to develop a knowledge base and the ability to draw conclusions from this knowledge base. Thought processes should be rational, logical and consequential. Conclusions should grow directly from the data and accepted fundamental chemical principles. In addition, students should not only arrive at conclusions, but be aware that they are expected to defend these conclusions. It is also important to realize that data may be interpreted in more than one way, and that science moves forward as these difference data interpretations clash with one another, and are then resolved. Students must therefore learn to deal with open ended questions, deciding which data and variables are important, and which can safely be ignored in creating a picture of the system under study. The ability to think critically about scientific content and processes is key to these students' futures. Critical thinking over time should become an internal skill, transferable to the rest of the student's life and career.

G 2: Analytical Skills
Analytical Skills center on mathematically analyzing information that relates to the chemical sciences. Students need a thorough mathematical background in calculus, statistics and algebra and be able to apply these skills to chemical problems.

G 3: Instrumental Skills
Students who graduate need to be familiar with many different instruments and proficient in understanding not only how to use basic techniques (GC, HPLC, IR, UV-Vis and NMR) but also what information these techniques would allow the user access to.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Oral and Written Communication Skills (M: 2)
Full Description: Each graduate shall develop oral and written communication skills. The written communication skills will be evidenced by 1a and/or 1b. The oral communication skills will be evidenced by 1c and/or 1d. 1a) At least six reports based on laboratory experiments which will comply with current American Chemical Society guidelines. 1b) A term paper, grant proposal, literature review or research paper on a current topic in chemistry. 1c) An oral examination or an oral presentation in class. 1d) Presentation of a poster or oral talk at a Georgia State, local, regional or national meeting.
Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

SLO 2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry (M: 1, 2)
Each graduate will develop critical thinking skills as relates to Chemistry. 2a Each student will develop high order problem solving skills. 2b. Each graduate will be able to ask pertinent questions and develop logical experimental procedures to answer these questions. 2c Each graduate will learn to 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Average of 4.2/8.

Target for O4: Quantitative skills
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 by persons wishing to minor in chemistry (2400/3410). The second part of the report addresses the efforts to improve the retention, progression and graduation of persons who major in chemistry. Introductory Courses “Many introductory science courses are responsible for driving off many students either from a science major or from taking science courses.” (Reform in Undergraduate Science Teaching in the 21st Century, ) Because of the “turn off” factor of these 1000 and 2000 level courses one of the key factors that will affect retention is the number of students who receive a D, F or withdraw from the course. These students either are turned off by science and change majors or are forces to retake the course causing the department to offer more sections both of which are unfavorable outcomes. Over the past four years the department has placed a priority in improving the retention of students in the 1211/1212 sequence believing those courses will affect the most people. These efforts have been supported by the University System of Georgia’s RPG initiative and STEM initiative. A three year grant based on the RPG initiative allowed the department to attack the retention problem in three ways; the implementation of peer tutorials, weekly meetings between faculty members who teach the courses in order to discuss ideas, methods and problems in the various units and a redesign in the courses. Peer Led Tutorials Peer led tutorials are an effective way to allow students to receive help and ask questions in a small group setting (25 as opposed to 100 – 200). Students enrolled in 1211, 1212, 2400 or 3410 can register for a tutorial which is led by either an undergraduate student who has recently excelled in one of the courses or a graduate student. The grade for the course is based on class attendance and participation by the student. We have found that the tutorials have been moderately effective in the 1211 and 1212 sequence but less effective in the 2400 and 3410 sequence. The department is currently modifying the tutorials so that they are more interactive and students are required to work out problems on the board as the peer leader circulates throughout giving help where needed. We believe that this activity will more actively engage the student allowing him/her to work the problem on their own with hints from the leader. In addition the department is developing a book of “worked out” problems which students can download. Weekly Communication Weekly meetings between the faculty members who teach introductory courses were started initially with a senior faculty member who facilitated discussion on what materials in the text were more important and what topics should be less emphasized. Since most persons teaching the general chemistry sequence come in as visiting faculty and very little experience teaching except as a TA we found that there is a preconceived notion that everything in the text must be taught. Through these meetings the general chemistry faculty has been able to increase the depth of student knowledge rather than go for complete “coverage” of the text. In addition the faculty have exchanged ideas on how to teach different topics, discussed student misconceptions and developed slides which we can use as needed. It is often difficult to schedule these meetings around teaching schedules so this part of the action plan has been waning over the past semester, but we hope that we can continue this as part of the upcoming year’s action plan. Course Redesign In the eight sections of CHEM1211 and CHEM1212, General Chemistry I and II in Spring 2009, 151 out of 255 of students enrolled are biology majors (59%) and 28 are chemistry majors (18%). After the General Chemistry series, the biology majors go on to take BIOL3800 – Molecular Cell Biology, which requires students to have a strong background in key chemistry concepts. Both chemistry and biology majors are then required to complete a course in Biochemistry. In addition, much of the research performed in the chemistry department at Georgia State University is biologically oriented with most of

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1: Oral and Written Communication Skills</td>
<td>83% scored adequate or better on final paper</td>
<td>Adequate or better under critical thinking on the rubric.</td>
<td>80% scored adequate or better</td>
<td>85% met goals</td>
<td>90% of students should be able to use quantitative skills from laboratory measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3: Technology</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4: Quantitative skills</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Finding new delivery methods for increasingly larger classes

With the class size growing in almost every course new methods of instruction will need to be discussed.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

More SI/help sessions are being offered

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.

Growth

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

UAC
### Mission / Purpose

The Chemistry Department has long supported the University’s mission. The Department of Chemistry has active research programs in each of the five traditional areas (analytical, biochemistry, biophysical, chemical education, and organic/medicinal) and a bioinformatics option is available in each. Our students have the opportunity to conduct cutting edge research at the interface of chemistry and biology under the guidance of our dynamic faculty. The Department is committed to and has the ability to maintain outstanding facilities to support research efforts. Our goal is to deliver a high quality instructional program at the graduate level to prepare our students for productive careers in academia, industry and government. While the emphasis of our graduate program is in the training of scientists, we offer both a thesis and non-thesis master’s degree.

### 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.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 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.

**SLO 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.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1)**

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

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

5 thesis students were eligible and 5 students successfully defended their thesis in 2012-2013.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

5 thesis students were eligible and 5 students successfully defended their thesis in 2012-2013.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

5 thesis students were eligible and 5 students successfully defended their thesis in 2012-2013. 7/7 students successfully submitted 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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Chemistry PhD
As of: 12/13/2016 05:58 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. The Department of Chemistry has active research programs in each of the five traditional areas (analytical, biochemistry, biophysical, chemical education, and organic/medicinal) and a bioinformatics option is available in each. Our students have the opportunity to conduct cutting edge research at the interface of chemistry and biology under the guidance of our dynamic faculty. The Department is committed to and has the ability to maintain outstanding facilities to support research efforts. Our goal is to deliver a high quality instructional program at the graduate level to prepare our students for productive careers in academia, industry and government. The emphasis of our graduate program is in the training of scientists.

Goals

**G 1: Knowledge of Chemistry**
The Department of Chemistry administers a doctoral program designed to endow its graduates with the ability to approach fundamental scientific questions from both a biological and a chemical perspective and to be able to successfully employ scientific methodology to solve real life problems.

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 summarize 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.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions. 2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems. 3. Understand and analyze experimental results Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry 4. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter. 5. Effectively perform laboratory 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.

**SLO 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.

**SLO 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.

SLO 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 based on the achievement of a minimum percentage score (minimum score varies by area of specialization, but no student will pass who scores below the 80th percentile). Once the written exam is complete a committee administers 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 may be general in nature or very specific and related to the student’s research. If the student passes the oral exam, he/she is advanced to the level of doctorate candidate having passed the General Exam.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Communication Skill**
The target would be 85% of all Ph.D. students will achieve a score in the 80th percentile or better. Students are advised in their first year of enrollment to take specific core classes in their area of specialization. These core courses are designed to provide the requisite knowledge necessary to continue in advanced research methods and prepares the students for success on the qualifying exam. Additionally, students may elect to take one practice exam before the formal administration of the Qualifying Exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
December 2012 and June 2013 Administration of Written Qualifying Exam: 16 students took the exam in December and 3 took the exam in June as retakes (total test takers = 19). Of the 16 December test takers, 2 failed the first attempt of the exam and rescheduled for 6 months (June test takers). December test takers: 16/2 = ~87.5% passed the exam on first try. June test takers: 2/2 = 100 % passed on second try.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**
The target would be 85% of all Ph.D. students will achieve a score in the 80th percentile or better. Students are advised in their first year of enrollment to take specific core classes in their area of specialization. These core courses are designed to provide the requisite knowledge necessary to continue in advanced research methods and prepares the students for success on the qualifying exam. Additionally, students may elect to take one practice exam before the formal administration of the Qualifying Exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
December 2012 and June 2013 Administration of Written Qualifying Exam: 16 students took the exam in December and 3 took the exam in June as retakes (total test takers = 19). Of the 16 December test takers, 2 failed the first attempt of the exam and rescheduled for 6 months (June test takers). December test takers: 16/2 = ~87.5% passed the exam on first try. June test takers: 2/2 = 100 % passed on second try.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Skills**
The target would be 85% of all Ph.D. students will achieve a score in the 80th percentile or better. Students are advised in their first year of enrollment to take specific core classes in their area of specialization. These core courses are designed to provide the requisite knowledge necessary to continue in advanced research methods and prepares the students for success on the qualifying exam. Additionally, students may elect to take one practice exam before the formal administration of the Qualifying Exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
December 2012 and June 2013 Administration of Written Qualifying Exam: 16 students took the exam in December and 3 took the exam in June as retakes (total test takers = 19). Of the 16 December test takers, 2 failed the first attempt of the exam and rescheduled for 6 months (June test takers). December test takers: 16/2 = ~87.5% passed the exam on first try. June test takers: 2/2 = 100 % passed on second try.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
The target would be 85% of all Ph.D. students will achieve a score in the 80th percentile or better. Students are advised in their first year of enrollment to take specific core classes in their area of specialization. These core courses are designed to provide the requisite knowledge necessary to continue in advanced research methods and prepares the students for success on the qualifying exam. Additionally, students may elect to take one practice exam before the formal administration of the Qualifying Exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
December 2012 and June 2013 Administration of Written Qualifying Exam: 16 students took the exam in December and 3 took the exam in June as retakes (total test takers = 19). Of the 16 December test takers, 2 failed the first attempt of the exam and rescheduled for 6 months (June test takers). December test takers: 16/2 = ~87.5% passed the exam on first try. June test
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 research faculty member.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Communication Skill
100% of all PhD students who graduate will write and defend a dissertation successfully. In order to receive the PhD degree, the candidate must undergo a rigorous process of research, literature reviews, and writing before the dissertation defense can be scheduled. Each semester, the student is expected to make satisfactory research progress and under the guidance and at the direction of the research advisor, the candidate will write an updated progress report of his/her research for a grade. Additionally, the final portion of a student's academic work is spent in the laboratory where research is conducted and through weekly group meetings the student must communicate to advisor and peers his/her research. The student must also meet with his/her dissertation committee once each academic year to provide an overview of research project and to report and discuss research progress. When the student schedules the dissertation defense, it is at the approval of the research advisor and dissertation committee.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
12 out of 12 students have successfully defended their dissertation in 2012-2013.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
100% will write and defend a dissertation successfully.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
12 out of 12 students have successfully defended their dissertation in 2012-2013.

Target for O3: Technology
100% will successfully write their dissertation following specific college guidelines and will use overhead projectors, computers, and other equipment during the dissertation defense presentation.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
12 out of 12 students have successfully defended their dissertation in 2012-2013.

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
Ability to perform analyses on chemical data (i.e., such as chemical reactivity, solubility, molecular weight, melting point, radiative properties) and to apply that analyses to real life problems. Must develop skill at using modern computer and communication techniques applied to chemistry. Write technical papers or reports Work with research advisor to conduct analyses of research projects, interpret test results, or develop nonstandard tests.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All PhD students will be required to submit technical reports at the end of each semester that provide a technical summary of research findings. 100% of all actively enrolled students met this requirement in 2012-2013 each semester.

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
All PhD students are encouraged

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

Continued Quality
Our goal is to continue excellence with our program’s growth.
- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Fall 12
- Responsible Person/Group: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

Continued Quality and Growth
The department has met all its goals and will continue to grow while keeping the quality of the program.
- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

Action Plan
The PhD program meets all our objectives. Our plan is to continue this excellence with continued growth.
- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Communication Assessment of Core
As of 12/12/2016 05:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

Speech Communication explores the construction, diffusion, analysis, and impact of messages as they occur among individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures in the media age.

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.

Goals

G 1: effective communicators
Students become effective consumers and producers of communicative acts in various contexts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: critical thinking (G: 1) (M: 4)
At the end of the semester, students will be able to…1. Explain the various components of human communication. 2. Apply major principles of human communication to specific instances. 3. Create and deliver a public speech. 4. Analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions. 5. Consider opposing points of view when appropriate.

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)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 2: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension
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.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

M 3: Willingness to Communicate
In fall 2010 and spring 2011, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing 949 scores in fall 2010 and 728 scores in spring 2011. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2010 mean score indicated an overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations, from 181.4056 pre-test to 196.3284 post-test. In fall 2010, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased (from 21.66178 to 23.36701 and from 51.25136 to 57.24465 respectively) and logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2010, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2011 results showed an increase in the willingness to communicate measure, from 181.2584 in the pre-test to 197.2571 in the post-test, as well as slight increases in all other measures.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledage mastery

M 4: Cornell Critical Thinking Exam (O: 1)
In order to assess “critical thinking” among students who have taken SPCH1000, we define critical thinking as: “reasonable and reflective thinking on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, Millman, & Tomko, 2005). We have adopted the Cornell Critical Thinking
Exam Z as the means by which to measure critical thinking as it was designed to test critical thinking among advanced high school students, college students, and graduate students. Exam Z is a general-content critical thinking measure, which uses content from a variety of subject matter familiar to our target group. Exam Z provides both an overall score, and subtest scores for each type of critical thinking skill. For this reason, it promises to provide more detailed data than other similar measures. As the summer 2013 term was the first time we have assessed SPCH1000 under Area B (critical thinking), our sample is extremely small, and only shows post-test results. We will pilot a full course assessment across all SPCH1000 sections, with a pre-test / post-test format, in fall 2013.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

### Target for O1: critical thinking

Based on the meta-summaries collected by Ennis et al., we expect to find the above results among our SPCH1000 students. Earlier findings of the Cornell Critical Thinking Exam Z at various academic institutions show that the mean score for upper division undergraduates is 31.7, the mean score for lower division undergraduates is 28.4, and the mean score for remedial undergraduates is 20.8. In these initial attempts at assessing critical thinking in the Core Curriculum, we predict that the percentage of SPCH1000 students will breakdown as shown in Table 1.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

In our initial sample of 28 SPCH1000 students, we found that 25% scored 31 or above, 18% scored between 26-30, 36% scored between 21-25, and 21% scored below 21. See Table 2 for details. These results indicate that SPCH1000 students fall generally within the expected parameters for college students on the Cornell Critical Thinking Exam Z. The 2013-2014 data promises to be more illuminating as we will collect a much larger sample (approximately 1000-1200 students per semester), compare pre-test & post-test scores, and break the overall critical thinking score into various skill sets.

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

#### Full Pilot of Critical Thinking Assessment

In the 2013-2014 academic calendar year, we plan to engage a full-fledged pilot of the Critical Thinking Assessment across all SPCH1000 sections (approximately 1000-1200 students per semester), compare pre-test & post-test scores, and break the overall critical thinking score into various skill sets.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Davin Grindstaff, SPCH1000 Course 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?

In the 2012-2013 academic calendar year, we made significant changes to the SPCH1000 Core Curriculum Assessment Report. First, we updated the Mission Statement to reflect the specific purpose of the Speech Area Major rather than the Communication Department as a whole. Second, we revised the Goal Statement into a single statement of what we want students to BE; and subsequently, Student Learning Outcomes were narrowed slightly and incorporated our new status as Area B (Critical Thinking) within the Core Curriculum. Third, we introduced a new measure (the Cornell Critical Thinking Exam Z), new targets, and a pilot of the new findings based on a small sample of SPCH1000 students (N = 28). In the 2013-2014 academic calendar year, we plan to engage a full-fledged pilot of the Critical Thinking Assessment across all SPCH1000 sections (approximately 1000-1200 students per semester), compare pre-test & post-test scores, and break the overall critical thinking score into various skill sets.

**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.

At this point, more data needs to be collected in order to assess the capability of SPCH1000 to enhance Georgia State students’ critical thinking faculties, and thus, recommend substantive changes to the course. The 2012-2013 data is promising, but limited in its scope.

---
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*(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. Our mission is to offer a high quality graduate program, which educates students to implement evidence-based services across the scope of practice in speech-language pathology. We will accomplish this by providing state of the art instruction and cutting-edge research that maximizes interdisciplinary collaboration across the university.

**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 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 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

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

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt by scoring 600 or better.

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

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
93% of the students for which there was data scored within the national average or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Five students scored above the national average, 1 student below, 8 scored within the range.

M 3: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category II Phonological and Language Disorders.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.
### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

86% of the students for which there is data scored within the national average or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Eleven students scored within the average range, 1 scored above, and two scored below.

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

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

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

86% of the students for which there is data scored within the national average or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Eleven students scored within the average range, 1 scored above, and two scored below.

### M 4: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category III Speech Disorders.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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

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

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

71% of the students for which there was data scored within or above the national average range. Nine students scored within the range, one student scored above, and four students scored below.

### M 5: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category IV Neurogenic Disorders.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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

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

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

100% of students for which there is data scored within or above this section of the exam. Six scored above the national average range and 8 scored within the range.

### M 6: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category V Audiology, Hearing.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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

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

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

100% of students for which there is data scored within or above this section of the exam. Six scored above the national average range and 8 scored within the range.

### M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemt) (O: 4)
Score for Category VI Clinical Management.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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

Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (4-6), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The average performance score for students for which there is data is 65%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

86% of students were within the national average performance range for this section of the exam. Five students scored above the national average, two scored below, and 7 scored within the range.

### M 8: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) (O: 5, 6)

Score for Category VII Professional Issues, Psychometrics, Research.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

### Target for O5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students for which there is data performed within or above the national average performance range. Three scored above and 11 scored within the range.

### Target for O6: Evaluate Research Relevance

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students for which there is data performed within or above the national average performance range. Three scored above and 11 scored within the range.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students achieved a 4.0 on this section of the portfolio.

### M 10: Portfolio Section 2 (Comm & Swallow Process)

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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students achieved a 4.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students achieved a 3.63 on this portion 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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 3.75 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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Students achieved an average rating of 4.0 on this section of the portfolio.

**M 15: Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues)**
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

**M 16: Portfolio Section 8 (Prof Credentials)**
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

**M 17: Portfolio Section 9 (Comm Skills)**
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

**M 18: Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess)**
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they can accurately assess clients with communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders.

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

**M 19: Portfolio Section 11 (Clin Skills - Interven)**
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can develop and implement functional and effective intervention programs.

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

**M 20: Portfolio Section 12 (Interpersonal Qual)**
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they have appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and are able to self-evaluate clinical performance.

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

**M 21: Portfolio Section 13 (Apply Technology)**
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they can use appropriate technology for assessment, intervention, and professional productivity.

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

**M 22: Portfolio Section 14 (Ling & Cult Diversity) (O: 14)**
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can discuss and apply the standards of cultural competence and diversity.

**Target for O14: Apply Cultural Competence**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 3.75 on this section of the portfolio.
learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate their knowledge of linguistic and cultural issues related to communication and swallowing disorders.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O14: Understand Linguistic &amp; Cultural Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.87 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. During the 2011-12 cycle 100% of our students met this goal (Clinical Management); however, during the current cycle (2012-13) 86% met this goal. The fluctuation exists historically as well (2010-11, 87.5%; 2009-10, 100%). We will continue to monitor our students’ ability to achieve our stated goal for another two years.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Low
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Management) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
  - Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) | Outcome/Objective: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
- Implementation Description: Students’ scores for this subtest will be monitored during the next two years for potential trends in student performance.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
- Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator.
- Additional Resources: None

#### Reduction of Outcomes & Measures

Assessment process will be streamlined in 2012-2013.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The number of outcomes for the assessment has been reduced to 6.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Jacqueline Laures-Gore, Program Coordinator

#### PRAXIS Category III Score

During the current cycle (2012-13) 71% met this goal. This is surprising given that our students met this goal (over 90%) during the previous three cycles. We will continue to monitor our students’ ability to achieve our stated goal for another two years. Additionally, we will hire new faculty and ensure no missing data points from PRAXIS reports.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
  - Measure: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
- Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty Members

#### PRAXIS II Category V Scores

During the current cycle (2012-13) 65% met this goal. This is surprising given that students met the goal of 70% during the previous three cycles. We will continue to monitor our students’ ability to achieve our stated goal for another two years. Additionally, we will hire new faculty and ensure no missing data points from PRAXIS reports.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
  - Measure: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
- Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty Members

#### PRAXIS Scores Category II

During the current cycle (2012-13) 86% met this goal. We will continue to monitor our students’ ability to achieve our stated goal for another two years. Additionally, we will hire new faculty and ensure no missing data points from PRAXIS reports.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
### 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, styles, and movements that comprise the film canon.

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

Writing: the student is able to effectively present research in writing, cogently and effectively orchestrating his/her knowledge of the literature and theory to present a well-organized, clearly written, and effective argument. Production students are expected to write proposals that clearly convey the aesthetic qualities of the proposed work, as well as situate the work within larger aesthetic traditions. (film production track) Aesthetic and Technical: Students in the film production track are expected to have a thorough knowledge of the history of cinematic forms of expression; are expected to develop an original artistic voice in which to express themselves; and are expected to produce works that have a solid technical command of the components of filmmaking (cinematography, editing, sound).

**SLO 3: Understanding of research methods (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 5, 6)**

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.

**SLO 4: Engagement with New Media (G: 2)**

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

M 1: 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 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.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

In the core Issues and Perspectives area that showed highest incidence of level-2 performance (25%) was breadth of knowledge of major theories of communication. Film: Theory We separate out studies students from production students, as expected outcomes are different for the 2 cohorts. Studies: The 2 areas where we see the lowest level of aggregate performance are: a/ knowledge of the major aesthetic traditions of the cinema; and b/ knowledge of post-classical film theory. The first has to do with variable undergraduate preparation of our admitted students; the second has to do with the inherent difficulty of the subject matter. Production: Production students are showing unacceptably low levels of performance in 3 areas: knowledge of major aesthetic traditions of cinema; and knowledge of both classical and postclassical film theory. Thus, across the board, we can identify as a problem area the students' overall breadth of knowledge in the field.

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.

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 Advanced Film Theory class assesses method. Here the target is 3.0 or higher for all students.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

The one methodological issue that we found in the assessments was the students' ability to find objects of analysis that connected in a meaningful and imaginative way to the research question being posed. This may have to do, to some extent, with the other finding in the area of knowledge of literatures: if the students' knowledge of the aesthetic traditions or the theoretical body of work in the field is low, this can likely impact how imaginative they can be in connecting objects to research questions. Action item is suggested here.

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

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

In general, writing in the core seminars was assessed to be at level 3 in about 75% of the students. This pretty much accords with our expected target, though we may want to begin aiming for a higher targeted outcome here.
### 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 measured 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Only a tiny fraction of the prospectuses produced this year were assessed. This is probably due to a misunderstanding among area faculty. Clearly, the prospectus is a key assessment document, insofar as it allows us to see the extent to which coursework has prepared the student for developing a thesis project. Thus, we need to devise a system which will allow graduate directors to make sure all prospectus defenses are assessed.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Only a tiny fraction of the prospectuses produced this year were assessed. This is probably due to a misunderstanding among area faculty. Clearly, the prospectus is a key assessment document, insofar as it allows us to see the extent to which coursework has prepared the student for developing a thesis project. Thus, we need to devise a system which will allow graduate directors to make sure all prospectus defenses are assessed.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Only a tiny fraction of the prospectuses produced this year were assessed. This is probably due to a misunderstanding among area faculty. Clearly, the prospectus is a key assessment document, insofar as it allows us to see the extent to which coursework has prepared the student for developing a thesis project. Thus, we need to devise a system which will allow graduate directors to make sure all prospectus defenses are assessed.

### 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 measured 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Among the 7 research theses assessed, competence in most areas that assessed knowledge of traditions averaged at a 3.3 to 3.5 level, thus evidencing that we did indeed see 40% performing at levels of 4 or higher. The one area that showed up as a potential problem area (in theory and in method) was the choice of appropriate objects of analysis in relation to the research question posed. This coincides with findings in the doctoral program as well, and an action item should be developed here. The 8 creative theses scored consistently in the 4 to 5 range, with the exception of 2 students who returned to the program after a hiatus of many years.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In both the research theses and the creative theses, writing and technical media production skills were both assessed at acceptable levels.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Among the 7 research theses assessed, competence in most areas that assessed knowledge of traditions averaged at a 3.3 to 3.5 level, thus evidencing that we did indeed see 40% performing at levels of 4 or higher. The one area that showed up as a potential problem area (in theory and in method) was the choice of appropriate objects of analysis in relation to the research question posed. This coincides with findings in the doctoral program as well, and an action item should be developed here. The 8 creative theses scored consistently in the 4 to 5 range, with the exception of 2 students who returned to the program after a hiatus of many years.
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

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:** Terminated  
**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 each 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:** Finished  
**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:** Finished  
**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
Addendum 2013: This course will no longer be part of MA assessment. We are paring down the number of core assessment courses for efficiency. 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: Terminated
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.

Institute BA/MA program in media production
We are currently in the process of implementing a BA/MA program. We feel that this will address some of the issues that have come up in the past with the film production MA, where some of the MA cohort were not adequately trained in film aesthetics before coming into the program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Chair; production faculty

Monitor Prospectus Defenses
The prospectus will be a key benchmark for assessing progress of MA student before completion of the thesis, and after taking the key core course. We have not been tracking prospectus defenses as vigorously as we should.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Grad Directors.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Communication Studies PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Graduate Program in Communication offers its students a multi-disciplinary curriculum leading to the Ph.D. degree. The program is designed to prepare students for research and teaching in one of three primary areas of emphasis: Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Images Studies. The curriculum is designed to provide students with in depth training in communication pedagogy and the professional expectations of the discipline, as well as mentored experiences in both teaching and research.

Goals
G 1: To produce PhDs highly skilled in research
The areas of Rhetoric/Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Image Studies are all highly interdisciplinary, drawing on a broad range of theoretical and intellectual traditions. We would like our PhDs to frame research questions with full understanding of their positioning within this broad discursive matrix, while at the same time having highly developed research skills specific to their research questions.

G 2: To produce excellent undergraduate teachers
We seek to produce PhDs with demonstrated teaching excellence in the undergraduate classroom, both at the level of the introductory or survey course and in higher-level courses related to their research projects.

G 3: To foster academic professionalism
We strive to produce PhDs with significant professional experience, including presentation at conferences in their area (Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, or Moving Image Studies), professional interaction with leading scholars in their areas of research, publication in journals, and service activities in the graduate student caucuses of the professional organizations in their area.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: 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. At the doctoral level, after the comprehensive exam assessment, we will use common forms for assessing dissertation prospectuses and dissertations. These will tie 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 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 tie 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)

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.

**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. The 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The target was met in knowledge of the literatures.

**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 O3: Proficiency in communication theory**
Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher; 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
The one area in which students underperformed in relation to targets was in the ability to mobilize theory in the analysis of media texts (or political texts); this was the case in all doctoral tracks.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
In both MIS and Public Comm tracks, two areas were found to be areas of underperformance in the seminars: 1. the ability to select appropriate objects or texts to analyze in relation to the theoretical argument one is making; and 2. (related) the ability to mobilize theory in performing a textual analysis. Both areas should be subject to action items.

**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
In the newly adopted assessment plan put in place in Spring of 2012, we decided to begin assessing doctoral dissertation prospectuses and dissertations, which 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. Dissertation assessments will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported 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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Proficiency in writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher, 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
We are finding that slightly more than 20% are performing below level 3. This may suggest that an action item be devised in relation to writing in the seminar context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Proficiency in communication theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After looking at comprehensive exam performance for the academic year, we see that most students tend to perform at level 4 in some areas and at level 3 in other areas: thus a reasonable expectation would be to set the target at 3.5 for the typical student, and then monitor any areas of comps that come in at consistently lower levels than 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
In the theory portions of the comps, the students consistently performed at level 3 or higher, with a fairly equal division between performance at levels 3, 4, and 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Proficiency in writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the newly adopted assessment plan put in place in Spring of 2012, we decided to begin assessing doctoral dissertation prospectuses and dissertations, which 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. Dissertation assessments will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher, 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
We received too few assessments of prospectuses this year to be able to set targets. This is probably due to a misunderstanding among faculty of the need to assess the prospectus. Action item: develop a "prospectus calendar" that shows all upcoming prospectus defenses and allows grad directors to follow up on assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research and Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After looking at comprehensive exam performance for the academic year, we see that most students tend to perform at level 4 in some areas and at level 3 in other areas: thus a reasonable expectation would be to set the target at 3.5 for the typical student, and then monitor any areas of comps that come in at consistently lower levels than 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
In the assessment of research design and methodology, all exams in all tracks of the PhD were assessed at 3 or 4 (or higher), thus indicating competence in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After looking at comprehensive exam performance for the academic year, we see that most students tend to perform at level 4 in some areas and at level 3 in other areas: thus a reasonable expectation would be to set the target at 3.5 for the typical student, and then monitor any areas of comps that come in at consistently lower levels than 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
In the theory portions of the comps, the students consistently performed at level 3 or higher, with a fairly equal division between performance at levels 3, 4, and 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Proficiency in writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher, 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
We are finding that slightly more than 20% are performing below level 3. This may suggest that an action item be devised in relation to writing in the seminar context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Proficiency in communication theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After looking at comprehensive exam performance for the academic year, we see that most students tend to perform at level 4 in some areas and at level 3 in other areas: thus a reasonable expectation would be to set the target at 3.5 for the typical student, and then monitor any areas of comps that come in at consistently lower levels than 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
In the theory portions of the comps, the students consistently performed at level 3 or higher, with a fairly equal division between performance at levels 3, 4, and 5.
Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures
All students should achieve at least a level 3 in assessment of knowledge of literatures. The rubrics are designed so that very few will score at level 5. The average aggregate performance should be 3.5.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All dissertations scored 3, 4, or 5 in areas related to knowledge of literatures.

Target for O2: Research and Method
Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All dissertations scored 3, 4, or 5 in areas related to research and methodology.

Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory
Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All dissertations scored 3, 4, or 5 in areas related to theory.

Target for O4: Proficiency in writing
Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
In the area of writing, a significant difference was seen between performance in the Moving Image Studies area, and performance in the Public Communication areas. In MIS, we saw consistently lower scores in the writing, with 2 to 3.2 being the range. In Public Comm areas, the writing was assessed at an average 4.5, exceptionally high. Given that these high scores in public were seen in all other areas of the dissertation, it could be that Public had an exceptionally strong pool of dissertators, and that MIS dissertators were not the strongest in the program. Whether an action item should be developed for writing should be considered by the area faculty in MIS.

M 9: Presentation of work 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In the academic year 12-13, our doctoral students presented a total of 88 conference papers: 14 at international conferences, 42 at national conferences, 20 regional and 12 local.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
This year saw an upswing in the number of publications among the doctoral students, perhaps evidence that our continued emphasis on getting their seminar work out to journals is now leading to results. Our students have 10 journal articles either in press or published, and 5 book chapters in press or published. In addition, they published 3 online articles, 6 book reviews/review essays, and 2 encyclopedia entries. We can thus marked our target as having been met, while realizing that we need to keep reminding doctoral students to stay active in this area.

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

**Institute prospectus writing workshop**
In Fall 2009, we began to offer a prospectus writing workshop for all students who had completed coursework (whether or not they had taken comps yet). We believe that this workshop will not only help doctoral students avoid the post-comprehensive-exams "doldrums," which often drags out the period during which the prospectus is written; but that it will also help the student in the publication process, as the completed prospectus can serve as a kind of template for planning which areas of the dissertation would be best suitable for sending out for publication during the writing process.

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

**Revised doctoral proseminar curriculum**
At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new prosemin format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosemin at least twice during their doctoral residence, once before comprehensive exams, and once in the dissertation-writing period. We believe that this shift in focus in the prosemin will help bring the students more quickly up to speed in the theoretical foundations of the field, and in their oral and written proficiency.

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

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

**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

**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 from the time of submission, to 'revise-resubmit,' to final acceptance) vary so widely that one cannot set expectations that are tied to academic years.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
This year saw an upswing in the number of publications among the doctoral students, perhaps evidence that our continued emphasis on getting their seminar work out to journals is now leading to results. Our students have 10 journal articles either in press or published, and 5 book chapters in press or published. In addition, they published 3 online articles, 6 book reviews/revision-essays, and 2 encyclopedia entries. We can thus marked our target as having been met, while realizing that we need to keep reminding doctoral students to stay active in this area.
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.

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).

Revamp end-of-semester online assessment of doctoral students

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

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.

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.

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 during coursework which will serve as assessment courses, so that we can measure student progress at every stage of the program.

---

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Responsible Person/Group:** Restivo; MIS area faculty

**Institute earlier application deadlines for graduate application**

**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**

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

**Revamp end-of-semester online assessment of doctoral students**

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Non-thesis option adopted 2011.

**Add writing requirement to Prosem**

**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**

**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**

**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.
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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory

Projected Completion Date: 03/2012

Fine tune the new assessment system begun Spr2012
2013: Feedback we received from assessment experts suggested that we were doing too much early assessment in course work; thus we are going to phase out course assessment and assess at important end points: comprehensive exams, prospectus, dissertation prospectuses. 2012: 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: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
Measure: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures

Implementation Description: Ongoing meetings with area faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Angelo Restivo; Mary Stuckey; graduate committee

Department workshops in selection of objects of study
Because a consistently measured weakness was the ability to select appropriate objects of analysis in relation to the larger arguments the student wants to make, we are going to have a series of proseminar sessions on this subject in Spring 14.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory

Implementation Description: Ongoing meetings with area faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 03/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dept faculty

Monitor Prospectus Defenses
The prospectus defense is extremely important benchmark to assess student progress in the program, and yet this is the one area where our assessment has been extremely uneven. Thus, we are making a concerted effort to vigorously enforce the assessment of dissertation prospectuses. This is going to be especially valuable for the Rhetoric and Politics area; in 2011, they added two additional courses (in theory and method) to the already required 2 courses, in response to measured performance on comps to be below expectation. This year marks the year in which the first cohort under the new core curriculum will be comping and writing prospectuses; thus we will be able to find out how effective the new curriculum in Rhetoric and Politics is.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
Measure: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures

Revise comps film reading list for Moving Image Studies
Our current comps reading list in film studies is not only out of date, but it is too diffuse and thus does not allow us to ask the kinds of questions we need to in order to assess students’ overall knowledge of the field. This manifests itself, for example, in sometimes poor performance on prospectus writing/defense, when we should have identified the problem area at an earlier stage. Thus, we plan to revise the film studies reading list in order to organize it around a small number of key ideas in the field that we feel all the students must have complete mastery over.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: knowledge of the literature | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures
Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures

Responsible Person/Group: Film Area of Moving Image studies

Subcommittee on remediation
In the Moving Image Studies area, because of its interdisciplinarity, we admit students with a wide range of backgrounds. Some of the students are not conversant in the fundamentals of film theory and history. Thus we are forming a subcommittee to discuss the
posibility of accepting students on condition that do not-for-credit remediation work in film theory and media history, based on an examination of their transcripts during the admission process.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures
  | Proficiency in communication theory
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MIS area faculty; graduate committee

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Computer Information Systems MBA
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

In today's highly competitive global environment, the effective deployment of information technology has become the key to organizational success. There is a continuing shortage of individuals with the combination of business and technology skills needed to develop and manage information systems that provide competitive advantage in the global marketplace. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete. In many respects these applications are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The mission of the M.B.A. concentration and major in information systems is to produce graduates able to fill this need. Students will learn how to combine their general business knowledge with contemporary and emerging information systems concepts to enable organizations to compete strongly in the global marketplace. The courses to constitute a concentration (12 semester hours) in information systems are chosen from the 8000-level offerings of the Department of Computer Information Systems or IB 8680. This flexibility enables students to select courses that provide the best foundation for their career advancement. The M.B.A. IS enrollment over the 2008-2009 academic year was used to identify the specific courses for this assessment. Based on highest registration, the selected courses were CIS 8000 IT Project Management, CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation & Organizational Change Management, CIS 8020 Systems Integration, and CIS 8080 Security and Privacy. Indeed, these are logical extensions of the overall MBA program. Businesses need to continually innovate. This typically requires employing IT enabled business process reengineering and careful management of organizational change and of the overall innovation project. Finally, security and privacy are evermore important to maintain integrity and trust in this highly connected business environment.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Build and renew business via technology and process (M: 1)
Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

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
### 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,

---

### 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 written assignments 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. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

---

### 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 assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

---

### Target for O3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

---

### Target for O4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

---
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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/ctl/outcomes/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 in resulting student learning).

Goals

G 1: CIS BBA Program Goals
Students will become better problem-solvers; students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking; students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline; students will be well prepared for positions in the discipline.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 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 requirements for a replacement system. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop program specifications 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 design current systems architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to present tier, business tier, and data tier abstractions. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop current system architectures will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students 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. Students 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 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.

SLO 3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency (M: 7, 8, 10)
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

M 1: Identified User Requirements (O: 1)
Acquired and scoped the system and user requirements
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis

4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specified System Requirements (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specified, analyzed, &amp; refined the system and user requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developed Program Specifications (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Used Object-oriented concepts and notation (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developed Architecture (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Designed programs (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designed the programs according to specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coded and Developed (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coded/developed the specified &amp; designed programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | 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>Findings 2012-2013 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Findings 2012-2013 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Findings 2012-2013 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Findings 2012-2013 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</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

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 CIS BBA assessment process has generally been successful. During this last year, the survey form used for feedback from project sponsors was modified to focus on the higher level objectives and measures rather than the very fine grained questions used in the past. The main motivation for this change was that the great diversity in projects and the related activities. This meant that for many of these very detailed questions the answer should have been NA, not applicable. This focus on the higher level objectives and measures will be finalized this year. The assessment process management for the CIS BBA will also pass to new personnel.

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 including free form responses (some written and some oral) from students and project sponsors indicate the need to put programming back into the required part of the CIS BBA curriculum. This change has been approved by the CIS Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) and the CIS faculty. The formal proposal for the change was submitted to the Robinson College of Business (RCB) Undergraduate Program Council and is under discussion with approval anticipated. A second change is to require that more hours of CIS courses be completed before students may take the capstone course. The capstone course provides an opportunity for students to use the CIS curriculum body of knowledge in the context of a real world project. The previous prerequisites allowed CIS majors to enroll in the capstone if they had completed the three required CIS core courses. Since an additional three elective CIS courses must be completed along with the CIS capstone course (which finishes out the required 7 CIS courses), some students were taking four CIS courses (including the capstone course) in their final semester. It is difficult for the capstone project to give the students that opportunity to use the full body of knowledge of the CIS courses when students are just starting three of these courses. Changing the prerequisite for the CIS capstone course to completion of 15 semester credit hours including the three CIS core courses was approved by the CIS UPC, the CIS faculty, and the RCB UPC. We anticipate approval by the full RCB faculty at the next faculty meeting this fall.
**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology (M: 1)

Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs. This objective is not met in the core courses. In lieu of this, a surrogate objective will be used: Students will be able to select appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques and to correctly use these tools and techniques to specify the requirements for an information system. The student should be able to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

SLO 2: Create environments for programs and systems (M: 2)

Students will be 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 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.

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/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 compelling reasons. The first arises from the core nature of our discipline and the second arises from purely economic realities. 1) The disciplinary core. Our discipline is at the nexus of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Social Organizations. The modern business, governmental and Nonprofit organization is increasingly dependent upon these technologies to compete in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. Both these technologies and the organizational settings in which they are embedded are highly dynamic, and emergent settings. As such our discipline, and our curricula, must necessarily address those principles and skills that are stable over time, but also to anticipate where changing technical and social/political realities may lead. 2) Economic necessity. The triple-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 constant improvement of our programs, course offerings and course content. We offer these 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 Officer and other leaders from major Atlanta Metropolitan business and service industry organizations in group discussion covering the nature and content of our programs and course offerings. A fourth such process is in the offing for early 2007. And thirdly, CIS faculty hold leadership positions in the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) special interest group on computer personnel research (SIG CPR) and make a specific study of study the changing technical skill sets required of our graduates in the workforce. Our faculty are represented on Microsoft's academic advisory board and routinely engage with CIO and CTO level personnel in other industry and academic venues, which coupled with an active field research agenda provides a view of the changing skill-sets needed by our students. Thus, at both holistic and detailed levels of analysis, CIS faculty attempt to keep abreast of societal and technical changes requiring curricular adjustment. This document is, however, largely concerned with course-level assessment. It depends on direct measures of curricular competence, i.e., student exams, projects and presentations. Because it is an analysis of the artifacts of the curriculum and instructional activity, it is also an indirect assessment exercise. This assessment exercise addresses the fidelity by which the core course set in our CIS major meets a set of stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are represented below. Figure 1 (Napier, Johnson, Stuckc, 2006) Course-level Assessment method As is typical student performance was measured by means of direct and indirect measures of exam, 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 instructional staff to access the efficacy of the instrument and the completeness of the courses learning objectives. At the conclusion of the Fall and Spring term instructional faculty were asked to provide a sampling representing 15% of the student's work, with the provision that there should be a minimal sub-set of work representing all the stated learning objectives. For continuous curricular improvement activities engaging the energy of CIS faculty are represented on Microsoft's academic advisory board and regularly 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 means of direct and indirect measures of exam, 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 instructional staff to access the efficacy of the instrument and the completeness of the courses learning objectives. At the conclusion of the Fall and Spring term instructional faculty were asked to provide a sampling representing 15% of the student's work, with the provision that there should be a minimal sub-set of work representing all the stated learning objectives. These materials were made available to the assessment team of faculty, and PhD students. Those evaluating review all documents and the course syllabi and relevant assignment materials then completed the assessment questionnaire. The summary results herein and the overall picture may be evaluated for: (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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system (O: 1)
Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

M 2: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure (O: 2)
Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Create environments for programs and systems
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

M 3: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan (O: 3)
Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O3: Manage an information technology project
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

M 4: III.2: Manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques (O: 3)
Students will be able to manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O3: Manage an information technology project
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

M 5: IV.1: Identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies (O: 4)
Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

M 6: IV.2: Diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations (O: 4)
Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations enabled by information technology.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the target”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the target”), according to the evaluation rubric.

M 7: IV.3: Formulate an implementation plan to manage organizational changes associated with introduction of new technology (O: 4)
Students should be able to formulate an implementation plan to manage organizational changes associated with introduction of new technology.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Course instructor should follow assessment procedures

Course instructor responsible for teaching CIS 8030 must assign individual-level projects that reflect the course objectives. In addition, the course instructor must save copies of all M.S. individual student deliverables and make them available to the assessment coordinator.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system | Outcome/Objective: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology

- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course instructor for CIS 8030

#### Offer all core courses yearly; require course instructors to assign student projects that reflect course objectives.

There are 3 components of the action plan related to this learning objective. 1) Offer all required core courses on a yearly basis (to remedy the problem that CIS 8050 has not been offered for more than two years, and that faculty assisting in the assessment process have had to assess materials from a different course that students were permitted to substitute for CIS 8050). 2) All instructors who teach courses related to this learning objective must assign individual-level student assignments that reflect the course objectives. 3) All instructors who teach courses related to this learning objective must save all M.S. student deliverables from their courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure | Outcome/Objective: Create environments for programs and systems

- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course instructors who teach CIS 8040, 8050, and 8070.

#### Train assessors to allow for greater variability in student scores

The only portion of the target goal that was not achieved for objective III.1 was the last part, which specifies a goal of having 25% or more of assessed students scoring at the level of "3" ("exceeds the standard"). In this case, all of the assessed students (n=8) were scored as "2" (which means that 0% of students were assessed as scoring a "3"). One contributing factor may be that course assessors have not been trained to discriminate between higher or lower scores. The Assessment coordinator will provide additional detailed criteria for participating assessors to use when performing the assessment. With the exception of this detail, all other target objectives were met.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan | Outcome/Objective: Manage an information technology project

- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment coordinator

#### Re-engineer the MS IS Assessment Process

The previous MS IS assessment process proved to be infeasible due mostly to its labor intensive nature. A Computer Information Systems assessment coordinator made one set of changes simplifying the process. The subsequent process also proved infeasible and no tangible assessment results are seen for recent years. During this period, our MS IS program has moved to a cohort format which now requires a capstone project / field study. Given these three circumstances, the CIS MS (actually MS IS) assessment is being re-engineered and re-initiated during this 2013-2014 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The CIS GPC will review and renew the course objectives, student artifacts for assessment, and associated rubrics and measures for two CIS MS IS core courses each year for the next three years. This will cover the six courses in the CIS MS IS core. The CIS GPC will also evaluate the best means to utilize the capstone course for including in assessing the overall CIS MS IS degree program.

- **Responsible Person/Group:** The CIS Graduate Program Committee

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 Computer Science Assessment of Core**  
(As of: 12/13/2016 05:59 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Most 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Most often the charts were imported properly.

**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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Most of the students do not 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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Computer Science BS
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science B.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today's applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

Goals
G 1: Computer Science BS goals
students will become better problem-solvers; students will demonstrate clearer critical thinking, students will gain knowledge of the discipline; students will gain skills necessary to be successful in the discipline

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Computer Systems Development (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles, processes, and life cycles of computer systems development 2) to apply modeling techniques and tools for specification of systems under development and of computer systems project team management.

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

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

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

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

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

O/O 4: Discrete Mathematics (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles of discrete math 2) to formulate problems and theorems 3) to construct and
evaluate the validity of proofs 4) to apply discrete structures for solving problems in computer science

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**O/O 5: Hardware Systems (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students should be able: 1)to describe the principles and processes of hardware systems development 2)to apply modeling techniques and tools for implementing the phases of hardware development.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. 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

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 2012-2013 - 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 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

#### M 4: Written Assignments and Reports

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics.

#### 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
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.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Students 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

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 and none anticipated. We think that as is, we are doing fine so we will continue as is.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Computer Science MS

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

Mission / Purpose
MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science M.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today's applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

Goals
G 1: Computer Science MS Goals
Students will become better solvers of advanced computational problems; Students will improve abilities to develop advanced computational models of real world problems; Students will gain advanced knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career applying advanced computer science methods.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Computer Science Foundations (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
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, 5)
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: 3)
Students participate effectively in collaborative activities

O/O 4: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 5)
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)
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 2012-2013 - 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 very low acceptance rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Examinations (O: 1, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Examinations (O: 1, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### M 5: Thesis/Project Reports and Defenses (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)

Copies of M.S. theses and project reports and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (on going).

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

### Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Target for O4: Communication

The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for M.S. students, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

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

#### Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

#### Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

#### Consider foundation courses for graduate program

We plan to present the results to the computer science curriculum committee and show the areas(discrete mathematics and computer organization)that may need improvement. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Written Assignments and Reports | **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations
Dispatch alumni surveys
Prepare a survey questionnaire to send out to alumni from the Master's program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Ms. Tammie Dudley  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $1,000.00 (recurring)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Computer Science PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

### Mission / Purpose

**MISSION** Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders, educators and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science Ph.D. Program provides students with the underpinnings and advanced topics of computation and computer science for today's applications in industry, science, education, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

### Goals

**G1: 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)**

Students should be able to: 1. Describe the principles and methods of (a) discrete mathematics, (b) best-practices programming paradigms, parallel and distributed computing (c) algorithm analysis, theory of computation, and complexity analysis, (d) computer & hardware systems development, (e) advanced network-oriented software engineering, and (d) deductive databases and logic programming. 2. Develop models and corresponding optimization problem formulations, analyze computational complexity of problem formulations and applicable algorithmic approaches. 3. Apply (a) discrete structures for solving problems in computer science, (b) algorithmic techniques to optimization problems, (c) high-level programming languages, parallel and distributed computing to implement the programming paradigms, and (d) advanced software engineering and modeling techniques for specification of computer systems and implementing the phases of hardware development.

### Strategic Plan Associations

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: 4)**

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)**

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)**

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)**
Students should be able to: (a) analyze, correlate and extract information from biological and chemical databases with emphasis on the sequence and structure of proteins and nucleic acids, (b) apply computational tools, techniques and models to analysis of protein and nucleic acid sequences, and (c) develop new bioinformatics tools, techniques and models.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Student evaluations (O: 2)**
Student evaluations will be assessed to monitor the quality of teaching by our Ph.D. students
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O2: Teaching**
Ph.D. students should receive positive written comments for a majority of the responses. Additionally, we expect that the average of the answers for Question #17 on the evaluation to be above a 4.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
When selecting the recipient(s) for the Outstanding Teaching by a Graduate Student award, the Honors Committee has found that most students receive high marks and comments on their evaluations.

**M 2: Qualifying exam (O: 1, 6)**
The Ph.D. qualifying exam covers a breadth of the foundation material for the Computer Science curriculum. All Ph.D. students are required to pass this exam within the first three semesters of entry into the program.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Qualifying Examination Committee.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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.

**M 3: Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses (O: 1, 4)**
Copies of Ph.D. manuscripts and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (on going).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for 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.

**M 4: Research Publications (O: 1, 3, 4)**
Research publications in journals and conference proceedings produced by Ph.D. graduate students will be catalogued and made available to the Assessment Committee (on going).
Source of Evidence: External report

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Target for O3: Communication**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**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).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
Consider foundation material for graduate courses
The curriculum committee is currently evaluating the coursework at the graduate level in order to assess its relevance and currency to the state of the art in computer science. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Qualifying exam  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)  
- Computer Science Foundations

### Dispatch Alumni Survey

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

**Review qualifying exam format**

Review the format of the PhD qualifying examination to consider an option of replacing one mandatory foundation subject exam with a subject exam chosen by the student based upon their focus of research.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director and Graduate Faculty

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 Concentration in Accounting MBA**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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: Apply taxation law to business entities**

Apply taxation law to business entities

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Financial reporting skills: Develop (G: 1) (M: 2)**

To develop financial reporting systems for decision-making by applying professional standards, financial information tools, and professional judgment.

**SLO 2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (G: 2) (M: 1)**

To interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems by applying economic, financial, and psychological theories.

**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)**

To present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions.

**SLO 5: Collaboration Skills (G: 3) (M: 3)**

To collaborate and contribute to achieve team results.

**SLO 6: Communication Skills (M: 4)**

That students demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant.
### SLO 7: Technological skills (M: 7)

To demonstrate the technology skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

| M 1: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (O: 2) |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Source of Evidence:** | Academic direct measure of learning - other |
| **Target for O2:** | Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict |
| **Exam mean score 80% on three questions:** | (1) inter-company transaction concepts in the equity method of accounting; (2) reporting subsidiary income in consolidated financial statements; (3) consolidated reporting rules for assets. |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** | Not Met |
| Mean score of 72% in question 1, 43% on question 2, and 63% on question 3. |

| M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop (O: 1) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Source of Evidence:** | Academic direct measure of learning - other |
| **Target for O1:** | Financial reporting skills: Develop |
| Mean score of 80% or above. |

| M 3: Collaboration Skills (O: 5) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Source of Evidence:** | Academic direct measure of learning - other |
| **Target for O5:** | Collaboration Skills |
| Mean score of 85% in Tax 8120 |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** | Not Reported This Cycle |
| Since the implementation of the action plan in summer 2013, the results will be known later in the calendar year. |

| M 4: Communication Skills (O: 6) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **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 5: Analytical Skills (O: 4) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Source of Evidence:** | Academic direct measure of learning - other |
| **Target for O4:** | Analytical Skills |
| Mean of 75% on relevant quiz questions. |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** | Met |
| Mean score of 75% for valuation implications from asset impairments and a mean score of 84% for analyzing profit margins and asset turnover. |

| M 6: Assurance Skills (O: 3) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Source of Evidence:** | Academic direct measure of learning - other |
| **Target for O3:** | Assurance Skills |
| Exam mean of 80% |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** | Met |
| The students performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as expected. |

| M 7: Apply tax law (O: 7) |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Source of Evidence:** | Academic direct measure of learning - other |
| **Target for O7:** | Apply tax law to individuals and entities. |
**Target for O7: Technological skills**

Research project mean of 85% or above for class.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score on research project was 94.21% for spring 2013 students.

### 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

#### 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:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Analytical Skills
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Skills

#### Assign homework problems for class participation credit.

The concepts under assessment are challenging and significant practice is required to master the concepts. Beginning fall 2013, questions will be assigned for homework and will be collected and reviewed in class for class participation credit.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Concentration in Business Analysis MBA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST)

(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**
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Target for O1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation

**Achievement Target:** 80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 1 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from courses across the curriculum. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in every course where it is applicable during the academic year. Learning Outcome 1. Rubric Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Understanding of the business goal / issues is able to state the key issues clearly and accurately Either clarity or accuracy can be improved Both clarity and accuracy are below expectation It is clear that the student does not understand the issues ii Identifying Key variables that need to be analyzed Knows clearly what variables must be used to represent the key issue(s) Some lack of clarity in expressing the key variables Unsure or incomplete understanding of what needs to be analyzed Does not understand the key variable that relate to the issues. iii. Analysis potential relationships among variables Accurate and thorough qualitative analysis of the situation Some lack of clarity in expressing the relationships Weak understanding of relationships among concepts/variables Very little understanding of how variables/concepts are related. iv. Interpretation of results Can clearly relate the results of model building and quantitative analysis back to the main issue Can make the connection of model results to situation most of the time Some errors in interpretation of results in the context of the situation Inability to connect the results of model with the situation at hand.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score was 3.44. The target was met. MBA students usually find this objective easy to meet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Model Building Ability (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Target for O2: Model Building Ability

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 2 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from MGS 8150. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in MGS 8150 each time the class is offered. Learning Outcome 2 Model Building Ability Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Identifying the dependent variables and appropriate metrics Can clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about measurement Unsure about the dependent variable Does not understand the connection between the issue at hand and the dependent variable ii Identifying Key independent variables and their metrics Can clearly identify the independent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about measurement Unsure about the independent variables Does not understand the connection between the dependent and the independent variables iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning, transformations Accurate and thorough preliminary analysis of the data Most parts of preliminary analysis done well Skipped or misunderstood some aspects of data preparation Poor understanding of the need to examine data carefully before modeling. iv. Model Development and validation Clear demonstration of a viable model and results from a validation. Possibly accurate model, not validated sufficiently Some errors in model building Model inappropriate or has too many errors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score was 3.44. The target was met. MBA students usually find this objective easy to meet.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

On-Growing Improvement

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

The business analysis area is showing increasing enrollment, and there is unfilled demand for our courses in the PMBA programs as well. The analytics field is growing quickly in industry, and additional courses in this area can be offered to keep up with the demand. However, with the loss of faculty to retirements, new hiring is necessary to grow the area to its potential.

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

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. 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. iii. Discriminant Analysis or Logistic Regression Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average score was 3.00. This was barely adequate to meet the requirements. As the popularity of Business Analysis grows a bit among MBA students, more take the courses, including a few students that perhaps lack the quantitative background to truly do well.

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

Target for O4: Software Skills

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 4 is to be used in scoring on 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 4 Rubric Software Skills Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Microsoft Excel Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Well designed spreadsheets. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects Inaccurate spreadsheets, sloppy work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks. ii. SPSS Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks. Inaccurate work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks. iii. SAS Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks. Inaccurate work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average score was 3.10. Once again, as with the previous objective, just enough to meet the target, but the lower scores compared to previous years may be due to more students hearing about Analytics in the business world and wanting to take the classes without being prepared for it.
Implementation Description: Non-tenure track positions in Business Analysis were announced, and the recruitment process is currently in progress.
Responsible Person/Group: Recruitment committee chaired by Dr. Subhashish Samaddar

Faculty Hiring
Hired one more faculty member to start in Fall 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Hired one full time NTT faculty member who will start in Fall 2013.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: 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?
The assessment process remains the same.

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 the added faculty member, we will possibly be able to offer all the core courses in the area on a schedule that will help students have better choice. Our inability to offer sufficient classes may have discouraged some students in the past. If the MS program students can be separated into different sections it can help us tailor the classes better for MBA students only.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Concentration in Entrepreneurship is to integrate knowledge gained through core subjects such as finance, accounting and marketing with a fundamental understanding of key principles of entrepreneurship such as opportunity recognition, business idea development and analysis, resource acquisition, innovation and growth/exit strategies. Entrepreneurship students are prepared for engagement in either new business formation or management within dynamic corporate settings that demand innovation and strategic renewal.

Goals
G 1: Deep reflective thinking
Students will be reflective thinkers.

G 2: Conscious Experimentation
Students will be conscious experimenters.

G 3: Experience transformation
Students will be equipped to transform their experience into new knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Tranformative Reflection (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will transform experiences with entrepreneurs into knowledge connecting personal and professional development; entrepreneurship principles, and their futures.

SLO 2: Conscious Experimentation (G: 2, 3)
x

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Reflection Paper (O: 1)
Field study students (MGS8590) will spend the semester working closely with an entrepreneur on a large scale strategic project. From this experience, students will write a reflection/action plan paper reflecting upon their experience and describing a personal
development plan for using the newly acquired knowledge in their career.

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

**Target for O1: Transformative Reflection**

Student average on criteria will be 2.5 on a 5.0 scale

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Average was 2.12 with one student scoring above a 3.0 (3.3) and two students below a 2.0.

**M 2: Vicarious experience reflection (O: 1)**

Entrepreneurship students (MG8500/8050) will interview and observation of an entrepreneur. Findings from this experience are compiled in a reflection paper. The content of the paper will reflect on their vicarious learning experience and will include a personal development plan for integrating and using their new knowledge moving forward.

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

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

*Develop measure for objective #2*

conscious experimentation

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**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?

Entrepreneurs require two types of knowledge to succeed: (1) industry or market-specific domain knowledge and (2) tacit knowledge of "how to be an entrepreneur" (Minniti and Bygrave 2001). Tacit knowledge of "entrepreneuring" is best attained experientially through direct hands-on experience or vicariously through indirect observation of the actions and outcomes of others (Politis 2005; Holcomb, Ireland et al. 2009). Entrepreneurship students gain direct apprenticeship experience through a field study course and vicarious experience through case studies, guest speakers and a major project in which they observe and study a successful entrepreneur. Reflection and experimentation are key components within the process of constructing tacit knowledge by "grasping and transforming experience" (Kolb 1984, pg. 41). Given this, we have changed our assessment plan to focus on the development of tacit knowledge within the concentration of Entrepreneurship as it is critical in utilization of the industry knowledge gained in the core MBA courses. The MBA program assesses students business knowledge.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Concentration in Finance MBA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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. The goal of the program is to provide students with the skills necessary to understand issues in the context of the rapidly evolving business environment particularly as relates to finance. The program provides graduates 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 become knowledgeable about 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 become conceptually and technically skilled 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: Development of critical thinking skills**

Students will become critical thinkers while analyzing complex financial issues.

**G 5: Managerial leadership preparation**
Students will become equipped for senior management levels in financial and non-financial organizations.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Development and application of foundation knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

MBA-Finance concentration 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 (G: 2, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Technical skills that MBA-Finance concentration 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 (G: 3, 5) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

MBA-Finance concentration 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 1-2013:Direct Assessment of Course Performance (Spring 2013)" for findings from Spring 2013. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013: 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 least 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 least 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 least 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 least 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 least at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 least at or above the expected level of performance and that their analytical and conceptual skills in finance meet our targets.

**M 2: Alignment of student learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)**

In the Document Repository, see "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance 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: Administrative measure - other

**Target for O1: Development and application of foundation knowledge**
The course level questions which examine student learning outcomes should align completely with the program learning outcomes (see "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance 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).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

As indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment and Alignment" the representative questions align completely with the program learning outcomes.

**Target for O2: Development and application of technical skills**

The course level questions which examine student learning outcomes should align completely with the program learning outcomes (see "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance 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).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The questions which examine student learning outcomes are aligned completely with the program learning outcomes as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment Plan and Alignment".

**Target for O3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills**

The course level questions which examine student learning outcomes should align completely with the program learning outcomes (see "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance 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).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The questions which examine student learning outcomes are aligned completely with the program learning outcomes as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment Plan and Alignment".

**M 3: 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: Administrative measure - other

**Target for O2: Development and application of technical skills**

To ensure the development and application of technical skills in the world of practice, we should have at least 20 students doing field studies in finance courses every semester.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Consistent with the need to develop and apply technical skills in the world of practice, we do have more than 20 students doing field-studies in finance courses every semester.

**Target for O3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills**

To ensure the development and application of analytical and conceptual skills in the world of practice, we should have at least 20 students doing field studies in finance courses every semester.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Consistent with the need to develop and apply analytical and conceptual skills in the world of practice, we do have more than 20 students doing field studies in finance courses every semester.

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

**Curriculum**

The Department continues to review its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace. In response, we have most recently added two courses: FI 8350 "Corporate Restructuring and Workouts" and FI 8260 "Hedge funds and their trading strategies." These two courses have been successfully taught now for 2 cycles and are among our most popular courses. Looking forward to the 2013-2014 academic year, we will continue to review the curriculum and identify potential new courses that will provide students with important skill sets relevant to their professional development.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills
  - Development and application of foundation knowledge | Development and application of technical skills

**Implementation Description:** continuous

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Gerry Gay

**Practical Training and Field Study Experience**

Our experience in developing and offering the field-study in finance course FI 8391 continues to prove highly useful for providing MBA-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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: continuous
Responsible Person/Group: Professors Milind Shrikhande and Richard Fendler

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 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. During the 2012-2013 academic year, we were able to select courses in the MBA finance program that were largely populated by MBA students and less by MS students. This is because most of the MS-Finance students are now required to participate in the cohorted fast track MS-Finance classes. Also, going forward, with each academic year, there is the likelihood that new and/or different faculty will instruct the 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.

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, based on feedback from students, we continue to seek ways to innovate the curriculum. Recent examples include new courses on the topics of hedge funds and on corporate restructuring and workouts. These courses have been successively launched. We will continue to review the curriculum for improvements. Second, in response to earlier feedback from students, we 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. Third, with the growing success of the College’s Professional MBA program, the Finance Department will continue to seek ways to offer finance classes to those PMBA students seeking specialized training in finance.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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.

G 5: Workforce Diversity
To graduate students from the MBA/HRM program with the ability to identify and react to the issues and challenges of workforce diversity and cross-cultural HR.

G 6: Global HR Management
To graduate students from the MBA/HRM program with the ability to identify issues and react to issues and challenges of global HR.

G 7: HR in Mergers and Acquisitions
To graduate students from the MBA/HRM program with the ability to manage the role of HR in mergers and acquisitions.
### G 8: Unions and employment relations

To graduate students from the MBA/HR program with the ability to manage complex relationships with unions and to deal with employee relations issues

#### 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, 8, 10, 11, 12)**

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)

**SLO 5: Workforce Diversity and Cross-Cultural Issues (G: 2, 5) (M: 8, 9)**

Identify issues and challenges of workforce diversity and cross-cultural HR management.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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)

**SLO 6: Global Issues in HR (G: 2, 5, 6) (M: 10, 11)**

Identify issues and reaction to global issues in HR.

**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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 7: Manage HR in Mergers and Acquisitions (G: 7) (M: 12)**

Understand the role of HR in mergers and acquisitions, including functions, legal considerations, and actions to be taken.

**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)

**SLO 8: Union and employee relations (G: 8) (M: 13, 14)**

Understand the complex relationships and interpersonal and legal issues in dealing with unions and employee relations.

**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.

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: General Understanding of HR in Organizations (O: 1)**

Students will understand the role and usage of job analysis, job description, job evaluation, and performance appraisal techniques and can apply the appropriate method in a variety of settings.

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

**Target for O1: The Role of HR in Organizations**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MBA Concentration in HR Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 1.85/3.0. 86% of MBA/HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 2: HR Formulation Techniques (O: 1)**

The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify, evaluate, and effectively react to issues in the areas of employee relations and performance management.

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

**Target for O1: The Role of HR in Organizations**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected exam questions in MGS 8300, 8360, and 8390. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately and in detail describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.0/3.0. 83% of MBA/HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 3: Identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues. (O: 2)**

Students can identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues.

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

**Target for O2: Problem Solving**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 Rubric to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.17/3.0. 100% of MBA/HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 4: Resource Identification in HR (O: 2)**

Students can find and apply appropriate resources to address critical HR issues and solve HR problems.

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

**Target for O2: Problem Solving**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 4 Rubric to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Target was met last year.

**M 5: Links with Business Strategy (O: 3)**
Students will show the ability to select appropriate business strategies and accompanying HR strategies and policies in case analyses in MGS 8300, MGS 8390, and MGS 8395.

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

**Target for O3: Links with Business Strategy**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.25/3.0. 100% of MBA/HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 6: Law and Issue Identification (O: 4)**

This measure will capture the students’ ability to identify and address legal issues and relevant laws and policies to address legal issues in compensation, selection, and other HR areas.

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

**M 7: Understanding and Interpreting Case Law (O: 4)**

This measure will capture the students' ability to understand and translate into appropriate HR policies case law concerning HR issues.

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

**Target for O4: HR Law**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 7 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 4: Understand the role of legal constraints on HR activities and policies. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 7: Understand and translate into appropriate HR policies case law concerning HR issues. Can discuss some implications of HR case law and can apply to some HR legal issues. Can discuss most implications of HR case law and can apply to most HR legal issues. Can discuss all implications of HR case law and can apply to all HR legal issues.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.0/3.0. 100% of MBA/HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 8: Diversity Issues (O: 2, 5)**

Students can identify relevant issues in workforce diversity and cross-cultural HR management

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

**Target for O2: Problem Solving**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 8 Rubric to randomly-selected MGS 8360 projects. Identify advantages and challenges of diversity 1 = students can identify 1-2 issues 2 = students can identify 3-4 issues 3 = students can identify more than 4 issues

**M 9: Adaptation to Workforce Diversity (O: 5)**

Students can react to issues in workforce diversity and cross-cultural issues to solve problems in HR management

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

**Target for O5: Workforce Diversity and Cross-Cultural Issues**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 9 Rubric to randomly-selected projects in MGS 8360. Adapt to workforce diversity issues 1 = Students can react to 1-2 issues 2 = Students can react to 3-4 issues 3 = Students can react to more than 4 issues

**M 10: Global HR Issues (O: 2, 6)**

Students can identify issues in HR global management

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O6: Global Issues in HR**

80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 10 Rubric to randomly-selected projects in MGS 8360. Identify issues relevant to global HR management 1 = Students can identify 1-2 issues 2 = Students can identify 3-4 issues 3 = Students can identify more than 4 issues

**M 11: Reaction to Global HR Issues (O: 2, 6)**

Students can react to issues and challenges in global HR management

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

**Target for O6: Global Issues in HR**

80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 11 Rubric to randomly-selected projects in MGS 8360. React to global HR issues 1 = Students can react to 1-2 issues in a superficial way 2 = Students can react to 3-4 issues in an adequate way 3 = Students can react to more than 4 issues in a highly-effective way

**M 12: Role of HR in Merger and Acquisitions (O: 2, 7)**

Identify expectations and role of HR in mergers and acquisitions

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
### Target for O7: Manage HR in Mergers and Acquisitions

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 12 Rubric to randomly-selected case analyses in MGS 8300. Identify expectations and actions of HR in mergers and acquisitions 1 = Students can give incomplete or inappropriate identification of 1-2 HR roles 2 = Students can give complete and adequate identification of 3-4 HR roles 3 = Students can give complete and detailed identification of more than 4 HR roles

### M 13: Union and employee relations (O: 8)

MBA/HRM students will be able to identify cultural, legal, and ethical issues related to union and employee relations

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

### Target for O8: Union and employee relations

80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 13 Rubric to randomly-selected cases in MGS 8300. Identify issues related to unions and employee relations 1 = Student can identify 1-2 issues 2 = Student can identify 3-4 issues 3 = Student can identify more than 4 issues

### M 14: Address union and employee relations issues (O: 8)

80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 14 Rubric to randomly-selected cases in MGS 8300. Identify issues and give reactions to issues in union and employee relations 1 = Students can address 1-2 issues 2 = Students can address 3-4 issues 3 = Students can address more than 4 issues

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

#### 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
- Relations (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: Finished
- Priority: High
- Relations (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: General Understanding of HR in Organizations | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
- Additional Resources: None

#### 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
- Relations (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Resource Identification in HR | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Add additional time for strategy in MGS 8300
Add 30 minutes to the presentation in MGS 8300 devoted to linkage between corporate strategy and HR strategy.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Develop a concise lecture and handouts on corporate strategies and appropriate HR strategies for each.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of MGS 8300
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Add 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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors of MGS 8360 and MGS 8390.
- **Additional Resources:** None

Add in-class activity to MGS 8300
A short in-class activity in MGS 8300 will be designed to illustrate the linkage between case law and HR policy. Feedback for improvement will be given in class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** A short in-class activity using a case that will then be used to have students practice writing rules and regulations.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of MGS 8300
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

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:** Finished
- **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

Add MGS 8300 case on unions and employee relations
Add a case in MGS 8300 to cover problem solving concerning unions and employee relations, including identification of issues and appropriate and legal reactions. 6/1/2014

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Address union and employee relations issues
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Union and employee relations
- **Implementation Description:** Add case to MGS 8300
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of MGS 8300
- **Additional Resources:** None
Additional lecture in MGS 8300
Add an additional 30-minute lecture in MGS 8300 to supplement textbook information on business strategies and appropriate HR response for each. Continue to monitor and check for reinforcement in MGS 8390.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Resource Identification in HR | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving

Implementation Description: Add strategy lecture in MGS 8300
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300
Additional Resources: None

Mergers case added to MGS 8300
Add a case to MGS 8300 concerning HR roles and constraints in mergers and acquisitions

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Role of HR in Mergers and Acquisitions | Outcome/Objective: Manage HR in Mergers and Acquisitions

Implementation Description: Add case to MGS 8300
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Dimotakis
Additional Resources: None

MGS 8360 case on global HR issues
Add a case to MGS 8360 concerning issues and reaction to global HR issues.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Reaction to Global HR Issues | Outcome/Objective: Global Issues in HR
| Problem Solving

Implementation Description: Case concerning global HR management will be added to MGS 8360
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None

Workplace diversity and cross-cultural issues in HR
Add a case study in MGS 8360 to address workforce diversity and cross-cultural issues.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Add a case student concerned with diversity and cross-cultural issues. Grade based on identification of issues and appropriate responses.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360
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 several few faculty members in HR. We met several times early in the year to review our goals and action plans and our new and existing faculty made adjustments to the courses based on these. At the end of the year, the new faculty took an active role in assessing the programs. As a result, many of our goals were met and new ones developed. We see this as largely attributable to having qualified FT faculty teach 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.

Our new faculty members took an enthusiastic approach to designing activities and content that help students achieve the goals of our program. As a group, we discussed grading, overlap in content (where appropriate and helpful and where inefficient), and integration and reinforcement from one course to another. This was the first time in several years we had a critical mass of faculty working together on specific targets. We feel we have tightened up the program and made our students more attractive to employers.

Annual Report Section Responses

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 increasing competition in our market from other state schools, for-profit and on-line schools, and other programs, in addition to the growth of our own PMBA degree program at the expense of the MBA program, will mean increased attention to class sizes and offerings and sequencing. The classroom interface between MBA students with high-level HR jobs and extensive work experience and MS students with little or no work experience will mean more challenges for covering material at the appropriate level.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
We quantified a number of measures in our rubrics, so instead of saying something such as "identified a number of outcomes" we now have "identified 1-2 outcomes" and more specific wording in many cases. This move led to very fruitful discussion among faculty members which helped to clarify expectations of students a great deal.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

With additional FT faculty, more of our goals were met and new ones designed. We tried to take into account more employer feedback on what qualities in our students they find most important. We have shifted to a more hands-on, skill-building approach.

---

**Georgia State University**
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**2012-2013 Concentration in Operations Management MBA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the MBA Concentration in Operations Management is to provide students pursuing a broader MBA degree (vs. the MS in Operations Management) with a moderate level of breadth and depth of understanding with respect to the major operations management issues confronting organizations of all types today. Students will be able to deal with operational issues in both a manufacturing, as well, service environment.

**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 through continual revision and improvement of the curriculum. In the Fall 2011 and again Fall 2012, the faculty reworked the 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. This course continues to be reviewed for contemporary content as supply chain management and logistics subject matter evolves.

**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 management 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 integrate 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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Develop Decision Making Abilities (M: 4)**

The Student should be able to identify critical success factors 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 functions 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. The project also requires collaboration and teamwork among the team members.

**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 on a timely basis. 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 each 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 O1: A Strategic view of OM
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2.5 on the Rubric for Measure One. Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 1: Reasoned Analysis The student is not able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student can determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student exceeds at completing a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student excels at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Our case studies and article analysis both require rational and reasoned analysis for a clear understanding of the essential elements of the homework assignment. Our students are being asked to read, assess, and differentiate what is critical to the success of the entity and what is not. Change is occurring at a faster rate in operations, logistics and supply chain management than before and our students are being ask to appreciate the ability to reason, direct, develop and deploy solutions at a faster rate. The student responses are demonstrating the ability to master this type of reasoning and responding with rational, logical, and analytical responses at a 90%+ level.

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 and/ or industry.

Target for O1: A Strategic View of OM
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 2 Integration of recommendations The student is not able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student determines the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student exceeds at integrating recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student easily determines the effects that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic.

M 3: Performance (O: 1)
This item measures the students' ability to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment through their ability to identify the critical success factors of an OM application and the assessment of available resources and capabilities.

Target for O1: A Strategic view of OM
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3 Performance The student is not able identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student is able identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student excels at identifying critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to easily assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students excel at analyzing or understanding how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment.

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.

Target for O2: Develop Decision Making Abilities
An adequate number of written questions are used on each exam among the various course requirements to determine the critical thinking capabilities of the student. Case analysis adds an additional dimension for assessing critical thinking through writing. Students are expected to comprehend and offer alternative solutions that adequately (85%) resolve the problem statement and satisfy the criteria for a reasonable solution.

**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. Leaning 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. Evaluate after next offering.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Meets standards=2**
Our findings indicate a greater appreciation for environmental and sustainability issues. These findings are based on classroom discussions and written assignments. We find that 90% of our students are well versed on these topics.

**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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Meets standards=2**
Our findings reflect that the majority of our students (95%+) appreciate the value of a collaborative work environment engaged in divergent/ convergent thinking. Our students understand and appreciate the value of establishing criteria for problem solving and assessing alternatives against these criteria in a team setting.

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

**A strategic view of OM**
With respect to the first learning outcome, to develop a strategic view of OM, two actions will be taken: · Add several readings from Business Week, New York Times or Wall Street Journal about aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering. · Add an in-class exercise based on a case about operations making significant difference for a company’s 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: 12/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None

**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: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None

**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.
Annual Report Section Responses

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

Outcomes.

**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 performance.

Modified the Operations Planning course (MGS 8710) to Logistics and Operations Planning with additional focus on supply chain management and logistics. 3) Each of the six courses include a comprehensive team project which focuses on the course topic and includes process analysis, critical path analysis, risk assessment, supply chain event management, human resource issues and some financial analysis. In addition, the assignment includes a class presentation made at the senior management level. Both components of the assignment represent a significant component of the grade for the course. In most cases there are articles and cases that are a component of the final grade. Each case and/or article must be analyzed and written up with specific issues to be addressed for the course.

**Team Membership**

With respect to the fourth learning outcome, to become a strong team member, three actions will be taken: 1) Incorporate lessons on effective teams into teaching material. 2) 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. 3) Ask each team to evaluate other teams' performance to emphasize the importance of teamwork. Evaluate after next offering.

**Critical Thinking**

The Operations Management faculty members will develop a measurement mechanism, including targeted assignments and exams, as well as a measuring rubric, for the assessment of the use of critical thinking skills in the solving of problems in operations management.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**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?

Among the six courses, and six instructors, we have made no significant changes in the assessment process. Minor changes to MBA 8155 case study (Marriott Case) has been dropped and an updated IKEA case added.

**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 elective course MGS 8710 title has been changed from Operations Planning to Logistics and Operations Planning. This change better reflects the course curriculum and student needs in this area of study.
process, please note those here.

We have no plans to modify the measurement.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

As our current outcomes are good, we do not plan to change them.

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

Peter Zhang is on the university-wide research proposal review committee and Walter Wallace is on the Critical Thinking through Writing task force committee and is one of the original Ambassadors representing the Managerial Sciences Department.

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.


International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

Walter L. Wallace spend two summers (2010 & 2011) at Sichuan University, Suzhou Institute teaching four MBA courses in Operations Management, Operations Strategy, Service Operations, and Logistics and Supply Chain Management. In 2012, Walter accompanied 20 PMBA students to Hong Kong and mainland China, visiting a variety of U.S. companies headquartered in Shanghai and Beijing, as well as Chinese based companies.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

To increase retention rate, the faculty in the area has regularly talked to students for future job opportunities and let students know skills for job search. The Global Logistics Roundtable which is a component of the Managerial Sciences Department invites graduate students from our MS and MBA program to attend monthly programs and meet senior executives from member companies. In the past several years the Roundtable has been instrumental in placing five students into member companies.

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).

The Global Logistics Roundtable which is a component of the Managerial Sciences Department invites graduate students from our MS and MBA program to attend monthly programs and meet senior executives from member companies. We feel this outreach with corporate organizations in the Southeast has been instrumental for our student involvement as well as our operations management faculty to engage in research and consulting opportunities.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Concentration in Organization Management MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The manager in today’s business environment deals with a variety of complex concerns including structural and organizational design, people issues and managing people, power and politics, and cultural dimensions. The Master of Business Administration in Organization Management prepares managers to analyze issues, events, problems, resource constraints, and change from the vantage point of each of these concerns and to consider each as they make decisions to chart the organization’s future. Organizations are composed of people, and people bring unique challenges to the workplace. These challenges include working with people as individuals, people in work groups, and people collectively in organizations.

Goals

G 1: Diagnose Organizational Events and Problems
Goal 1: To graduate students from the MBA in Organizational Management with the ability to diagnose the basic causes of organizational events, issues, and problems.

G 2: Recommendations for Org. Events & Problems
Goal 2: To graduate students from the MBA in Organizational Management with the ability to recommend appropriate responses to organizational events, issues, and problems.

G 3: Understand Impact of Power & Politics
Goal 3: To graduate students of the MBA program in Organization Management with an understanding of the impact that power, influence, and political behavior have on general organizational success and upon the success of specific initiatives in organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analyze Organizational Situations (G: 1) (M: 1)
Outcome/Objective 1: Analyze a variety of organizational situations and identify the causes of effective and ineffective movement toward meeting the organization's agenda. Full Description: Organizational issues, events, and problems have causes that
simultaneously emanate from structural, human, political, and cultural roots. Therefore, most significant issues, events, and problems must be viewed from multiple perspectives to obtain a reasonably complete understanding. Graduate should be able to simultaneously see issues, events, and problems from multiple perspectives. Related Measures Case assignments and exam questions in MBA 8165, MGS 8435, and MGS 8440.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Specify Courses of Action (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Outcome/Objective 2: Review a variety of organizational events, issues, and problems and specify appropriate courses of action the organization should take as a response. Full Description: Organizational issues, events, and problems have causes that simultaneously emanate from structural, human, political, and cultural roots. Graduate should be able to simultaneously see issues, events, and problems from multiple perspectives and to formulate responses that reflect an understanding of these multiple roots. Related Measures Case assignments and exam questions in MBA 8165, MGS 8435, and MGS 8440.

**SLO 3: Analyze Political Realities (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Outcome/Objective 3: Effectively analyze political realities in organizational situations. Full Description: The MBA graduate will be able to identify the effect of power and politics on resource allocations, personnel decisions, and other decisions that organizations make. Related Measures Exam questions, cases, and projects in MGS 8355.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
Average rating of 1.65. 25% of students achieved 2.0 threshold 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Average faculty rating of 1.63 on all criteria. 50% of students achieved 2.0 threshold on all criteria.

**M 3: Identify Political Dimensions of Decisions (O: 3)**
M3: Students can identify political dimensions of organizational decisions.

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

**Target for O3: Analyze Political Realities**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 Rubric to randomly selected exams, cases, and projects.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
Average of 1.7 on all criteria. 33% of students achieved the 2.0 threshold 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**: In-Progress
- **Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Recommend Responses Incorporating Four-Perspective Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Specify Courses of Action

- **Implementation Description**: Case is being implemented.
- **Projected Completion Date**: 05/2014
**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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Find Four-Perspective Causes of Events /Problems | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Organizational Situations

Implementation Description: Additional case was introduced. Case will be changed for the next iteration.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Identify Political Dimensions of Decisions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Political Realities

Implementation Description: First iteration was not ideal. Will adjust in the next iteration.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8435 instructors

**Add group decision-making activity**

In order to put increased emphasis on group-level decision-making, we will add a group-level in-class activity. This will be the "Towers Market" exercise. The debrief of this activity is intended to provide focus on group decisions when no apparent coalitions are present.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MBA 8165 instructors

**Change the case for recommendations**

In the previous cycle, we added a case to improve students insights into how to recommend and organize recommendations based on their diagnosis of organizational problems. While this addition has helped, the instructors are not sufficiently pleased with the selected case once it was used in class. Therefore, we will be implementing a new case for this purpose.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MBA 8165 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 maintained the outcomes, measures, and targets. Our focus has been on making individual adjustments within the individual courses in order to increase performance as measured against the stated 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.

In the coming year, we plan to revise the curriculum to reduce the number of elective courses and increase the number of required courses. Also, we intend to narrow the list of approved elective courses. In general, this strategy is intended to provide more focus and a more common experience within the program for the graduates.
Mission / Purpose
The MBA degree program is designed for individuals with work experience who aspire to organizational or entrepreneurial leadership positions. The program enhances general management abilities and provides an opportunity to place emphasis on a functional area of expertise. The mission of the concentration in real estate is to provide that expertise in the area of real estate.

Goals
G 1: Business skills required to lead by pursuing ethical, innovative and value-enhancing strategies in real estate organizations
Graduate students with the business skills required to lead by pursuing ethical, innovative and value-enhancing strategies in real estate organizations in a culturally diverse and technologically advanced world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems (G: 1) (M: 1)
Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems

SLO 2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm (G: 1) (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 in an exam question. (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
MBA students score a minimum average 2.0 on 3.0 scale on measure with 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
Average on Criteria 1: 1.6 29% 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 in an exam question. (RE8100) Criterion 2: Understand the changing intersection of workers, space, and technology in designing workplaces in an exam question. (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
MBA students score a minimum average 2.0 on 3.0 scale on measure with 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Average on Criteria 1: 2.4 71% students met standard. Average on Criteria 2: 2.6. 100% students met standard.

M 3: Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies (O: 2)
Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies using material from both real estate and MBA core classes. Criterion: Identify key criteria and evaluate alternative real estate strategies to support common business strategies in an exam question. (RE 8100)
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm
MBA students score a minimum average 2.0 on 3.0 scale on measure with 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Average on Criteria 1: 2.0. 40% 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 in an exam question. (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**
MBA students score a minimum average 2.0 on 3.0 scale on measure with 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Average on Criteria 2: 2.1. 86% students met standard.

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

**Review course materials and exercises for O1.M1.C1.**
Review course materials and exercises on related topics to examine why target not met this year, but has been met in previous years. (O1.M1.C1.)

- 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 organizational and operational structures using material from both real estate & MBA core classes | Outcome/Objective: Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems
- 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: Finished
- 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

**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 since last year. No changed planned 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 to program or curricular design arose from this year’s assessment.

---

**Georgia State University**
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Counseling Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The Counseling Psychology PhD Program, a unit of the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, subscribes to a scientist-practitioner model designed to integrate science with practice and advocacy. Students are prepared to generate and apply psychological knowledge to human development, adaptation, and adjustment issues.
Goals

**G 1: Clinical Competence**
Students are competence in understanding and applying theoretical knowledge in ethical clinical practice while being sensitive to multicultural issues.

**G 2: Research Competence**
Students are competent in both understanding and applying research methods.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Clinical effectiveness with diverse groups of clients (M: 1, 2)**
Students are prepared to work with clients who are individually and culturally different from themselves.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain D.

**SLO 2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice (M: 3, 4, 5)**
Students are knowledgeable about the tenets and principles of ethical practice
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**SLO 3: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession (M: 6, 7)**
Students are proficient in diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, supervision, and psycho-educational interventions.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**SLO 4: Understands relevant clinical theories (M: 8, 9)**
Students understand theories of psychological 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 empirical 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: Clinical effectiveness with diverse groups of clients**
90% of students meet evaluation target on evaluation.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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: Clinical effectiveness with diverse groups of clients**
90% of students receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructor.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students received satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructor.

**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 clinical practice**
90% of students score a 3 or above on practicum evaluation items.
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students met target of scoring 3 or above on practicum evaluation items.

**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 clinical practice**
90% of students receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructor.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students received rating of 4 or higher on evaluation by instructor.

**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 two-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 clinical practice**
80% of students receive passing grade on ethics comprehensive area question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of target met.

**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 clinical areas of the profession**
90% of students receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on a 5 point scale) in courses related to key areas of the profession (e.g., Assessment).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students received satisfactory evaluations in courses.

**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 clinical areas of the profession**
90% of students will receive a score of 3 or higher on related practicum evaluation items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target of receiving score of 3 or higher on evaluation items.

**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 clinical theories**
90% of students will receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by instructors of theory related courses.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grades satisfactory evaluations in theory related courses.

**M 9: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 4)**
Theory comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students write a 12-page answer to the question to demonstrate their knowledge of counseling theories and applications. Answers are evaluated by a 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 clinical theories**
80% of students will receive passing grade on theory area comprehensive question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students received passing grades on theory comprehensive questions.
**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)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**
90% of students will receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by instructors in research related courses.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students receives satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructors in research related courses.

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

### Comprehensive Examination Orientation
Present an orientation the the comprehensive examination to enhance students' preparation for the theories portion of the comprehensive examination.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive examination question on theory | Outcome/Objective: Understands relevant clinical 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 clinical practice

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of the program

### Monitor Program Strengths
All outcome objectives were fully met. Program faculty will work to maintain positive program characteristics, and will continue to monitor and assessment stated learning outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive examination question on ethics | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice
- Measure: Comprehensive examination question on theory | Outcome/Objective: Understands relevant clinical theories
- Measure: Performance in Advanced Multicultural Course | Outcome/Objective: Clinical effectiveness with diverse groups of clients
- Measure: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) | Outcome/Objective: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession
- Measure: Performance in ethics course | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice
- Measure: Performance in research courses | Outcome/Objective: Use and conduct research
- Measure: Performance in theories courses | Outcome/Objective: Understands relevant clinical theories
- Measure: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors | Outcome/Objective: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession

**Implementation Description:** Use Spring Faculty meeting to review objectives and program strengths and weaknesses.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Counseling Psychology Faculty

### Return Assessment Courses to Dept.
Offer psychological assessment courses in the department rather than having students take courses in psychology department to allow for tailored instruction to Counseling Psychology students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive examination question on ethics | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice
- Measure: Comprehensive examination question on theory | Outcome/Objective: Understands relevant clinical theories
- Measure: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) | Outcome/Objective: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession

**Implementation Description:** Courses are being offered Fall 2013 and Spring 2014.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Counseling Psychology Faculty
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 be skilled and knowledgeable teachers 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 be able to demonstrate advanced counseling skills.

G 4: Supervision
Students will be knowledgeable and skilled clinical supervisors.

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. 1 point equates to does not meet standards; 2 points equates to competent; 3 points equate to exemplary.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students (N=6) completing the teaching portfolio received either a 2 or 3 on the final assessment.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The range of scores for this question was 4.6 to 5.0 with a mean of 4.8. Therefore, 100% (N=5) 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The range of scores on this question was 4.4 to 5 with a mean of 4.7. 100% (N=5) met this target.

**M 4: Research (O: 2)**

Students will complete and submit their predissertation project. All students in the CEP program must successfully complete the predissertation study, this is a milestone project and students cannot advance until they have successfully completed the predissertation study.

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

**Target for O2: Research**

Students will complete and submit their predissertation study.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Four students successfully completed their predissertation study during 2012-2013 cycle.

**M 5: Research (O: 2)**

Students will receive a Passing on the research portion of their comprehensive examination. The comprehensive examination is a requirement of the College of Education and the CEP program. All students must pass the comprehensive examination before becoming a doctoral candidate. Students have two opportunities to successfully pass the comprehensive examination. After two unsuccessful attempts at passing the comprehensive examination, students may not continue with their program of study.

*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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

During the 2012-2013 cycle, we only had one student take their comprehensive examination and she successfully passed the research portion of the comprehensive examination.

**M 6: Clinical Skills (O: 3)**

Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80% receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds. 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients. 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession.

*Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation*

**Target for O3: Clinical Skills**

Students will receive at least 3 out of 5 on the relevant questions on the Supervisee Evaluation Form.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% (N=2) of the students who took advanced practicum received at least a 3 or higher on the relevant questions. 1= needs considerable improvement in this area. 2= needs improvement in this area. 3= demonstrates minimal competency in this area. 4= demonstrates competency in this area. 5= demonstrates exceptional ability in this area. NA= not applicable More specifically the means were: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts (mean =5). 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds (mean=5). 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients (mean=5). 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession (mean=5).
M 7: Supervision (O: 4)

Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80% receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of supervision and counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds. 3. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling/supervision profession and utilizes supervision to clarify ethical challenges faced with supervisees.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O4: Supervision

Students will receive at least a 3 on the relevant questions of Supervisor in Training Evaluation Forms, with 80% receiving at least a 4 or 5.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

1. The range of scores for the theory question was 4 to 5 with a mean of 4.5; 100% (N=2) passing this criteria. 2. Both students received a 5 on the diversity question; 100% (N=2) passing on this criteria. 3. Both students received a 5 on the ethics question, 100% (N=2) 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical practice
Continue to monitor the supervisee evaluation forms.

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>Clinical Skills</td>
<td>Clinical Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision
Continue to monitor the SIT evaluation forms.

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>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching-goals/objectives
Continue to monitor the teaching evaluations.

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>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of the Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling Track
We will investigate the possibility of having a clinical rehabilitation counseling track as a part of the CEP program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: We will work with the Rehabilitation Counseling Program coordinator to work out the details.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chang
Additional Resources: none
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. We anticipate that our students will become academics or applied researchers and our mission is to provide them with training and mentoring that will help them achieve these goals.

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: Teaching Excellence (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)
Graduate student instructors will demonstrate teaching excellence.

Strategic Plan Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Presentations (O: 1)
We will count the number of presentations, given by Ph.D. students who have reached candidacy, at regional and national conferences in Criminal Justice and Criminology, based on a review of the student's Curriculum Vitae.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Of the three students who have advanced to candidacy, all have presented 3 or more times, including at least 2 at national conferences.
meetings. The average student presented 8 papers at professional conferences.

**M 2: Publications (O: 2)**

We will count the number of peer-reviewed publications, by Ph.D. students in Criminal Justice and Criminology who have advanced to candidacy, based on a review of the student's Curriculum Vita.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All three of the students who have advanced to candidacy have published a peer-reviewed journal article (100%). Two of the three students have published two or more peer-reviewed journal articles (66.6%). The average for the three students was 2.33 peer reviewed articles.

**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: Teaching Excellence**

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 13 course sections instructed by graduate students, 100% were scored over a 3.5 on this item. Of the 7 course sections instructed by graduate students, 84.6% were scored at 4.0 or higher on this item. Of the 7 course sections instructed by graduate students, 61.5% were scored at 4.5 or higher on this item.

**M 4: Faculty Evals (O: 3)**

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

**Target for O3: Teaching Excellence**

100% of students will have an average score of 3 or higher on the 12-item faculty-rated classroom observation form. 50% of students will attain an average score of 4.0 or higher on the 12-item faculty-rated classroom observation form. 25% of students will attain an average score of 4.5 or higher on the classroom observation form.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Faculty rated all 4 students observed in the classroom above a 3.0 average (100%). Faculty rated all 4 students observed in the classroom above a 4.0 average (100%). Faculty rated 2 of the 4 students observed in the classroom above a 4.5 average (50%).

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not Reported this cycle.

**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: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Comps Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinkers
- Projected Completion Date: 10/2013
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee
- Additional Resources: None
**Comps**

The graduate committee will meet this year to assess the comps process and propose revisions to the existing comprehensive exam structure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee / Full Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

We combined two student outcomes, because they were redundant and poorly worded - as noted by the Graduate Assessment Committee's review. We created targets for some of the measures this year that we had not created last year. We collected data for the first time, since the Ph.D. program is so new. We are in the process of revising our comprehensive examinations structure and the assessment of the comps as a measure of critical thinking.

**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 changes to our comprehensive examination process and how we assess critical thinking through the comps via a rubric.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**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 lost three key tenured or tenure track faculty members this year (20% of the faculty). Implementation of the existing program and especially the comprehensive examination structure has been critically compromised by these losses.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

Two of the outcomes proposed last year were redundant and poorly worded, so they have combined into a single outcome with two measures.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Criminal Justice Assessment of Core**

(Also 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 2012-2013 academic year.

**Goals**

**G 1: Students should be critical thinkers**

Students are critical thinkers in the context of contemporary issues in crime and criminal justice.

**G 2: Students should be analyzers of crime and criminal justice**

Students should be analyzers of the complexity of crime and criminal justice system 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 effectively analyze a wide range of contemporary crime and justice issues to which they are exposed using a social science perspective.
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 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, 2) (M: 1)

Students 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=7) of CRJU 2200 were offered during both the Fall 2012 (n=4) and Spring 2013 (n=3) semesters. Of the seven sections offered, four were taught by full-time tenure track faculty members, 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. Multiple choice, fill-in-the-blank, or true/false questions for each objective were embedded on each of the three exams in each of the sections to be 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 three sections, one taught in the Fall 2012 and two taught in the Spring 2013, all by full-time, tenure-track 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 or more exams 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 Core Fall 2012 2013.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 190 students (N=119 for Instructor 1; N=6 for Instructor 2; N=65 for Instructor 3) were enrolled in the three 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 1: Q1 Pass Rate: 79%; Q2 Pass Rate: 90%. Overall for Instructor 1, 84% pass rate (Overall: Partially met target goal)
- Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 83%; Q2 Pass Rate: 83%. Overall for Instructor 2, 83% Pass Rate (Overall: Met target goal).
- Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 79%; Q2 Pass Rate: 97%. Overall for Instructor 3, 85% (Overall: Partially met target goal).

Overall: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

A total of 190 students (N=119 for Instructor 1; N=6 for Instructor 2; N=65 for Instructor 3) were enrolled in the three 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 1: Q1 Pass Rate: 91%; Q2 Pass Rate: 78%. Overall for Instructor 1, 84% pass rate (Overall: Partially met target goal).
- Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 100%; Q2 Pass Rate: 100%. Overall for Instructor 2, 100% Pass Rate (Overall: Met target goal).
- Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 95%; Q2 Pass Rate: 84%. Overall for Instructor 3, 90% (Overall: Met target goal).

Overall: Met target goal.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 190 students (N=119 for Instructor 1; N=6 for Instructor 2; N=65 for Instructor 3) were enrolled in the three 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 1**: Q1 Pass Rate: 90%; Q2 Pass Rate: 99%.
  - Overall for Instructor 1, 95% pass rate (Overall: Met target goal).

- **Instructor 2**: Q1 Pass Rate: 100%; Q2 Pass Rate: 67%.
  - Overall for Instructor 2, 83% Pass Rate (Overall: Partially met target goal).

- **Instructor 3**: Q1 Pass Rate: 84%; Q2 Pass Rate: 42%.
  - Overall for Instructor 3, 63% (Overall: Partially met target goal).
  - 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
- **Implementation Description**: Fall 2010
- **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 Global & International Issues
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 Global & International 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 Global & International Issues
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Begin Assessing Ph.D. student instructors for CRJU 2200
Our Ph.D. program is in its fourth year. We occasionally have Ph.D. students teach CRJU 2200. Assessment is covered in their required teaching seminar course. As such, we will not begin assessing CRJU 2200 when taught by Ph.D. students. Doing so will allow us to compare not only within and across objectives, but also across types/levels of instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues
Implementation Description: Assess CRJU 2200 when taught by Ph.D. students to compare across type/level of instructor
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Coordinator/Committee
Additional Resources: none

Annual Report Section Responses
Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Change requirements for Area F, additional courses added to area J. Will be piloting grammarly.com in Fall 2013-Spring 2014, which should give us valuable feedback on student writing. We performed evaluations of all part-time instructors, which should enable us to ensure that course content is matching course objectives and learning outcomes are being met in those courses. We have spoken with faculty who teach CRJU 2200 to ensure that course content is matching course objectives and that assessments are designed to assess (at least in part) higher-order thinking.

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 are having turnover in the undergraduate program coordinator position this Fall. We also are implementing a new assessment of our undergraduates that should prove valuable for next year's reporting cycle.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Criminal Justice BS
As of: 12/13/2016 05:39 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes the development of understanding about issues of crime and justice, particularly within urban environments using multicultural, interdisciplinary perspectives that inform science, policy, and practice. The educational mission of the undergraduate program is to 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 2: Be critical thinkers
Students should be critical thinkers, specifically concerning crime and justice issues.

**G 4: Be effective writers**
Students will be effective writers, with a specific focus on communication about issues of crime and justice, necessary to excel in public and private sector criminal justice positions.

**G 1: Students should be knowledgeable about the criminal justice system**
Students should be knowledgeable about the functions and structures of the criminal justice system and issues related to crime and justice responses.

**G 3: Be appliers of ethical frameworks**
Students will be effective appliers of ethical frameworks when considering issues in criminal justice decision-making.

**G 5: Be effective oral communicators**
Students will be effective oral communicators, 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 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 1) (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.

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

**SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will develop and/or enhance skills in applying theoretical frameworks to contemporary issues in criminal justice. Students will be able to not only synthesize and interpret extant information, but also identify patterns within extant information, be able to compare and contrast different sides of a problem, and/or generate new predictions through their presentation in a written form.

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

**SLO 5: Written communication skills (G: 4) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to effectively communicate their knowledge and analytical skills in written form (paper). Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively identify issues, develop and organize subtopics, and generate streamlined presentations of information. In addition, students will utilize appropriate grammar and syntax, as well as the ability to adhere to APA style guidelines.

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

**SLO 6: Oral communication skills (G: 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 and evaluation of ethical frameworks (G: 3) (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: 2, 3, 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.

**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 (Comprehend & Synthesize). Finally, we expect 50% of students to achieve increased scores, as possible, between first and final draft submissions (where possible). The provided assessment rubric identifies dimensions represented by scores.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 81% (n=72) of the students scored a 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale on the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric dimension. Forty-six percent (n=41) of students received the highest score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 69% (n=61) exhibited an increase in the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric or remained at the highest score (4 of 4) between the first and final submission. Only 4% (n=4) exhibited a decrease and 28% (n=25) showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point). We almost met this goal, with the only dimension we missed on was that 46% of students as opposed to 50% were rated as a 4 on the rubric dimension.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data” contains data for these 89 students. Overall, 95% (n=85) of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 during the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters earned a score of 2, 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. Eighty-two percent (n=73) of students received a score of 3 or 4, and one-third (n=29) of these students earned a score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and show improvement over the first draft numbers in that 58% (n=52) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 3% (n=3) exhibited a decrease and 36% (n=32) 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 91% (n=81) of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 during the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters earned a score of 3 or 4 on the Writing Quality & Style dimension of the rubric. Forty percent of the students earned a score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 48% (n=43) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 9% (n=8) exhibited a decrease and 40% (n=36) 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: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment (O: 3, 6)**

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.

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

80% of student presentations will be rated as a 4 or 5 on a five point assessment scale utilized on a rubric (with 1 representing a poorly identified topic, lack of linkage between course/program content and internship experiences and 5 representing an achievement of excellence, with a timely and important topic relevant to internship agency functioning identified and analyzed using appropriate course and program materials and information).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

We did not assess outcomes using this measure this year.

**Target for O6: Oral communication skills**

80% of student presentations will be score at least an 80% on oral communication skills rubric (with low values representing a poorly developed and organized presentation, without a logical flow, that is not engaging and uses poor grammar and a 100% representing excellence – well organized, logical flow, engaging with excellent grammatical skills, clear).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Two sections of the capstone seminar were used to assess oral communication skills (section A N=14, section B N=22). For section A, 100% of students scored an 80% or higher on the rubric to assess oral communication skills. In section B, 95% of
students scored an 80% or higher on the rubric to assess oral communication skills.

**M 3: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment (O: 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. 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 in all 6 of the sections taught by the department in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. 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. Student must then create and justify criteria that they will apply to assess the quality of their sources. 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 O7: Identification and evaluation 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 154 students who were enrolled in CRJU 3060 in the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters, 58% had an increase in their overall total rubric score across the initial and revised assignment for the Learning to Think Critically about Ethical Issues assignment (see attached rubric data for CRJU 3060).

**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
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
  Measure: Continued data collection

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
  Measure: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
  | Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information | Written communication skills
  | Identification and evaluation of ethical frameworks | Written communication skills

Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Blackwell and undergraduate committee

Continued Monitoring
The department will continue monitoring to ensure that future cohorts continue to demonstrate success.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Blackwell and undergraduate committee

Data Collection
The department will cycle in data collection for determining achievement of this target in the upcoming year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis

Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Blackwell and undergraduate committee

Improve data collection efforts
The Department is reviewing the evaluation rubric to further enhance evaluation and data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador

Pilot Grammarly.com
We will be piloting Grammarly.com in CRJU 3060 this fall in the 2013-14 school year for use with at least one of the assignments in CRJU 3060. The instructor will have students submit their assignments first to Grammarly.com with the requirement of reaching a particular threshold before being able to submit the assignment for a grade. The same instructor will use the same assignment in another section of CRJU 3060 without the aid of Grammarly.com and compare rubric scores on the Mechanics dimension to assess writing improvement with the help of Grammarly.com. This same instructor is one of the instructors for CRJU 4930 Capstone Seminar. If the instructor experiences positive results from Grammarly.com, then the department will consider adoption for CRJU 4930 as well.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
  | Written communication skills

Implementation Description: Pilot Grammarly.com in CRJU 3060 during 2013-2014 school year for possible use in CRJU 4930 in future years.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor in CRJU 3060
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?
See CTW report

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?
See CTW report

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?
See CTW report

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

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Change requirements for Area F, additional courses added to area J. Will be piloting grammarly.com in Fall 2013-Spring 2014, which should give us valuable feedback on student writing. We performed evaluations of all part-time instructors, which should enable us to ensure that course content is matching course objectives and learning outcomes are being met in those 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.
We are having turnover in the undergraduate program coordinator position this Fall. We also are implementing a new assessment of our undergraduates that should prove valuable for next year's reporting cycle.
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' performance in the capstone course's final project. The items are rated on a 4 point scale, ranging from poor to excellent. The instrument is 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. One team averaged a 3.7 on the items that comprised this measure. The other team averaged a 3 on the items that comprised this measure.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. Both teams averaged 3.0 on the items that measured this outcome.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Since the course was not designed by a CJ faculty member, this outcome was not covered and these measures are not applicable this year.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. Both teams averaged 3.0 on the items that measure this outcome.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Since the course was not taught by a CJ faculty member and did not focus on these issues, the measures for this outcome are not applicable.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. Both teams averaged 3.5 on the items that measure this outcome.

M2: 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 that ranges from poor to excellent. Thesis directors use the survey instrument to rate the thesis product on 21 different dimensions.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Of the 5 students who completed theses this year, 100% averaged a 2 or better on the items that measure this outcome. 4 of the students (80%) averaged a 3 or better across the items that measure this outcome. 2 students (40%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this outcome.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this year, 100% averaged a 2 or better on the items that measure this outcome. 4 of the students (80%) averaged a 3 or better on the items that measure this outcome and 3 (60%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this outcome.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Of the 5 students who completed theses this semester, all 5 (100%) averaged a 2 or better on the items measure this outcome. 4 of the 5 (80%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this objective.

Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this semester, 3 out of the 3 who received scores on this item (100%) received a score of 4. Two students were scored as N/A for this item.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this year, 5 (100%) averaged a 2 or higher on the items that measure this outcome on the thesis assessment rubric, as scored by faculty. Four of the students (80%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this outcome.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this year, all 5 (100%) scored a 2 or higher on the item that measures this outcome. 4 of the 5 (80%) scored a 4 on this item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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  
  - Apply theory and terminology  
  - Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data  
  - Understand how systems & processes interact  
  - Understand theory  
- **Implementation Description:** We have revised the thesis targets. This year, we will revise and pilot the new instrument.  
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate committee

**Students are now writing a literature review in their first year in the program**

This is the first time in several years that we have not met our achievement target for this outcome. The analysis shows that the students were weakest on the item "The student is comfortable with his or her ability to write about crime and justice issues. Last year our required course "Crime and the Criminal Justice System" was re-vamped to require students to work extensively on writing a literature review on a criminal justice topic and I believe that this will strengthen their writing skills in this area. The two students that did not perform well on this outcome took the course before the changes were made.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Changes were made to the course and implemented in Fall 2010 for last year's cohort.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty teaching CRJU 7010

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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students
Outcome/Objective: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data
Understand how systems & processes interact

Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors for CRJU 7010 and CRJU 8980
Additional Resources: None

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. These options are required now that the capstone is no longer being offered by CJ faculty members and is instead being taught by a member of the PMAP faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students
Outcome/Objective: Apply research and statistical skills
Apply theory and terminology
Communicate effectively
Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data
Understand how systems & processes interact
Understand theory

Projected Completion Date: 03/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee
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 changes to the assessment process were made this year. We anticipate changes may be made to accommodate changes to our capstone course delivery. It is now being offered through a cross-listed course with PMAP, which will necessitate changes to our non-thesis capstone 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.

Much of the work we have done to create successful thesis track students worked as intended. The objectives for thesis students were all met this year. We plan to focus on the capstone students next. This is particularly important, since our capstone course is now cross-listed with PMAP and is being taught by a faculty member in that unit.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Accounting
Ac dr 12/02/2016 05:31 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The School of Accountancy offers an undergraduate major in accountancy. We seek to foster students' abilities to analyze the information, identify the relevant information and data necessary to solve complex problems, and to communicate the results of their analyses in an effective and efficient manner. We believe that effective oral and written communication are core competencies for accounting majors. CTW Application for accounting majors is as follows. All accounting students take a core business course (BUSA3000) 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 ASSURANCE SERVICES-CTW (AC4610). Students enroll in the Assurance class during their senior year, typically during the last semester of their undergraduate studies.

Goals
G1: 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. Feedback Response: Students will receive feedback on their written assignments at least twice before the submission of the final product. They will learn how to address critical comments to improve their writing.

G 2: SOA Goal Definition
We seek to foster students’ abilities to analyze the information, identify the relevant information and data necessary to solve complex problems, and to communicate the results of their analyses in an effective and efficient manner. We believe that effective oral and written communication are core competencies for accounting majors. We define Critical Thinking through Writing in Accounting as 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, obtain, organize, and analyze information Exercise judgment based on comprehension of a set of facts and available evidence Present, discuss and defend their views through written and spoken language Present conclusions and recommendations that are complete, plausible, and compelling, and demonstrate an understanding the accounting problem.

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.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression

SLO 2: Audit Objectives (M: 2)
Objectives of the course are as follows: Differentiate among the various types of auditing and the procedures applied on financial statements audits and audits of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting Evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified. Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process. Understand and evaluate the auditors' responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled. Evaluate, integrate, and apply different types of audit information and knowledge to form independent judgments. Present, discuss and defend their views through written and spoken language. Conclusions and critical points of view must be complete and demonstrate an understanding the audit problem.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Quality of the Memos Prepared (O: 1)
We will evaluate the extent to which student are able to identify key control weaknesses, identify key fraud risks, develop practical solutions to the deficiencies identified and communicate the results of their findings in a logical manner in a well-organized memo.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O1: Internal Control and Fraud Risk Assignment
At least 75% of the memos submitted should meet the criteria set forth in the measurement category.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
More than 90% of the student memos evaluated satisfactorily met the criteria established and achieved a level 4 or better in the associated rubric.

M 2: Comparision of Student Performance on CTW Quizzes (O: 2)
Students will complete two CTW quizzes during the course of the semester. The first quiz will be administered in the 5th or 6th week of the 14 week semester. The second Quiz will be administered in the 14th week of the course. (For courses taught during summer sessions the 1st and 2nd CTW quizzes will be administered on the date equivalent to the 5th/6th week and 14th week, respectively). The questions included in the quizzes will be equivalent in difficulty. We will compare performance on the two quizzes to measure improvement in critical thinking in accounting.

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

Target for O2: Audit Objectives

We would like to see at least a 5% improvement in the logical and internal consistency in student's analysis across the two quizzes.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Both the 1st and last CTW quiz had 2 questions. Each question had 2 parts: an objective evaluation and a written analysis to support the objective response selected. On the 1st CTW Quiz, only 32% of the students taking the quiz demonstrated internal and logical consistency. That is, only 32% of the students had an accurate objective response and an accompanying written analysis that was consistent with and supported the objective response selected. On the 2nd CTW Quiz, 45% of the students had logical and internal consistency in their response. Thus, we find that exposure to the CTW curriculum and feedback received from the CTW consultants contributed to an improvement (13%) in the logical consistency and internal consistency of responses that exceeded the target (5%).

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

Measure students ability to incorporate feedback on IC and Fraud Risk Memos

We will evaluate how well students incorporated the feedback received from the CTW coaches. CTW coaches will prepare a summary list of key action items for each of the memos reviewed. CTW instructors will be asked to assess the extent to which a sample the memos being evaluated for grading purposes demonstrated that the CTW Coach's recommendation was implemented.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Quality of the Memos Prepared | Outcome/Objective: Internal Control and Fraud Risk Assignment

Responsible Person/Group: CTW 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?

Our most significant accomplishment was in persuading students to appreciate the benefits of the CTW application in accounting. At the beginning of the semester the majority of accounting students are focused on quantitative analysis and are quite apprehensive about completing written assignments to communicate the analysis that they perform. In an attempt to overcome the negative reaction to CTW, during the orientation to the course, we explained how critical thinking can add discipline to their analysis. We also shared comments from potential employers who indicated that they valued the written communication and analytical thinking skills. The result was a student body that was more appreciative of the value of the course.

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

We observed that students demonstrate more logical consistency in their reasoning as a result of the CTW curriculum. For example, students are better able to identify the appropriate auditing standards and evidence rules to support the appropriate response on critical thinking questions. Our analysis of student performance on the first vs. last CTW quiz indicated that improvement in logical consistency and internal consistency of arguments improved by 13% overall.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the
implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
A major challenge in our program is that students never encounter assignments that emphasize the written communication skills.
While all accounting courses require analysis, the analysis required is almost exclusively quantitative. The earlier courses in the major focus more on excel spreadsheets and quantitative problem solving. As a result, when students enter the Auditing and Assurance course at the senior level, they are ill-prepared for a course that requires in-depth thinking of ill-defined problems. The students are resistant to dealing with issues that do not have clear-cut responses or for which there is no quantitative proof. Because the first CTW course is covered as part of the BBA curriculum (i.e., outside of the accounting curriculum), accounting majors are not well prepared for the senior level Auditing and Assurance course. Adding at least one writing and critical thinking analysis assignment in each of the lower level courses in the accounting major would help to prepare students for AC4610 CTW. A major challenge to implementing this suggestion would be resistance from faculty who would be reluctant to add an additional grading intensive assignment. Providing funding to the department to support hiring a TA who would be tasked with the responsibility of grading CTW type assignments in the lower level classes would help in effecting this enhancement to the curriculum.

Annual Report Section Responses

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
In the prior year assessment of learning in AC4610 CTW focused on how well students performed in the major writing assessment. For the 2012-2013 AY, we expanded our measurement to compare performance on the last CTW Quiz to performance on the 1st CTW, to measure improvement in CTW in the students enrolled in the course.

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2012-2013 CTW Afr Am Studies**
(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM ET)

**Mission / Purpose**
Through research, experiential learning and writing, AAS CTW courses will require students to engage in 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" (Basham, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, p 1.). Furthermore, in line with African American Studies mission of academic excellence and social responsibility through AAS CTW courses, students will engage in the "intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action" (http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/766). 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 attached rubrics which account for 20% of the assignment for each class.

**Goals**

**G 2: AAS CTW GOAL 2 (Final Research Report)**
Seminar and Practicum in African American Studies, AAS 4980 The objective of this course is to provide students with practical experience in research through carrying out research proposed in in their research proposal or through applying field research methods while providing service to community organization through community service learning. Students will learn the various aspects of applied research through application of skills learned in the research methods course. At each phase of the research students will engage in reflection, field entry, actual data collection, data analysis and writing and presentation of data results. The goal is that for the Final Research Paper students will exhibit, on average, CTW in the high "developing" range (as determined by the attached assignment rubrics). Further, students in AAS 4980 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). Connecting research to community problem and civic responsibility for social change.

**G 1: AAS CTW GOAL 1 (Research Proposal)**
African American Research Methods, AAS 3980 The objectives of this course is to introduce students to quantitative and qualitative research methods with particular focus on African Americans, employing the African centered methodological approach. In this course students will learn the different aspects of social science research including: how to review literature, logico-empirical reasoning, hypothesis forming and testing, research design, various data collecting methods and research proposal development. On a weekly basis, students will engage in assignments in which they will apply various research concepts and skills. Specifically students will learn: · Various aspects of social science research · General research concepts and skills as outlined above and in the course schedule · The Afrocentric methodological approach to explore issues/problems as they relate to African Americans · How to apply research skills/ tools in resolving issues/problems in general and as they relate to African Americans in particular · How to think critically about how research expands and contributes to knowledge bases in general and in the field of African American studies specifically · How to develop and write a research proposal The major project at the completion of the course is a research proposal. Students will develop the proposal in stages and be allowed to make several revisions at each stage through out the course. By allowing students to make several revisions and submissions it is the goal that students will exhibit, on average, CTW in the high "developing" range (as determined by the attached assignment rubrics).

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: CTW Objective 1 (M: 1)**
For African American Research Methods, AAS 3980 students will complete a research proposal. During the course of the semester
the proposal will be written in stages, e.g. references, statement of the problem and literature review, statement of purpose and significance of research and methods, with several revisions at each stage. The final product will be a well written and coherent research proposal, that may be used if the student chooses and the professor permits, to conduct the research in the following semester in African Seminar and Practicum, 4980. The Assignment accounts for 40% of the grade and CTW 20% of the assignment grade.

**SLO 3: CTW Objective 2 (M: 2)**
Seminar and Practicum in African American Studies, AAS 4980 will focus on applied research. Students will carry out the research proposed in their research proposal or they will provide service through service learning and apply research methods to produce a final research report. The primary outcomes of this course is experiential learning and/or applied research with a well-written research report that describes the research and for those to whom it applies reflects their experiences while working with an organization in a field setting. 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 reports. As with the assignments for AAS, 3980, this assignment will require students to "evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do" as it relates to the specific requirements of each assignment(Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction(McGraw-Hill, 2005, p1). More specifically, these activities will center the students’ own truth claims in critical thinking.

While the assignments for AAS, 3980 encourage students to critically engage (1) the general biases they bring to the course and (2) pre-existing research that is relevant to their chosen area of interest, assignments in AAS, 4980 will require them to critically Reflect on THEIR OWN truth claims as they conduct THEIR research, and/or THEIR OWN ideas, perspectives about issues confronting communities, specifically for students who provide service and apply research methods in a organizational field setting. Further, students will apply research skills to investigate challenges confronting organizations as they attempt to tackle issues in their communities. Additionally, students will propose solutions to problems. The end product is a final research report that is coherent, thoughtful, critical and reflective. Resubmissions provide students with additional opportunities to more fully reflect on and engage their research and experiences. These assignments account for 60% of the overall grade and CTW 20% of the assignment grade.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Proposal (O: 2)**
This is the first time teaching the AAS 3980 course as a CTW course. Therefore an assessment was not done this year. The Assessment for next academic year will be based on the following which is expanded on in the attached CTW Rubrics. 1. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the problem, question, or issue. 2. Identifies and considers the influence of the researcher. 3. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position. 4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence. 5. Integrates issue using other(disciplinary) perspectives and positions.6. Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences. 7. Communicates effectively, written, orally and technology assisted formats.

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

**Target for O2: CTW Objective 1**
Moving forward, we expect that 75% of students will have a minimum average score on each criterion of the rubric will be 4 (high developing), with a minimum overall average CTW rating of 4 (high developing) as well.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

**M 2: Final Research Report (O: 3)**
This is the first time teaching the AAS 3980 course as a CTW course. Therefore an assessment was not done this year. The Assessment for next academic year will be based on the following which is expanded on in the attached CTW Rubrics. FINAL RESEARCH REPORT-APPLIED RESEARCH 1. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the problem, question, or issue. 2. Identifies and considers the influence of the researcher. 3. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position, 4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence. 5. Integrates issue using Other (disciplinary) perspectives and positions. 6. Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences, 7. Communicates effectively, written, orally and technology assisted OR FINAL RESEARCH REPORT-SERVICE LEARNING & APPLIED RESEARCH 1. Awareness of Purpose of Service Learning 2. Application of Theory to practice and practice to theory 3. Self-Reflection-consider assumptions, context and civic responsibility or social change 4. Evaluation and reflection of organization experience 5. Application of research methods and interpretation of data 6. Propose adequate and feasible solutions 7. Communicates effectively, written, orally and in technology assisted formats.

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

**Target for O3: CTW Objective 2**
Moving forward, we expect that the minimum average score on each criterion of the rubric will be 4 (high developing), with a minimum overall average CTW rating of 4 (high developing) as well.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This is the first time teaching the AAS 3980 course as a CTW course. Therefore an assessment was not done this year.

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

**CTW Development**
To maintain the CTW progress evidenced during the past years, Instructor will devote time during summer to continue to explore CTW theory and application. During the semester Instructor will dedicate time in explain CTW to students 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.
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 1. Do more exploration on critical thinking and identify CTW assignments for students that will elucidate evidence of CTW in the selected assignments
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Patricia Dixon

Final Research Report
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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?
N/A Not assessed this year. The Academic Year 2013-2014 will be first year this professor will teach the courses as 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?
N/A for reasons specified in previous questions

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-for reasons specified in previous questions.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
Since I had not been trained on CTW the course was not assessed this year. This is the first time that I am teaching the courses as CTW courses. Changes have been made according to my different approach to the Seminar and Practicum in African American Studies course 4980. I have included applied research and community service learning. The CTW rubic for the applied research is the same as the rubic for African American Research Methods, AAS 3980. The service learning component required different criteria to assess critical thinking for service learning. The Service Learning Rubric has been attached.

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 The course has not been assessed this year for reasons specified in previous questions.

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 The course was not assessed this year for reasons already specified in previous questions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Anthro
As of: 12/13/2016 05:59 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical thinking in Anthropology (M: 1)
In Anth 3033, students were asked to submit 3 versions each of 4 papers—one for each course module. The third version of the fourth paper was selected for CTW score measuring. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to
In ANTH 4970, students were assigned 6 papers, 3 of which required multiple revisions. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In both courses, all of the assignment reflected all of the following goals: a. Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities. b. Draw Conclusions: students will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions that engage current perspectives in the discipline. c. Contextualize: students will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand. d. Critique: students will demonstrate an ability to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

### SLO 2: Critical thinking

In ANTH 3033, students were asked to submit 3 versions of papers—one on each course module. The third version of the fourth paper was selected for CTW score measuring. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. Of all the students received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4. In our two sections of ANTH 4970, students had 6 assignments, 3 of which required multiple revisions. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. For the Monday section, 76% of the students scored a 4 or 5, 12% scored a 3, 8% scored a 2. For the Wednesday section, 68.4% scored a 4 or a 5, 31.5% scored a 3. a. Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities. b. Draw Conclusions: students will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions that engage current perspectives in the discipline. c. Contextualize: students will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand. d. Critique: students will demonstrate an ability to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

### SLO 3: Outcomes (M: 2, 3, 4)

Students will complete a research paper that includes relevant current perspectives.

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. 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. 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. 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 ethnography for 75% to receive a score of 1 to 5. In ANTH 4980 (Anthropology of Self and Emotion), students were asked to write papers where they synthesized and reflected critically on course readings and discussions the course. For papers #1 and #2, students submitted initial drafts, received peer and instructor feedback and an initial grade, and then submitted a revised version of the paper for an improved grade where appropriate. For paper #3, students received TA and peer feedback in class but did not submit the first draft to the instructor for a recorded grade; rather, they were expected to engage in the revision process more independently. The revised, graded version of paper #3 is used for this measure. For this essay assignment, students were given a broad prompt/question concerning themes in Unit 3 of the course, but they were encouraged not only to choose one of these but to narrow and refine the question and argument according to their other interests and to draw upon readings from throughout the semester where appropriate. In ANTH 4980 (Anthropology and Public Health), students were asked to write three categories of papers: (1) papers that critically engaged course readings and discussions; (2) peer reviews of these; and (3) a final paper in the form of an agency-ready grant proposal. The measure chosen for this assessment was the grant proposal. These were intended to reflect students' cumulative critical and reflexive engagement with course literature and discussion, and to improve students' technical writing skills. In ANTH 4980 (The Archaeology of Ancient Cities), students were asked to write four research papers over the course of the semester. The first paper asked them to select a lens through which to investigate ancient cities (either the built environment, economics, or politics). The second and third papers were case studies where the students selected an ancient city and investigated through their selected lens. They received feedback on each of their papers and incorporated that feedback into their fourth paper, which was a compilation of their three previous papers. The fourth paper serves as the measure for this course.

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 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 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: Measures (O: 3)

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 (see rubric in the Files section.)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
In ANTH 3033, 85% of students received at least a 3 on this assignment. Of these, 20% scored a 5; 55% received a 4, and 10% received a 3. 5% received a 2, and 10% received a 1 for not submitting the assignment. In ANTH 4970, approximately 75% of students who turned in the assignment scored a 4 or 5; 14% scored a 3; 7% had a 2; 0% scored a 1. In ANTH 4980, 8 papers were submitted. All assignments received at least a 3, while 75% (6 papers) received at least a 4. (One paper counted as a “3” was a borderline 3/4). 2 papers received a 5. In ANTH 4980 65% of the students (n=17) received at least a 3, and 46% received a 4 or 5. The remainder of the students received a 2 (n=6) or a 1 (n=3) on this final assignment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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 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. Catley’s ANTH 4970 will no longer be offered, in that Dr. Catley 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 In the future, 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 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. Catley’s ANTH 4970 will no longer be offered, in that Dr. Catley 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 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

2012-2013

Even though the format, course materials and requirements, and teaching style of ANTH 3033 was exactly the same as in previous years, students' performance seemingly declined. This course will not be offered in Fall 13; however, in the future I intend to give students more tutoring opportunities to improve their performance. ANTH 4970: We have two similar assignments (personal statement and self-reflexive paper). I've noticed students sometimes are at a loss for what to include in the personal statement but have less trouble with the self-reflexive paper. I am considering ways to combine these two assignments or use both exercises to help students construct personal statements they can use in the future. ANTH 4980: This is the first year that this course has been offered as a CTW. Learning outcomes were achieved (and slightly exceeded) for the course, suggesting that the writing assignments and peer workshop model have been very successful. Grades assigned for paper #2 (which utilized formal peer review) were slightly higher than those for paper #3 (in which integrating peer feedback was optional), which seems to indicate that students achieve better outcomes through the peer review process. When the course is next offered, I will plan to incorporate structured peer review into all three assignments. ANTH 4980: In the future I will dedicate at least another class period to discuss what is expected from this final compilation paper and how to effectively connect the three papers into a coherent whole. I will also increase the point value of this paper to be equal to that of the other three papers. I think some students did not take the final paper as seriously because it was not worth as much as the other papers.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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 expanded our CTW offerings by piloting a new archaeology course as well as a new section of a cultural anthropology 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?

In ANTH 3033, students' performance improved considerably over the course of the semester. However, some students did not submit the last assignment. ANTH 4980 (Archaeology of Ancient Cities) had a similar problem, with students skirting the last assignment even though, according to the instructor, their critical thinking through writing skills had improved over the semester. The performance in the capstone seminar and Paticio's class was consistently satisfactory.

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 developing new CTW courses every year, though we do not have GRA funding to support all of our teaching needs. Making funding available for CTW Writing Consultants would be extremely helpful.

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

Overall, the quality of students' writing has improved. Several faculty members have adopted rubrics for their non-CTW courses, and students respond well. We are offering a new CTW course this Fall, and expect to have more offerings in Spring 14.

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 deemed 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.

No changes were deemed necessary.
**Goals**

**G 1: evaluate arguments**
Students will learn to evaluate arguments and present the rationale behind the conclusions drawn.

**G 2: address personal prejudices**
Students will learn to address personal prejudices, for example as relating to language-trait-focused discrimination.

**G 3: write clearly**
Students will learn to present an argument clearly in writing.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: language in society final paper (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

**SLO 2: communication across cultures final paper (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Students will write a 17-22 page final paper on a microculture (e.g., dog breeders, massage therapists, yoga instructors, faculty members, graduate students, 1st graders). They will identify a microculture that interests them, observe members of the microculture interacting, identify an informant, take field notes, develop ethnographic interviewing skills, and collect and analyze ethnographic interview data. Finally, they will complete the written presentation of your project. All writing assignments in this course relate to and build toward this final paper. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to demonstrate an honest awareness of their feelings/thoughts about cultural difference, show awareness that they are cultural beings, present convincing arguments based on data, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives (O: 1)**
Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: language in society final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "fails to identify underlying values and assumptions of different perspectives", 2 is "Does not identify many underlying values and assumptions of different perspectives or addresses only one perspective", 3 is "Identifies many underlying values and assumptions of more than one perspective" and 4 is "Clearly identifies most underlying values and assumptions of more than one perspective". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of this outcome, 93% of students received at least a 3 and 74% received a 4.

**M 2: demonstrates self-awareness about cultural difference (O: 2)**
Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills on their final papers for Communication across Cultures, including their ability to demonstrate an honest awareness of their feelings/thoughts about cultural difference.

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

**Target for O2: communication across cultures final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Fails to demonstrate 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of this outcome, 91% of students received at least a 3 and 69% 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 of prejudicial aspects of the problem", 2 is "Partially acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem", 3 is "Fully acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem; may attempt some steps to address them" and 4 is "Fully acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem and takes reasonable steps to address them". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 98% of students received at least a 3 and 83% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: communication across cultures final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Fails to show awareness that oneself is a cultural being", 2 is "Partially shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being", 3 is "Fully shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being" and 4 is "Fully shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being and demonstrates ability to mediate one's cultural behavior as necessary". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 91% of students received at least a 3 and 69% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: presents convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence (O: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in their final papers, including their ability to present convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 91% of students received at least a 3 and 69% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 88% of students received at least a 3 and 57% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: draws reasonable conclusions (O: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking on their final papers through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to draw reasonable conclusions.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 88% of students received at least a 3 and 52% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: communication across cultures final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Conclusions are based on misconceptions of data, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented or on bias", 2 is "Conclusions are somewhat or vaguely based on data, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented or bias", 3 is "Conclusions are clearly supported by data-informed arguments 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 88% of students received at least a 3 and 73% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion (O: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in their final papers, including their ability to present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 88% of students received at least a 3 and 73% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of this outcome, 91% of students received at least a 3 and 61% received a 4.

**Target for O2: communication across cultures final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Writing is incoherent and ideas are illogically arranged", 2 is "Few ideas are logically arranged. Writing is often unclear", 3 is "Most ideas are logically arranged. Writing is generally clear" and 4 is "Ideas are logically arranged. Writing is clear and precise". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of this outcome, 94% of students received at least a 3 and 72% received a 4.

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

**change to course requirements for Communication across Cultures**

Students had difficulty identifying cultural difference (and thus, becoming aware of their feelings and thoughts regarding such differences) and recognizing themselves as cultural beings if they were investigating a micro-culture with which they were already too familiar (e.g. Starbucks, gaming). In future offerings of Communication Across Cultures, students will be required to do their final paper on a micro-culture with which they are not at all familiar, which should help them to become more aware of cultural differences.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: demonstrates self-awareness about cultural difference | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: draws reasonable conclusions | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: presents convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: shows awareness of bias | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
- **Implementation Description:** Information about preferred ordering of the courses is now given in multiple places on the departmental web pages. We also intend to submit a note to be added to the catalog, and will discuss whether we can put a prerequisite on the number of hours a student must have completed before taking the senior-level class. 2013: We have set 3031 as a prerequisite for the senior-level course (to be waived for students from other departments wishing to take our senior-level CTW course as an elective).

**timely data collection**

The Ambassador did not try to collect data from instructors until after the semester was over. The instructors had already returned some papers, and had not always kept rubric data separately. This likely resulted in overall lower scores on the Communication across Cultures rubrics, as students who make the effort to pick up their final papers (those whose data are missing from the current report) are often those who are likely to have done a good job to begin with. The process of doing this report has already helped clarify what is needed, but in the future the Ambassador will make sure the instructors are keeping this data; at that point we will be able to better assess whether other changes are needed.

- **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: draws reasonable conclusions | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: presents convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: shows awareness of bias | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador
Lower non-completion rates for CTW courses

Track failure rates due to non-completion of course assignments and aim for 95% completion for students still enrolled at the end of the semester. In order to increase the course completion rate among students who are still enrolled, instructors will provide more in-class advising at the beginning of the semester regarding realistic expectations of the workload for these courses, and provide plenty of early feedback so students can withdraw instead of failing.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors

Assess the effectiveness of prerequisites for 4151

We have set our junior-level CTW course as a prerequisite for our senior-level course in order to strongly encourage students to take them in the right order. However, we are somewhat concerned about creating bottlenecks for graduation since the junior-level course is usually (over)full. Thus, we will monitor whether the prerequisite causes problems and how often it needs to be waived, and discuss as a faculty whether having set the prerequisite resulted in a net gain.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: CTW 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?

We have continued to improve advisement of students (as added to our Action Plan in the 2010-11 cycle) so that they take the two CTW courses in the correct order. In the 2011-2012 cycle we added information about preferred ordering of the courses to multiple places on the departmental web pages, which was helpful. However, this year we have still had a few students take the courses in the wrong order or simultaneously in spite of being strongly advised otherwise; they were not very successful in the senior-level course.

This year we set a prerequisite of 90 completed hours, including the junior-level CTW class, for the senior-level class. Now the students can see these requirements in GoSOLAR, plus the information that it is “a senior capstone course” and that the prerequisites are “strictly enforced EXCEPT for students outside the Applied Linguistics major who want to take this course as an elective.” Since this is a new change, we are as yet unable to gauge its effectiveness. Thus, our new action plan is to assess the effectiveness of having set the prerequisite. Last year's action plan proposed to track the course completion rate among students who were still enrolled at the end of the semester, aiming to increase it to 95% for students still enrolled at the end of the semester. In fact, we achieved a 95% completion rate for all classes, or 94% for the junior-level course and 97% for the senior-level class (although two students in the Maymester course took incompletes and finished the course much later). In addition, only one student withdrew from each level, suggesting that the percentage increase in course completions among registered students was largely due to students finishing the course rather than withdrawing. This success may be attributed to better advising to the students on the first day of class. For example, the undergraduate director (who taught two sections of the senior-level course herself) came to the other senior-level section to talk about the class, its requirements, and its place in the program. She gave the students a clear sense of the workload, and several students chose to drop in that first week because they realized that they would not be able to handle the workload in that semester. The instructor of the course noted that “it is my belief that simply upon experiencing this level of departmental involvement, students take their roles as students more seriously.”

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 the junior-level and three sections (including one small one in the Maymester) of the senior-level course were offered this year; data provided are averages from both or all sections of a course. In the junior-level course, students had three assignments that required them to compare and contrast public opinion with a sociolinguistic perspective. In Table 1 we can see either steadily high performance or improvement in their rubric scores from the first assignment to the third for all measures. Improvement is especially notable on “shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem” and “presents convincing arguments based on linguistic principles”, although the latter could still improve. 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 across these assignments. In terms of final papers for both courses (see Table 2), the scores for the junior-level class are already quite high, so we do not see an improvement on them in the senior-level class. However, it should be noted that both the content and methodology for the senior-level class are quite different from the junior-level class, so students are applying what they have learned about crafting an argument and organizing their writing to new tasks. Additionally, the junior-level course involves more repetition of the same type of assignment whereas the senior-level course involves a wider range of assignments. We have consistently met our targets for the last couple of years, while the percentage of students scoring “sophisticated” has increased. As we have honed the courses we have been better able to provide appropriate scaffolding for students. However, it should be noted that many of the students in the 4151 class this year were particularly strong.

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?

Workload and ability to offer sufficient numbers of courses continues to be an issue, although the situation was better this year with three faculty members involved in teaching five sections of CTW courses (instead of one instructor teaching all four). The additional course was offered in Maymester, which may not be a good option for the CTW course, as many students need more time to process the material. We hope to offer an additional section of the junior-level course during the summer term, which would help a great deal since it is generally full or generally open. However, this will also increase the availability of teaching staff. In the longer term we expect to need more sections of the senior-level course (or an additional senior-level course) as well.

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?

Besides the changes specifically mentioned in the action plan, this year we had a wider range of faculty involvement in the CTW initiative, with three instructors teaching five courses. We hope to continue this broader participation! In a related point, having an instructor whom the students already know and trust come to the first day of class to talk seriously to the class about the workload was very effective. It provided support for the instructor of the course (who was teaching it for the first time) as well as for the students. It also provides continuity and cohesion to the courses offered in the department. The communication among the CTW faculty about teaching that has resulted from the initiative has also been beneficial. Other notes on impact are repeated from last year’s report; they are still very relevant: 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 the parallel assignments in the junior-level class as well as the multiple drafts and extensive feedback that are part of both classes have helped them to be 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, addressing all three areas of global competence: skills, knowledge, and awareness. The overt focus on awareness of bias in both courses is also helpful, as becoming aware of biases and learning to make different choices is usually the result of a longer-term effort than can be made in a single class. While we have had courses that address bias and that fit well with the global education initiative before, the CTW initiative has ensured that this is done more systematically in courses that all students take.
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Mission / Purpose

In conversations among the art education faculty since the initiation of CTW, we arrived at two operational definitions for critical thinking that are particularly relevant to students in our area. One centers upon the ability to critically analyze and interpret artworks, which is fundamental to teaching about art. The other promotes students’ capacities to think critically about pedagogy, relate educational theory to classroom practice, and become reflective practitioners. Students have opportunities to develop both aspects of critical thinking in our program. In AE 4200, the first course in the major, students conduct classroom observations and examine aspects of teaching such as: adapting curricula for students with special needs, managing space and materials, integrating technology and other subjects, utilizing diverse visual communication strategies, planning lesson content, and creating a productive learning environment. In their modules and final field experience reflection, students analyze, compare, and evaluate what they have observed and relate it both to course readings and to their own emerging teaching philosophies. They also critically analyze various popular resources available to art teachers in journal and digital formats in a second CTW assignment. In AE 4900, students engage in learning activities related to art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, and acquire familiarity with several different critical frameworks for deriving meaning from artworks. They also explore strategies for actively engaging young learners in these disciplines. The CTW assignment in this course focus upon analysis of artworks and visual culture toward the objective of developing relevant instructional plans.


As a national collaborator on the Arts Map for the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and as a signatory to the Partnership for 21st Century Skills’ National Action Agenda, NAEA recognizes the importance of having all students leave school prepared with the skills and knowledge to address the challenges that await them. To that end, we support the following PRINCIPLES:

- That the arts, including the visual arts, dance, music, and theatre, are recognized as core subjects in the framework of the Partnership for 21st Century 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 reflective 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.

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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
This year, AE 4200 was offered in both Fall '12 and Spring '13 semesters. The scores reported here reflect cumulative scores for the total 19 undergraduate students enrolled in both of these sections. 100% of students scored at 80% or better on all criteria except for "Compare/Contrast" and "Develop." On these two criteria one student scored below 80%, (rated at 70%) meaning that 95% of students scored above target. This will be discussed in our action plan.

**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.

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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
During the section of AE 4900 offered in Spring '13, 100% of the 9 undergraduate students enrolled met target by scoring 80% or better on this assignment. Scores ranged from 87% to 98% on rubric criteria.

**M 3: Resource Review (O: 3)**
Students were asked to select an art educational resource from print or online source and answer questions through critical analysis. Graduate students in this course were given a more challenging version of this assignment.

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

**Target for O3: Resource Analysis**
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%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Out of a total of 19 undergraduate students enrolled in AE 4200 in Fall '12 and Spring '13, 100% met the target of scoring 80% or better on all criteria. The criteria of "Interpretation" had the weakest ratings, with 26% of students earning 80%.

**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:** Finished  
**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

### Address Weakness in Criteria described in Final Field Experience Reflection

After analyzing results from previous years’ implementation of CTW rubrics, we successfully addressed weaknesses in students’ abilities to meet the criteria associated with "Evaluation," so that all students scored 80% or better on all three assignments with this criterion. However, this year I notice some weakness in students’ ability to meet target in criteria of "Compare and Contrast" and "Develop" in the Final Field Experience Reflection. One student of 19 did not meet target, but to address this weakness I plan to spend more time and provide more examples to students when giving this assignment and explaining the rubric.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Responsible Person/Group:** Melanie Davenport

**Additional Resources:** Examples of successful student work, more thorough explanation of expectations.

### Change Course Designation

Because of curriculum changes that have been approved for our program, CTW designation will need to be moved from AE 4900, which is a course being eliminated so that the content can be rolled into AE 4300 and so that we can provide more field experience hours by adding a course, AE 4600. We plan to seek approval for CTW designation to be added to AE 4300 as we make these program changes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Responsible Person/Group:** Melanie Davenport, Melody Milbrandt

---

### 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 our action plan last year, we identified the criteria of "Evaluation" as earning the lowest scores on our CTW rubrics, so we made extra efforts in AE 4200 and AE 4900 to explain expectations and provide successful examples of "evaluation" in critical thinking assignments. This proved successful, as 100% of students in both courses during this school year met target for this criteria. We will try the same strategies for other criteria in which students demonstrated less success, as described in our new 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?

The Art Education faculty notes an improvement in our students' writing skills, particularly if they take advantage of the opportunity to turn in drafts and make revisions on key assignments. With the new Common Core curriculum in K-12 schools, it will be increasingly important for our students to develop their Critical Thinking through Writing skills in order to demonstrate the higher order thinking skills and knowledge base required by these new standards. In general we agree that from the first assignment in the first class through the assignment in the second class, the majority of students seem to try harder to write well, reflect deeply, and justify their conclusions. We will continue efforts to work more closely in tracking their development and adding further assignments and activities to help them reach these important goals.
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 between faculty and data collection still needs to be formalized and streamlined in order to gain more insight and ensure student success. A group workshop may be helpful in this regard.

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 above, we do perceive that CTW is having a positive impact on student achievement related to reflection, analysis, interpretation and evaluation, all important skills for future teachers. Although we made few changes to assignments in the past year, we did work on delivery to address weaknesses noted in last year's data, which seemed to be effective. More students scored higher on "evaluation" criteria this year because of increased emphasis and more thorough explanation and examples. We anticipate one major change to our CTW courses in the coming academic year, changing the designation from AE 4900 (which is being cut) and adding it to the Secondary Methods course, AE 4300. In line with this change, we anticipate adding a second CTW assignment to the 4300 course, in order to collect further data.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Art History

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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: AH3000 research paper (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1)

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 students'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. Measurable outcomes include: developing a clear thesis; identifying the salient issues/questions/debates about the topic (inquiry); making effective use of supporting evidence (synthesis); effectively analyzing evidence (evaluation); and posing valid interpretations (interpretation and reflection).

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.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 2: AH4990 interdisciplinary assignment (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 2)

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 is restricted to the written portion of this assignment. The measurable outcomes include: developing a clear topic (inquiry); identifying effective supporting material (inquiry); positing valid connections between the material and topic (synthesis and evaluation); and posing valid interpretations and assumptions (interpretation and reflection).

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.

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.

Standard Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: AH 3000 research paper (O: 1)

A holistic rubric, with a scale from 0 to 6 (insufficient to excellent) allows us to measure the five goals for critical thinking in this research paper 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 O1: AH3000 research paper

Ideally we would like all students to meet or exceed 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

18 out of 20 students, or 90% of the class, met the target of a score 4 or better on the rubric. 10 students, or 50% of the class, scored a 5 or better on the rubric.

M 2: AH 4990 interdisciplinary assignment (O: 2)

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 O2: 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

86% of the students (13 out of 15) scored a 4 or better on rubric. 73% of the class scored in the excellent range (5 to 6).

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

Course sequence

One issue we continue to run up against is that many of our students end up taking the CTW courses simultaneously.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: 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: Finished
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 rubric 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
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: We implemented the new rubrics this past cycle.

Data tracking of individual students
We plan to begin tracking individual students in order better to determine what, if any improvements, occur in their critical thinking skills. Ideally we would like to see improvement in the higher levels of critical thinking by the time a student completes the second course. This may take a year or two to yield any significant data, as only a handful of students complete the two courses in a given year.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We met our target for both CTW courses. We met our targets last year too, so we did not specify an action plan for 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 class?
We have not tracked a cohort of students from the entry to the exit level class. We have identified this in our action plan as a goal for the next couple of years.

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?
Per the action plan we've developed for next year, we would like to collect data that will allow us to track individual students' academic careers. This data will also allow us to determine which areas of critical thinking improve or stay the same as students move through the sequence of CTW courses. To date the samples of student work provided to the CTW ambassador have always been anonymous and randomly selected by the instructor to reflect three levels of accomplishment in 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?
We have not made any major changes since the last cycle, but will continue to discuss the data collection process in order to determine how it can be more useful for instruction and student outcomes.
Mission / Purpose
The Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design defines critical thinking through writing as: “a wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student’s Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, page 1.) NOTE: The Welch School of Art and Design is in the process of drafting a revised mission statement, effective fall 2013. The role of critical thinking through writing within the updated mission might result in revisions to the information on this website.

Goals

G 1: Technical Skills
Students will demonstrate competent formal writing skills in support of their chosen studio practice. Writing competency is considered a relevant technical skill for art and design students to 1) deepen the ideation of their practice, 2) participate in the intellectual discourse of their chosen field, and 3) participate in the professional activity of their chosen field.

G 3: Professional Portfolio
Graduating BFA students will have professional quality portfolio that includes digital documentation of artwork, video documentation of artwork (if appropriate), correctly formatted resume/cv, and professional statement. Competent writing skills facilitate correct materials such as the resume/cv, bio, and cover letter. Critical thinking through writing is perceived to improve the types of professional statements that artists/designers are required to produce as active participants in their chosen fields.

G 2: Unified Body of Artwork
Students will complete the BFA program with unified body of art or design work, supplemented by professional written materials such as an artist statement. Competent critical thinking through writing is perceived to have a positive impact on the coherence of students' creative work. Clear and accurate writing is perceived to increase the personal and professional usefulness of artist/designer statements.

G 4: Critical Writing Skills
Students completing the BFA program will have the critical writing skills necessary for a career in art and design.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Ideation (G: 1)
Critical thinking through writing used to deepen the ideation of students’ creative practice.

SLO 3: Greater Intellectual Discourse (M: 7)
Critical thinking through writing will enable students to participate in the broader intellectual discourse of their chosen field.

SLO 4: Enabled Professional Activity
Critical thinking through writing will enable students to participate more effectively in the professional activity of their chosen field.

SLO 5: Unified Body of Work
Critical thinking through writing will lead students to more informed creative practices that lead to a unified body of work. (Please note that the body of work may be unified through formal means, conceptual means, or some other means.)

SLO 6: Professional Statement (M: 6)
Critical thinking through writing leads to improved professional statements that artists/designers are routinely required to produce. (These statements may be in the form of "artist statements" used for gallery/museum publication or "design statements" used as part of project proposals.)

SLO 7: Resume/CV
Critical thinking through writing will lead to better execution of the artist/designer resume/cv, as required by individual creative disciplines.

SLO 8: Professional Bio (M: 5)
Critical thinking through writing will enable students to write effective bios for themselves as required by their respective disciplines.

SLO 9: Connecting disciplines
Critical thinking through writing will ideally produce students who can make creative associations within their own disciplines, as well as creative associations across multiple disciplines.
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Assignment (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9)
Assignment Description

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: rubric (O: 1)
rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 2: CTW FALL 2010 course data (1)
CTW FALL 2010 COURSE #1 Instructor: C. Drennen Class Name & Number: ART 3910 CRITICAL ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY ART
Assignment: WRITING ASSIGNMENT- ARTIST INTERVIEW (100pts) Interview an artist with significant regional or national career accomplishment. Initiate contact with your chosen artist via email, phone, or gallery staff. Your interviews may be conducted in person, through email, or over the phone. Our prior class content should inform your questions. (No GSU professors, former professors, or grad teaching assistants allowed.) Use appropriate interview protocols and formatting. Final version must be typed and double-spaced. DUE DATE: Beginning of last class meeting Rubric (as it appears on syllabus): Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterion #1 Identification of critical issue Critical issue not identified Critical issue identified but with no evidence of understanding context Critical issue identified with evidence of understanding social, cultural, political context Critical issue clearly identified with evidence of deep understanding of social, cultural, political context Context Criterion #2 Thorough and insightful analysis Analysis is incomplete with no indication of critical thinking Analysis is simplistic or vague with little indication of critical thinking Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking Analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking Criterion #3 Clear and logical organization Organization is not clear and logical and does not help to support claims Organization is at times clear and logical and only partially helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is very clear and logical and helps to strongly support claims Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance: Numbers alone are fine. No student names are needed. Student # Criteria #1 Criterion #2 Criterion #3 Criterion #4 student 1 2 3 4 student 5 6 7 8 student 9 10 11 12 student 13 14 15 16
CTW FALL 2010 COURSE #2 Instructor: N. Floyd Class Name & Number: Photo 4950 Portfolio II Assignment: Artistic Critique Portfolio II is the capstone course for students completing the BFA in Studio Arts with a Concentration in Photography. As the capstone course for the major, Portfolio II is designed as a Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) course. This means that a component of this course requires students to engage, through writing, in critical thinking in relation to their studio work. The University defines critical thinking through writing as: “wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” (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. Rubric for CTW Assessment of Writing for PHOTO 4950 / Portfolio II Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterion #1 Descriptive language that effectively communicates the theme or intention of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. None of the language describes the theme or intention of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. Some of the language describes the theme or intention of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. Most of the language describes the theme or intention of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. All of the language describes the theme or intention of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. Criterion #2 Individual perspective that provides personal insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends Individual perspective is absent. Statement is generic and offers no insights into or understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Individual perspective lacks specificity and offers little insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides some insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Criterion #3 Clear language, void of “artspeak”, that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates. Some of the language is clear and easily understood but a significant amount is confusing or vague. Most of the language is clear but is not effectively communicated to a wide audience. All of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. GRADING RUBRIC Assessment of Student Performance: Numbers alone are fine. No student names are needed. Student # Crit#1 Crit#2 Crit#3 Crit#4 student 1 2 3 4 student 5 6 7 8 student 9 10 11 12 student 13 14 15 16
CTW FALL 2010 COURSE #3 Instructor: J. Pollack Class Name & Number: 4950 Portfolio I and II in Textiles Assignment: Text 4940 / 4950 Portfolio I and II Proposal Project Proposal Project description: Describe the project outline, objectives, context, historical & contemporary issues, and artists whose work inspires you, and why it is important for you to do the project. Please attach visuals (sketches, photos, samples, quotes, etc.) to substantiate your project description. Method of Inquiry: Describe how you are going to conduct the research project. Detail the equipment, materials, processes, and resources, collections, web sites and books. Project Proposal: State the goal of the project in concrete terms such as the format, number and size of the final work to be presented as final product and how they will be presented for exhibition. Rubric for CTW Assessment of Artist Statement (Portfolio II) Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterion #1 Descriptive language that effectively communicates the basic theme of the work and how the theme is embodied in the work. None of the language describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work. Some of the language describes the themes of the work but the themes are not embodied in the work. Most of the language describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work. The CTW...
Individual perspective lacks specificity and offers little insight into and understanding of the work.Criterion #3 Clear language, void of "artspeak", that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates. Some of the language is clear and easily understood but a significant is confusing or vague. Most of the language is clear, easily understood and effective, but leaves an impression of it being clear and not of the work, the language does not lead to a wide audience.

Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance (No assessment of student performance given.) CTW FALL 2010 COURSE #4 Instructor: P. C. Longmore Class Name & Number: ART 3910 CRITICAL ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY ART Assignment: (No assignment given.) Rubric Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterion #1 Identification of critical issue Issue not identified Critical issue identified with evidence of understanding social, cultural, political context Critical issue clearly identified with evidence of understanding social, cultural, political context Criterion #2 Thorough and insightful analysis Analysis is incomplete with no indication of critical thinking Analysis is simplistic or vague with little indication of critical thinking Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking Analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking Analysis is complete and clear analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking Time is at times clear and logical and only partially helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is very clear and logical and helps to strongly support claims Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.
Rubric for CTW Assessment of Writing in 4950 Portfolio II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crit#1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides some insight into &amp; understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides some insight into &amp; understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit#2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual perspective that provides personal insight into &amp; understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit#3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some of the language is clear and easily understood but a significant amount is confusing or vague. Most of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: 3/4 (Satisfactory)
CTW SPRING/MAYMESTER 2012 COURSE #3

Instructor: C. Drennen

Class Name & Number: ART 3910 (MAYMESTER) CRITICAL ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY ART Assignment: WRITING ASSIGNMENT: EXHIBITION REVIEW (100pts) Students will write a review of an Atlanta exhibition, due at the beginning class on the final exam date. SPECIFICATIONS: * Visit each of the following galleries in Atlanta’s West Side Arts District (https://wadatla.com/about): 1. Atlanta Contemporary Art Center http://www.thecontemporary.org/ ($3 admission with student ID; Thursday evenings are free) 2. Poem 88 (free) http://www.poem88.net/events.html 3. Get This Gallery (free) http://getthissgallery.com/ 4. Sandler Hudson Gallery (free) http://www.sandlerhudson.com/ * In addition to these Atlanta museums: 1. High Museum http://www.high.org/ 2. Museum of Contemporary Art, Georgia (MOCA) http://www.mogaga.org/Visit/MOCAGA.asp 3. Museum of Design, Atlanta http://www.museumofdesign.org/ * Collect the exhibition badges from each place you visit. They will be turned in as well. * Typed, double-spaced, 12-word minimum (approximately 4 pages). No maximum. * 12-point font Rubric (as it appears on syllabus): Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterion #1 Identification of critical issue Critical issue not identified Critical issue identified but not with evidence of understanding Critical issue identified with evidence of understanding social, cultural, political context Criterion #2 Thorough and insightful analysis Analysis is incomplete with no indication of critical thinking Analysis is simplistic or vague with little indication of critical thinking Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking Analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking Criterion #3 Clear and logical organization Organization is not clear and logical and does not help to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and only partially helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is not clear and logical and does not help to support claims Critic#3 Identification of critical issue Critical issue identified but with no evidence of understanding social, cultural, political context Criterion #2 Thorough and insightful analysis Analysis is complete with no indication of critical thinking Analysis is simplistic or vague with little indication of critical thinking Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking Analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking Criterion #3 Clear and logical organization Organization is not clear and logical and does not help to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and only partially helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Critic#4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance: Numbers alone are fine. No student names are needed. Student # Criterion #1 Criterion #2 Criterion #3 Criterion #4 Student 1 1 1 1 Student 2 1 1 1 Student 3 1 1 1 1 Student 4 3 3 3 2 Student 5 4 4 4 4 Student 6 4 4 3 3 Student 7 3 3 3 3 Student 8 3 3 3 3 Student 9 3 3 3 3 Student 10 4 3 3 4 Student 11 4 4 4 4 Student 12 4 3 3 3 Student 13 1 1 1 1 Student 14 4 4 4 4 Student 15 4 4 3 3 3 Student 16 3 3 3 3 Student 17 3 3 3 3 3 Student 18 4 4 4 4 4 Student 19 4 4 4 4 4 Student 20 4 4 3 3 3 CTW SPRING/MAYMESTER 2012 COURSE #2 Instructor: C. Drennen Class Name & Number: ART 3910 CRITICAL ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY ART Assignment: WRITING ASSIGNMENT: ARTIST INTERVIEW (100pts) Interview an artist with significant regional or national career accomplishment. Initiate contact with your chosen artist via email, phone, or other means of communication. May be done in person, email, or over the phone. One person in class should inform your questions. (No GSU professors, former professors, or grad teaching assistants allowed.) Use appropriate interview protocols and formatting. Final version must be typed and double-spaced. DUE DATE: Beginning of last class meeting Rubric (as it appears on syllabus): Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterion #1 Identification of critical issue Critical issue not identified Critical issue identified but with no evidence of understanding context Critical issue identified with evidence of understanding social, cultural, political context Criterion #2 Thorough and insightful analysis Analysis is incomplete with no indication of critical thinking Analysis is simplistic or vague with little indication of critical thinking Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking Analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking Criterion #3 Clear and logical organization Organization is not clear and logical and does not help to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and only partially helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to support claims Critic#4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance: Numbers alone are fine. No student names are needed. Student # Criterion #1 Criterion #2 Criterion #3 Criterion #4 Student 1 1 1 1 Student 2 1 1 1 1 Student 3 1 1 1 1 Student 4 3 3 3 2 Student 5 4 4 4 4 Student 6 4 4 3 3 Student 7 3 3 3 3 Student 8 3 3 3 3 Student 9 3 3 3 3 Student 10 4 3 3 4 Student 11 4 4 4 4 Student 12 4 3 3 3 Student 13 1 1 1 1 Student 14 4 4 4 4 Student 15 4 4 3 3 3 Student 16 3 3 3 3 Student 17 3 3 3 3 3 Student 18 4 4 4 4 4 Student 19 4 4 4 4 4 Student 20 4 4 3 3 3 CTW SPRING/MAYMESTER 2012 COURSE #1 Instructor: S. Anderson Class Name & Number: GD 4950 Portfolio I 1. Assignment: Artist Statement: Your ARTIST STATEMENT: Who are you at this point in your creative life. QUESTION: Why do I have to write an artist statement? If I wanted to write to express myself I would have been a writer. The whole idea of my art is to say things that people just don’t get. ANSWER: Art is not for everyone, not stupid; they are essential. And you don’t have to be a writer to write one. People already look at your art and take away whatever experiences they will. Your artist statement is about facts, a basic introduction to your art; it’s not instructions on what to experience, what to think, how to feel, how to act, or where to stand, and if it is, you’d better do a rewrite. When you’re not there, your artist statement answers for you. Or when you’re there, but you don’t like to answer questions, or you’re too busy to answer questions, or you’re too busy to answer questions, or someone’s too embarrassed to ask you questions, then, your artist statement, does the job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art. A good artist statement works towards this end, and the most important ingredient of a good statement is its language. WRITE YOUR STATEMENT IN LANGUAGE THAT ANYONE CAN UNDERSTAND, not language that you understand, not language that you and your friends understand, not language that you learn in an art school, but language that you use every day things. An effective statement reaches out and welcomes people to your art, no matter how little or how much they know about art to begin with; it never excludes. Like an introduction to a book, your statement presents the fundamental underpinnings of your art; write it for people who are about to read your book,” not those who’ve already read it. In three to five paragraphs of three to five sentences each, provide basic information like WHY YOU MAKE YOUR ART, HOW YOU MAKE IT, WHAT IT’S MADE OUT OF, and perhaps briefly, WHAT YOUR ART MEANS TO YOU. Don’t be afraid to want to know more; even, but rather, as the first impression, your statement should hook and invite further inquiry, like a really good story is about to be told. Give too little, not too much. People have short attention spans. 2. Personal Voice Project. See above description Projected Time allotted is 4 weeks. Rubric (as it appears on your syllabus): (No rubric included by this faculty.) Assessment of Student Performance: No student names are needed. Student # Criterion #1 Criterion #2 Criterion #3 Criterion #4 Student 1 1 1 1 1 Student 2 1 1 1 1 Student 3 1 1 1 1 Student 4 3 3 3 2 Student 5 4 4 4 4 Student 6 4 4 3 3 Student 7 3 3 3 3 Student 8 3 3 3 3 Student 9 3 3 3 3 Student 10 4 4 4 4 Student 11 4 4 4 4 Student 12 4 3 3 3 Student 13 1 1 1 1 Student 14 4 4 4 4 Student 15 4 4 3 3 3 Student 16 3 3 3 3 Student 17 3 3 3 3 3 Student 18 3 3 3 3 3 Student 19 3 3 3 3 CTW SPRING/MAYMESTER 2012 COURSE #4 Instructor: Jess Jones Studio Discipline: Textiles Semester / Year: Spring / 2012 Artist Statement: Your ARTIST STATEMENT: EXPLAINING THE UNEXPLAINABLE. Q: Why do you have to write an artist statement? It’s stupid. If I wanted to write to express myself I would have been a writer. The whole idea of my art is to say things visually. Why can’t people just look at my art and take away whatever experiences they will? Artist statements are not stupid; they’re more like essential. You don’t have to be a writer to write one. And people already look at your art and take away whatever experiences they will. Your artist statement is about facts, a basic introduction to your art; it’s not instructions on what to experience, what to think, how to feel, how to act, or where to stand, and if it is, you’d better do a rewrite. On this planet, people communicate through language, and your artist statement introduces and communicates the language component of your art. People who don’t have your art, they ask to know more about your art, and if your art is there, your artist statement answers for you. When you’re there, they ask you and answer. When you’re not there, your artist statement, answers for you. Some students do not need a rubric. Rubric: (as it appears on your syllabus): (No rubric included by this faculty.)
someone's too embarrassed to ask you questions, then, your artist statement, does the job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art. A good artist statement works towards this end, and the most important ingredient of a good statement is its language. WRITE YOUR STATEMENT IN LANGUAGE THAT ANYONE CAN UNDERSTAND, not language that you understand, not language that you and your friends understand, not language that you learn in art school, but everyday language that you use with everyday people to accomplish everyday things. An effective statement reaches out and welcomes people no matter how little or how much they know about art. Like an open book, your statement presents the fundamental underpinnings of your art; write it for people who are about to read "your book," not those who've already read it. In three to five paragraphs of three to five sentences each, provide basic information like WHY YOU MAKE YOUR ART, HOW YOU MAKE IT, WHAT IT'S MADE OUT OF, and perhaps briefly, WHAT YOUR ART MEANS TO YOU. Don't bog readers down, but rather entice them to want to know more. As with any good first impression, your statement should hook and invite further inquiry, like a really good story is about to be too short, too little, not too much. People have short attention spans. Rubric for the Assessment of Artist Statement: Student #5

Assignment of Student Performance: No student names are needed. Student # Crit#1 # Crit#2 # Crit#3 # student 1 2 3 2 3 student 2 2 2 3 3 student 3 3 3 3 3 student 4 2 2 3 3 CTW SPRING/MAYMESTER 2012 COURSE #5 Portfolio II - CTW ID 4950, CRN 16520 Spring 2012 | Instructor: Tim Nichols WRITING ASSIGNMENT This is excerpted from a larger writing called the Thesis Program Document. It is an independent directed research document based on a project type and location of the students choosing. The Thesis Problem Statement and Precedents section were chosen for the CTW exercises in writing. The thesis problem statement is a brief introduction (2-3 pages) to the basic parameters of your thesis program document including social, cultural, and environmental context, the central theme, the project type and location, general hypothesis of your design objective, and finally the anticipated outcome and result of your design solution. The precedent analysis describes the history of your project type (e.g., restaurants, bed and breakfasts, residential design, etc.) throughout history? How far back you go depends on the project type: e.g., residential, could go as far back as Neanderthal man and cave dwellings whereas speculative office development might only go back to the mid twentieth century. (8-10 pages)

GRADING RUBRIC

Crit#1

Criterion #2

Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking

Criterion #3

Clear language, void of "artspeak", that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates.

Criterion #4

Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Artist Statement: Student #7

Assignment of Student Performance: No student names are needed. Student # Crit#1 # Crit#2 # Crit#3 # student 1 2 3 4 4 student 2 3 4 3 4 student 3 3 4 4 4 student 4 2 2 3 4 student 5 3 3 3 3 student 6 3 3 3 4 student 7 2 2 2 4 student 8 4 3 4 4 student 9 2 2 2 4 student 10 2 2 4 4 student 11 3 3 3 4 student 12 2 2 3 3 student 13 3 2 3 4 student 14 3 2 2 4

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

M 6: CTW FALL 2012 COURSE DATA (Q: 6)

CTW FALL 2012 COURSE #1 Instructor: C. Drennen Class Name & Number: ART 3910 CRITICAL ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY ART Assignment: WRITING ASSIGNMENT: ARTIST INTERVIEW (100pts) Interview an artist with significant regional or national career accomplishment. Initiate contact with your chosen artist via email, phone, or gallery staff. Your interviews may be conducted in person, through email, or over the phone. Our prior class content should inform your questions. (No GSU professors, former profs, classmates, or the person you interview). Grading Rubric Criteria

Crit#1

Identification of critical issue

Crit#2

Criterion #2 Individual perspective that provides personal insight into and understanding of the work. Individual perspective lacks specificity and offers little insight into and understanding of the work. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides greater insight into and understanding of the work. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides greater insight into and understanding of the work. Poor articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides lesser insight into and understanding of the work.

Crit#3

Organization is clear and logical and helps to support problem statement Organization is clear and logical and helps to support problem statement Organization is very clear and logical and helps to strongly support problem statement Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.

Crit#4

None of the language describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work. Some of the language describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work. Most of the language describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how themes are embodied in the work.Criterion #2 Individual perspective that provides personal insight into and understanding of the work. Individual perspective lacks specificity and offers little insight into and understanding of the work. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides greater insight into and understanding of the work. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides greater insight into and understanding of the work.

Criterion #3 Clear language, void of "artspeak", that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates. Some of the language is clear and easily understood, but a significant is confusing or vague. Most of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. All of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience.

Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.

Assessment of Student Performance: No student names are needed. Student # Crit#1 # Crit#2 # Crit#3 # student 1 2 3 4 4 student 2 3 4 3 4 student 3 3 4 4 4 student 4 2 2 3 4 student 5 3 3 3 3 student 6 3 3 3 4 student 7 2 2 2 4 student 8 4 3 4 4 student 9 2 2 2 4 student 10 2 2 4 4 student 11 3 3 3 4 student 12 2 2 3 3 student 13 3 2 3 4 student 14 3 2 2 4

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
CTW FALL 2012 COURSE #4

**Assessment of Student Performance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Criteria 1</th>
<th>Criteria 2</th>
<th>Criteria 3</th>
<th>Criteria 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

- **Student 1:** Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides little insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.
- **Student 2:**颇有 insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides little insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.
- **Student 3:** Weak articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides little insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Weak articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides little insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.
- **Student 4:** Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.
- **Student 5:** Excellent articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Excellent articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends.

**Criteria**

- **Criterion #1:** Descriptive language that effectively communicates the theme or intention of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance: Student # Criternon 1
- **Criterion #2:** Criterion #2
- **Criterion #3:** Criterion #3
- **Criterion #4:** Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work.
None of the language describes the theme or intent of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work.

Some of the language describes the theme or intent of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work.

Most of the language describes the theme or intent of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work. All of the language describes the theme or intent of the work and how the theme or intention is embodied or applied in the work.

Criterion #2 Individual perspective that provides personal insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical context that reflects your understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Individual perspective lacks specificity and offers little insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides some insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides clear insight into & understanding of the work in light of contemporary and historical trends. Criterion #3 Clear language, void of "artspeak", that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates the language of the artwork or is confusing or vague. Most of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. All of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance: Numbers alone are fine. No student names are needed. Student # Criterion#1 Criterion#2 Criterion#3 Criterion#4 001665003 3 3 4 4 Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
individual perspective that is informative and provides greater insight into and understanding of the work. Criterion #3 Clear
language, void of “artspeak,” that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates.
Some of the language is clear and easily understood but a significant confusion is vague or confusing. Most of the language is clearly
understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. All of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively
communicates to a wide audience. Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and
punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little
evidence of correction. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting, spatiotemporal
distraction, spelling or punctuation errors. Assessment of Student Performance: Student # Criterion#1 Criterion#2 Criterion#3 Criterion#4
student 1 3 3 4 3 student 2 4 3 3 3 CTW SPRING 2013 COURSE #3 Instructor: S. Anderson Class Name & Number: GD 4950
Portfolio I. Assignment: Artist Statement YOUR ARTIST STATEMENT: Who you are at this point in your creative life. QUESTION
Why do I have to write an artist statement? If I wanted to write express myself I would have been a writer. The whole idea of my art is
beauty, why can’t I just express myself? An artist should not have to explain what ever they express. Art statements are not stupid; they are essential. And you don’t have to be a writer to write one. And people already look at your art and take away whatever experiences they will. Your artist statement is about facts, a basic introduction to your art; it’s not instructions on what to experience, what to think, how to feel, how to act, or where to stand, and if it is, you’d better do a rewrite. On this planet, people communicate through language, and your artist statement introduces and communicates the language component of your art. People who come into contact with your art and want to know more will question. When you’re there, they ask you and you answer. If it’s not a question, or if you’re not there, you’re not there. Or when you’re there, you’re not there. Or when you’re there, you’re not there. Or you’re too busy to answer questions, or someone’s too embarrassed to ask you questions, then, your artist statement, does the job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art. A good artist statement works towards this end, and the most important ingredient of a good statement is its language. WRITE YOUR STATEMENT IN LANGUAGE THAT ANYONE CAN
UNDERSTAND, not language that you understand, not language that you and your friends understand, not language that you learn in
art school, but everyday language that you use with everyone people to accomplish everyday things. An effective statement
reaches out and welcomes people to your art, no matter how little or how much they know about art to begin with; it never excludes.
Like an introduction to a book, your statement presents the fundamental underpinnings of your art; write it for people who are about
to read "your book," not those who’ve already read it. In three to five paragraphs of three to five sentences each, provide a basic
information like WHY YOU MAKE YOUR ART, HOW YOU MAKE IT, WHAT IT’S MADE OUT OF, and perhaps briefly, WHAT YOUR
job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art.
Why can’t people just look at my art and take away whatever experiences they will? ANSWER: Artist
statements are not stupid; they are essential. And you don’t have to be a writer to write one. And people already look at your art and
take away whatever experiences they will. Your artist statement is about facts, a basic introduction to your art; it’s not instructions on
what to experience, what to think, how to feel, how to act, or where to stand, and if it is, you’d better do a rewrite. On this planet, people communicate through language, and your artist statement introduces and communicates the language component of your art. People who come into contact with your art and want to know more will question. When you’re there, they ask you and you answer. If it’s not a question, or if you’re not there, you’re not there. Or when you’re there, you’re not there. Or you’re too busy to answer questions, or someone’s too embarrassed to ask you questions, then, your artist statement, does the job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art. A good artist statement works towards this end, and the most important ingredient of a good statement is its language. WRITE YOUR STATEMENT IN LANGUAGE THAT ANYONE CAN
UNDERSTAND, not language that you understand, not language that you and your friends understand, not language that you learn in
art school, but everyday language that you use with everyone people to accomplish everyday things. An effective statement
reaches out and welcomes people to your art, no matter how little or how much they know about art to begin with; it never excludes.
Like an introduction to a book, your statement presents the fundamental underpinnings of your art; write it for people who are about
to read "your book," not those who’ve already read it. In three to five paragraphs of three to five sentences each, provide a basic
information like WHY YOU MAKE YOUR ART, HOW YOU MAKE IT, WHAT IT’S MADE OUT OF, and perhaps briefly, WHAT YOUR
job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art.
Why can’t people just look at my art and take away whatever experiences they will? ANSWER: Artist
statements are not stupid; they are essential. And you don’t have to be a writer to write one. And people already look at your art and take away whatever experiences they will. Your artist statement is about facts, a basic introduction to your art; it’s not instructions on what to experience, what to think, how to feel, how to act, or where to stand, and if it is, you’d better do a rewrite. On this planet, people communicate through language, and your artist statement introduces and communicates the language component of your art. People who come into contact with your art and want to know more will question. When you’re there, they ask you and you answer. If it’s not a question, or if you’re not there, you’re not there. Or when you’re there, you’re not there. Or you’re too busy to answer questions, or someone’s too embarrassed to ask you questions, then, your artist statement, does the job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art. A good artist statement works towards this end, and the most important ingredient of a good statement is its language. WRITE YOUR STATEMENT IN LANGUAGE THAT ANYONE CAN
UNDERSTAND, not language that you understand, not language that you and your friends understand, not language that you learn in
art school, but everyday language that you use with everyone people to accomplish everyday things. An effective statement
reaches out and welcomes people to your art, no matter how little or how much they know about art to begin with; it never excludes.
Like an introduction to a book, your statement presents the fundamental underpinnings of your art; write it for people who are about
to read "your book," not those who’ve already read it. In three to five paragraphs of three to five sentences each, provide a basic
information like WHY YOU MAKE YOUR ART, HOW YOU MAKE IT, WHAT IT’S MADE OUT OF, and perhaps briefly, WHAT YOUR
job. Just about all artists want as many people as possible to appreciate their art.
cultural, political context Critical issue clearly identified with evidence of deep understanding of social, cultural, political context
Criterion #2 Thorough and insightful analysis Analysis is incomplete with no indication of critical thinking Analysis is simplistic or vague with little indication of critical thinking Analysis is complete with clear use of critical thinking Analysis is thorough and insightful with sophisticated critical thinking
Criterion #3 Clear and logical organization Organization is not clear and logical and does not help to support claims Organization is at times clear and logical and only partially helps to support claims Organization is clear and logical and helps to strongly support claims Organization is very clear and logical and helps to strongly support claims
Criterion #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. Many grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. STEP 4: Completed grading rubric for each student:
Student# Criterion 1 Criterion 2 Criterion 3 Criterion 4 1 3 3 3 4 2 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 4 3 3 3 2 2 5 4 3 3 3 6 3 3 2 3 7 4 4 4 8 3 2 3 9 3 3 3 3 10 2 2 2 3 11 3 3 4 4
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 8: CTW FALL 2013 COURSE DATA (O: 1)
(TO BE FILLED FALL 2013)
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 9: (BLANK FIELD) (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assignment revision needs to grow out of what you have learned from the data.
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW FAll 2010 course data | Outcome/Objective: Ideation
Responsible Person/Group: Craig Drennen

ART 3910 CTW Instruction by Lecturers
It has proven difficult finding full-time art and design faculty whose backgrounds and availability would allow them to teach the ART 3910 course. Whenever possible, the qualification to teach CTW courses was written into the job description for new full-time lecturers. Thus far two lecturers (Ms. Jenene Nagy and Ms. Jill Frank) have been called to teach ART 3910.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013 Implementation Status: In-Progress Priority: High

ART 3910 CTW Instruction by PTI
Due to the lack of interest and/or availability of full-time faculty to teach ART 3910, the department has experimented with hiring part-time instructors to teach the course. Thus far, one section of ART 3910 has been taught by a part-time instructor, Ms. Rachel Reese.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013 Implementation Status: In-Progress Priority: High

Faculty Data Reporting
Since fall 2010 we have not had full participation in digital data reporting from art and design faculty teaching CTW courses. Efforts have been made to streamline the process and remind faculty multiple times during the semester. The goal is 100% participation from all faculty teaching CTW courses.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013 Implementation Status: In-Progress Priority: High

Writing Assignment in Capstone CTW Courses
All art and design departments will use at least one final writing assignment in a capstone course to assess student achievement. The culminating assignment will be used to gauge the level of student thinking and writing competencies at the moment when they depart the program.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013 Implementation Status: In-Progress Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
CTW accomplishments for Welch School of Art and Design 1. More sections of ART 3910 were taught by the widest variety of faculty.
2. My spring 2013 we had the largest percentage of faculty participation in data collection thus far.
3. One section of ART 3910 was taught by a qualified part-time instructor.
4. ART 3910 student Alice Phillips (BFA DPP) had her interview with the artist Rocio Rodriguez accepted for publication in NUMBER journal.
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?

1. Anecdotal information by faculty teaching senior level Portfolio classes indicates that exiting seniors have higher reading comprehension and writing skills than their predecessors. (Please note that the numerical assessments don’t necessarily reinforce this assertion.) 2. Undergraduate students from the Welch School of Art and Design now appear with frequency as art critics in respected publications. Henry Detweiler (BFA DPP) worked for over one year as a paid staff writer for Burnaway magazine while a student. Santiago Junco (BA) and Faatima Stevens (BFA DPP) also wrote for Burnaway as contributing critics. This is a new development, and one that indicates that the best of our undergraduate students are prepared to contribute to professional publications. 3. Undergraduate students who apply to MFA programs utilize the artist statements from their Portfolio classes as part of their application materials. Two students from the past year, Summer Gray (BFA Textiles) and William Schweigert (BFA DPP) were both accepted into MFA programs at the University of Oregon and Northwestern University, respectively.

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

1. The 25-student limit in the ART 3910 courses has turned out to be too large. The emphasis in the course in on more numerous smaller writing assignments. So it’s not uncommon for a class of 25 students to have 10 weekly 2+ page writing assignments, a 4-5 page exhibition review, and blue book final exam. That can mean up to 1,375 pages of graded material per class for the faculty. This could be managed much better, and with more individual writing attention, if the course limit were reduced at least to 20. 2. In the capstone Portfolio classes, the preferred writing assignment chosen for assessment has been the artist statement. It seems useful to supplement that assignment with additional writing assignments throughout the studio courses. 3. It seems clear that students in the CTW courses benefit from as much individual attention and feedback in the grading process as possible. There are moments when clear line-by-line edits are useful. 4. The demographic of incoming students at GSU means that students arrive with a wide variety of reading comprehension and writing experience. A percentage—sometimes a significant percentage—of ART 3910 students arrive on the first day of class without basic English skills. 5. Faculty participation in data submission is not yet 100%.

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?

1. The best BA and BFA students appear to be more articulate in critique situations. (However, this has not created a comparable change in the lower achieving students.) 2. The CTW courses create an activated “culture of success” within the department. 3. The ART 3910 course provides a true multi-disciplinary classroom environment, which has had a positive impact throughout the program. 4. Students can now more easily initiate their own participation in critical writing for professional publications.

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?

1. There has been no significant changes in the official learning outcomes supported by the Welch School of Art and Design. The stress has been more on the implementation of the existing outcomes. 2. The Welch School of Art and Design is in the process of drafting its first official mission statement, to be effective by fall 2013. The new mission statement will take the CTW program into account. 3. All faculty teaching CTW courses will continue to be encouraged and reminding to contribute correct data reporting.

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

We have been in a transitional mode in the Welch School of Art and Design, and the CTW program is being looked at very thoughtfully by the new director.

Annual Report Section Responses

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.

1. It is always a challenge to get students into the ART 3910 sections at the appropriate moment in their degree pursuit. Presumably this challenge will continue. 2. It is a challenge to get qualified, interested faculty to teach the sections of ART 3910. 3. It is a challenge to teach full sections of 25 or more students in the ART 3910 sections. 4. It is a challenge to collect faculty data reporting in an efficient and timely fashion. I do not have have the authority to comment on other challenges facing the broader department.

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

There are no impending changes to the measurement methods.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

I have not been made aware of any intended modifications of outcomes.

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

My role as a junior faculty member does give me access to that information. Questions regarding faculty committee assignments may be directed to our Associate Director, Dr. Maria Gindhart (mgindhart@gsu.edu) or our director, Mr. Michael White (michaelwhite@gsu.edu).

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

The faculty and staff of the Welch School of Art and Design participate in exhibitions, publications, and presentations too numerous to mention here. More information about faculty and staff accomplishments can be seen on the Welch School of Art and Design website (http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwart/) under “People In The News”
International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
The faculty and staff of the Welch School of Art and Design participate in variety of international exhibitions, publications, and presentations. More information about faculty and staff accomplishments can be seen on the Welch School of Art and Design website (http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwart/) under "People In The News".

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
This information falls outside of my role as CTW Ambassador. For information regarding retention, progression, or graduate of BA and BFA art and design students, please contact the Undergraduate Advisor for the Welch School of Art and Design, Mr. Adam Wagner (awagner@gsu.edu).

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).
N/A

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Biology
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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.

Relevant Associations: Students in upper level CTW classes have show improvement in both critical analysis and in writing skills since taking the lower level CTW.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Written lab report rubric (O: 1)
The following rubric will be used to grade reports. For every concept that is not included in the report, 0.1-0.5 points will be deducted (for a 10 point report). I. Introduction (2 points) a. _____Includes background b. _____Citations were appropriate c. _____Is not a summary of methods d. _____Does not read like a summary of methods e. _____Relevance of study f. _____Does not read like protocol intro g. _____Moves from a broad to specific h. _____Includes a hypothesis II. Methods (2 points) a. _____Passive past tone b. _____Appropriate detail c. _____Only mentions own experiments d. _____Does not read like a protocol or recipe e. _____No numbered lists f. _____Organized into sections III. Results (2 points) a. _____Should include text which highlight important trends/observations and are NOT a part of the captions or legends!! b. _____Figures/Tables are cited (i.e. Table 1) c. _____Considers all data sets d. _____No interpretations or conclusion IV. Discussion (2 points) a. _____Uses data to draw conclusions b. _____Each analysis states expected results c. _____Includes work cited at the end with appropriate literature d. _____All interpretations are merged into a set of overall conclusions e. _____Scientific premise to all conclusions V. Figures/Tables (2 points) a. _____Appropriate labeling (axes, descriptive titles, column headings, gel lanes) b. _____Should include original captions (communicates methodology used to generate data. Concise, not as detailed as methods) c. _____Size should be big enough to read, but not awkwardly large d. _____Should function to simplify interpretation of data e. _____Appropriate numbering scheme (i.e. Table 1, Figure 1, etc.) f. _____Contains number, title and caption g. _____Shows only relevant data that is discussed in discussion VI. General a. _____Grammatical issues GRADING (points deducted/section deducted from) Intro: Methods: Results: Discussion:

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

M 2: Scientific Report (O: 1)
Students were asked to organize a report communicating their experiments. The structure paralleled that of professional manuscripts.

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

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW BIS
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Bachelors of Interdisciplinary Studies program combines ten university-planned programs with numerous student-developed programs that share a focus on issues, topics and areas of inquiry combining two or more disciplines to create areas of concentration not offered through any of the university's individual academic disciplines. The Bachelors of Interdisciplinary Studies program acknowledges and respects the definitions of critical thinking affirmed by the University and its individual departments. A common thread in these definitions presents critical thinking as an ability to effectively identify, formulate, analyze, and evaluate arguments, hypotheses, evidence, and truth claims or to use these skills to solve problems. Beyond that, the BIS program seeks to imbue its students with two other elements of critical thinking. These are: (a) to understand the logic, perspectives, terminology, and analytic methods of more than one academic discipline, and see how they complement, or overlap with, each other; and (b) to be able to apply the "tools" of more than one discipline (i.e., their logic, perspectives, terminologies, and methods) to draw reasonable conclusions and make sound judgments based on available information and/or empirical evidence.

Goals

G 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 will be able to: Analyze and evaluate 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 individual interdisciplinary programs. Formulate research questions related to individual interdisciplinary programs. 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 an 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 are reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence.

#### 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 are reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence.

### 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 assignment: Go to Atlanta History Center and view the "Metropolitan Frontiers" exhibit. Then write a 4-5 page paper in which you discuss and critique the content, design, and effectiveness of this exhibit, being sure to view it in light of class discussions and the book "Atlanta: An Illustrated History."

#### O/O 4: Demographic Assignment
Students in Metropolitan Atlanta class demonstrate ability to analyze data by completing a demographic assignment. The assignment requires them to obtain population, social, and economic data on Atlanta and several other metropolitan areas, and/or several counties in metropolitan Atlanta to compare/contrast them, to see how they compare to data from 20 or 30 years ago, and to draw conclusions about these changes and contrasts.

#### O/O 5: Analytical Reaction Essay (M: 4)
In Speech 3250, BIS students demonstrate analysis by completing an analytical reaction essay. Analytical Essay assignment description: Write an essay in which you demonstrate what you have learned from the textbook and apply those things elsewhere. You must make reference to the outside text (video or article) and explain its point. You must incorporate an issue or concept from the course (i.e., show how it is related to Persuasion). You must show how it connects to other things (examples from your world, something you've seen, studied, etc.). Questions to ask yourself: a. What is the author trying to say? b. What is the main idea? c. Why do you think that the article or video was assigned? d. What is the connection to the course? e. What other connections can I make? f. Do I agree or disagree with the argument? g. Is this generalizable? A strong paper will include solid analysis, 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
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 symbolic systems; and converse and pose questions about the production of knowledge through the communicative process. Rubric to Use for CTW Assessment: Not 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

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: ___________________________ Date: _____________

Rubric to Use for CTW Assessment:

HOW MANY STUDENTS IN THIS COURSE FIT INTO EACH CATEGORY? Poor Good Very Good Excellent 1 2 3 4 5

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

M 6: CTW for BIS students in Hist 3000 & Poli 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 at the GSU Library or through an on-line journal search using Galileo. These are not to be reviews, but rather critical analyses of the works as theatrical art. The list of plays on which you may write is: David Henry Hwang—Golden Child Tony Kushner—Angels in America: Part One—Millennium Approaches Eduardo Machado—Broken Eggs Paula Vogel—How I Learned to Drive Oscar Wilde—The Importance of Being Earnest Tennessee Williams—The Glass Menagerie August Wilson—Fences

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

M 9: BIS Entry Paper (O: 8)

Early papers from BIS students graduating in 2013 were reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. Eric Brown, the university advisor for BIS students solicited graduating seniors for papers and collected six early papers from students in Asian studies, classical studies, environmental studies, international studies, theatre design and production, and theatre performance. Papers came from a wide variety of classes, though some apparently were from CTW classes, which was not the goal of the measure. Ratings on a five-point scale in six rubrics (see attached spread sheet) indicated an overall rating of 3.08, with the strongest rating for knowledge (3.88) and the weakest for breadth of interdisciplinary focus (2.28). The latter is to be expected among students just starting their studies in an interdisciplinary field. For depth of interdisciplinary focus, students averaged 2.44, suggesting that though they were not yet working with a variety of disciplines, their work suggested an average understanding of the fields under consideration. For rubrics that would be applied to individual disciplines at the university, students performed well for rising sophomores, with average ratings above 3 in such areas as argumentation/critical thinking, development, grammar, knowledge and structure.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O8: Entry Paper for BIS Program

The minimum rubric scores we would like to see among students entering the BIS programs is: Argumentation/Critical Thinking: 3 Breadth of Interdisciplinary Focus: 1 Depth of Interdisciplinary Focus: 2 Development: 3 Grammar/Mechanics: 3 Knowledge: 3 Structure: 2 It is, however, virtually impossible to set up an action plan related to these targets for student work before their entry into a set of programs with minimal entry requirements. Students entering the BIS must have a minimum GSU GPA of 2.0, the same minimum required for enrollment in most other majors.
Upper-level papers from CTW courses from BIS students graduating in 2013 were reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council in accordance with the rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. Eric Brown, the university advisor for BIS students, solicited graduating seniors for papers and collected six early papers from students in Asian studies, classical studies, environmental studies, international studies, theatre design and production, and theatre performance. Papers came from a wide variety of classes. Ratings on a five-point scale in six rubrics (see attached spreadsheet) indicated an overall rating of 3.71, with the strongest rating for grammar/mechanics (4.3) and the weakest for breadth of interdisciplinary focus (2.61). The latter, though disappointing, reflects the fact that some students chose to submit papers from their 3000-level CTW courses rather than their 4000-level CTW courses. The slightly higher rating for depth of interdisciplinary focus (3.06) would suggest that even though students were not drawing on a variety of disciplines, they were at least dealing with the disciplines considered with an above average level of sophistication. For rubrics that would be applied to individual disciplines at the university, students performed very well for rising seniors, with average ratings above 4 in such grammar/mechanics and knowledge and approaching four in argumentation/critical thinking, development and structure. In addition, students showed improvement in all seven rubrics, with an average overall improvement of .63 and the highest improvement in grammar/mechanics (1.1). The disappointment growth in breadth of interdisciplinary focus (.33) may be the result of an inadequate sampling of work, with some entrance drawn from CTW courses. This would also account for the fact that four of the students whose work was sampled had breadth of interdisciplinary focus ratings that fell between the entrance and exit papers.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O9: Exit Paper for BIS Program**

Reasonable targets for students graduating with the B.I.S. degree would be: Argumentation/Critical Thinking: 4 Breadth of Interdisciplinary Focus: 4 Depth of Interdisciplinary Focus: 4 Development: 4 Grammar/Mechanics: 4 Knowledge: 4 Structure: 4

Given the variable nature of student preparation for the academic world, where students fall short of those targets, we would consider it acceptable to see improvement ratings as follows: Argumentation/Critical Thinking: +2 Breadth of Interdisciplinary Focus: +3 Depth of Interdisciplinary Focus: +3 Development: +2 Grammar/Mechanics: +2 Knowledge: +2 Structure: +2

**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.

**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.

**BIS Rubrics**

A subcommittee of the BIS Council met with Jennifer Lawrence to develop CTW rubrics for BIS students. These were presented to the BIS council and approved in fall 2012.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Evaluation of BIS Papers

Eric Brown, university advisor for BIS students, is charged with assembling sample entrance and exit papers from BIS students, which are then evaluated by a three-member sub-committee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Additional Resources:** Stipend of $500/each to be awarded to each member of the three-person subcommittee.
- **Implementation Description:** The BIS Council will meet with Eric Brown, the university advisor for BIS students, to determine the most equitable means of collecting and storing entrance and exit papers for their evaluation by a subcommittee of the BIS Council.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BIS Council. Eric Brown.

Refine Paper Collection for BIS Program

The first set of papers used for the CTW assessment for the BIS program in theatre were assembled by canvassing seniors graduating in 2013 to submit early and late papers written during their careers at Georgia State. From the small number of students participating (six) and the nature of the papers submitted, with some early papers selected from CTW courses and some late papers selected from 3000-level CTW courses, it would appear that the sampling was not the most reliable, as evidenced by low rubric ratings in the area of breadth of interdisciplinary focus and the fact that some people showed lower ratings for selected rubrics on their exit papers than on their entrance papers. We need to develop a better system for collecting papers, starting by requiring students to submit entrance papers when they apply to the program and exit papers at their graduation audits.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The BIS Council will meet with Eric Brown, the university advisor for BIS students, to determine the most equitable means of collecting and storing entrance and exit papers for their evaluation by a subcommittee of the BIS Council.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BIS Council. Eric Brown.

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 primary accomplishment this year was setting up a subcommittee to evaluate entrance and exit papers from graduating BIS students. This gave us the chance to try the rubrics and refine the sample gathering techniques. This encompasses all three areas of the action plan. The evaluation of BIS Papers is an ongoing process that involves using the previously completed BIS Rubrics. This first foray into assessing CTW progress has also pointed out the need to add refining paper collection to the action plan.

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

The first assessment process would indicate a slight overall improvement in paper quality, with the average for all seven rubrics rising from 3.08 to 3.08. The strongest improvement was in the area of grammar/mechanics, with a rise from 3.2 to 4.3, indicating that graduating seniors in the BIS program were beginning to achieve proficiency in that area. The only other area in which BIS majors moved into proficiency was knowledge, although that was only a slight improvement, indicating that students are coming into the program with high levels of achievement in that area.

**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 problem right now is in the assessment process. As indicated in other areas of the report, we are not yet getting an accurate sampling with which to show growth from entrance to exit papers. Because papers were only collected as students were graduated, some of the entrance papers were written after students had come into the program, with some samples coming from CTW classes. This was not the procedure originally envisioned, and we BIS Council needs to address this issue to determine a better means of gathering student work.

**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 the most difficult question to answer for the BIS program, which encompasses ten university-planned and several student-planned concentrations. The BIS Council does not always control the CTW courses taught in those concentrations, so any changes will require extensive dialogue with faculty in several academic departments. In addition, since this is the first attempt at assessing CTW progress among BIS students, the BIS Council has yet to meet and discuss the findings of the subcommittee evaluating papers.
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 graduation with a major in Managerial Sciences and a concentration in Business Analysis will be able to effectively
communicate their decision processes and conclusions on Business Analysis problems in the written format used in contemporary
organizations.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Problem Identification (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to identify correctly the nature of a problem that an organization is facing that is amenable to a business
analysis recommendation.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 2: Choice of Analytical "Tools" (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to identify the proper, established business analysis tools and skills for addressing the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 3: Application for Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to apply the proper, established business analysis tools and skills to the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 4: Drawing Conclusions from Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to draw a conclusion from among the identified viable alternatives that best addresses the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 5: Written Process Communication (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to communicate, in writing, the process of critical thinking that they used in arriving at the recommendation made
for the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 6: Written Communication of Conclusions (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to communicate, in writing, the basis for their conclusion relative to the other alternatives reasonable presented
for the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Problem Solving Memos (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

In this course students will be asked to write effective business memoranda addressing a problem that requires the systematic
application of the tools of analysis developed in this course. Students will do an initial analysis early in the semester. Following a
review on both the merits and the effective communication of the student's critical thinking and writing skills in the memorandum, the
student will be asked to re-write the memorandum addressing the issues raised. The second memorandum will then be resubmitted
and again, in addition to being graded on the merit of the assignment, the student will be required to attend a feedback session with
e 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
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: Writen Communication of Conclusions**

Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the fifth criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.

**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
- **Measure:** Problem Solving Memos | **Outcome/Objective:** Choice of Analytical "Tools" | Written Communication of Conclusions
- **Implementation Description:** Re-wording of hte 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 th Goals set out for BA student.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Review meetings will be held int eh 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, Jiim Shi, members of the BA faculty.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Rubric Update and Alignement**
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
- **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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students in the discipline get 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Gateway course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (adequate) by the final rewrite. On papers one and two students should demonstrate an emergence of critical thinking skills as they rewrite and resubmit papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **G 2: Capstone Course** |
| Students will be able to score 3 (adequate) in each area of the rubric by the final revision of their laboratory reports. At least 3 areas rated as excellent (4). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Appropriate Title that represents actual work done in lab (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SLO 5: Appropriate Discussion/Conclusion (G: 1, 2) (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: 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2: Appropriate Introduction (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction should be judged adequate based on the rubric section below. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The paper contains a materials and methods section which would allow a competent chemist to repeat the experiment. Based on the rubric section below:

**Explain: Includes the details of the experimental procedure (section titled Materials and Methods). A competent chemist should be able to reproduce the experiment using this section of the paper. Adequate: Minor details omitted that would hamper reproduction of the experiment. Not yet adequate: A competent chemist would have difficulty reproducing the experiment. Major components of experiment not described or omitted. Poor: Lack of experimental detail.**

**O/O 4: Appropriate Results section (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**

The paper contains a results section which is logical and incorporates all data in a readable format. Based on Rubric section below:

To think critically about data, it must be presented accurately, clearly and in a logical order. Excellent: Data presented fully including appropriate significant figures. Data are presented in logical order. Data format is readily available (in appropriate Tables, Figures and text) for facile assessment by the authors and readers. Adequate: One of significant figures, logical order, and efforts to make data readily accessible missing. Not yet adequate: Two of the above missing. Poor: Confusing organization of the data and/or major errors in presenting significant figures.

**O/O 6: Figures and Tables (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**

Figures and tables are added at logical places that enhance the readability of the paper and summarize data in a logical manner. Excellent: Use tables and figures when the data cannot be presented clearly as narrative, when many precise numbers must be presented, or when more meaningful interrelationships can be conveyed by the tabular format. Tables should supplement, not duplicate, text and figures. Tables should be simple and concise. It is preferable to use the Table Tool in your word-processing package, placing one entry per cell, to generate tables. Adequate: Most tables or figures have descriptive narrative (captions or titles) with minor errors which either have a lack of clarity or are not needed. Not yet adequate: Tables and figures do not add to the clarity of the paper. Poor: Tables and figures take away from the readability or clarity of the paper.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Reports 1 through 3 in Major Gateway course (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Students are required to perform a series of experiments and write laboratory reports using their data. The information given in the preliminary laboratory lecture is basic theory of the experiment. The critical thinking skills required increases with each experiment.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

97% of students met this target. 89% were considered excellent.

**Target for O2: Appropriate Introduction**

Target was not met at first submission but was met by all students by final submission.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

94% of students met this target. 83% were considered excellent.

**Target for O3: Appropriate Materials and methods**

90% of students score a 3 or better by the final submission.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

92% of students met this target. 39% were considered excellent.

**Target for O4: Appropriate Results section**

85% of students score a 3 or above by the final submission.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

89% of students met this target. 19% were considered excellent.

**Target for O5: Appropriate Discussion/Conclusion**

85% of students score a 3 or above on the final submission.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

86% of students met this target. 11% were considered excellent.

**Target for O6: Figures and Tables**

80% of students score a 3 or above on the final submission.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

69% hit this target. 8% were considered excellent.

**M 2: Final Paper of Capstone Course (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
The capstone paper required a semester's worth of research in a laboratory. A report is compiled using the data that the student acquires throughout the semester.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students (19) met this requirement. 95% (18/19) were rated 4 (excellent).

**Target for O2: Appropriate Introduction**
All students receive a 3 or better by the final submission

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students met this target. 89% were rated excellent.

**Target for O3: Appropriate Materials and methods**
All students receive a 3 or better by the final submission

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students met this target. 84% were rated excellent.

**Target for O4: Appropriate Results section**
All students receive a 3 or better by the final submission

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
All students met this target. 79% were rated excellent.

**Target for O5: Appropriate Discussion/Conclusion**
All students receive a 3 or better by their final submission

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students met this requirement. 53% were rated excellent.

**Target for O6: Figures and Tables**
All students receive a 3 or better by their final submission

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
95% of students met this target. 26% were rated excellent.

**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 in the areas of the rubric.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Barrow

**Training on Tables Figures**
More work needs to be done on expressing how to condense data into readable, logical format.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Reports 1 through 3 in Major Gateway course
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Figures and Tables
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Chem 4000 teaching group.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**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.

Increasing Enrollment in Chemistry 4000 without little or no additional funding will be difficult. It will be impossible to increase the number of students per section because of a limited number of instruments.
Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

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 the science and change majors or are forces to retake the course causing the department to offer more sections both of which are unfavorable outcomes. Over the past four years the department has placed a priority in improving the retention of students in the 1211/1212 sequence believing those courses will affect the most people. These efforts have been supported by the University System of Georgia’s RPG initiative and STEM initiative. A three year grant based on the RPG initiative allowed the department to attack the retention problem in three ways; the implementation of peer tutorials, weekly meetings between faculty members who teach the courses in order to discuss ideas, methods and problems in the various units and a redesign in the courses. Peer Led Tutorials Peer led tutorials are an effective way to allow students to receive help and ask questions in a small group setting (25 as opposed to 100 – 200). Students enrolled in 1211, 1212, 2400 or 3410 can register for a tutorial which is led by either an undergraduate student who has recently excelled in one of the courses or a graduate student. The grade for the course is based on class attendance and participation by the student. We have found that the tutorials have been moderately effective in the 1211 and 1212 sequence but less effective in the 2400 and 3410 sequence. The department is currently modifying the tutorials so that they are more interactive and students are required to work out problems on the board as the peer leader circulates throughout giving help where needed. We believe that this activity will more actively engage the student allowing him/her to work the problem on their own with hints from the leader. In addition the department is developing a book of “worked out” problems which students can download. Weekly Communication Weekly meetings between the faculty members who teach introductory courses were started initially with a senior faculty member who facilitated discussion on what materials in the text were more important and what topics should be less emphasized. Since most persons teaching the general chemistry sequence come in as visiting faculty and very little experience teaching except as a TA we found that there is a preconceived notion that everything in the text must be taught. Through these meetings the general chemistry faculty has been able to increase the depth of student knowledge rather than go for complete “coverage” of the text. In addition the faculty have exchanged ideas on how to teach different topics, discussed student misconceptions and developed slides which we can use as needed. It is often difficult to schedule these meetings around teaching schedules so this part of the action plan has been waning over the past semester, but we hope that we can continue this as part of the upcoming year’s action plan. Course Redesign In the eight sections of CHEM1211 and CHEM1212, General Chemistry I and II in Spring 2009, 151 out of 255 of students enrolled are biology majors (59%) and 28 are chemistry majors (18%). After the General Chemistry series, the biology majors go on to take BIOL3800 – Molecular Cell Biology, which requires students to have a strong background in key chemistry concepts. Both chemistry and biology majors are then required to complete a course in Biochemistry. In addition, much of the research performed in the chemistry department at Georgia State University is biologically oriented with most of the faculty specializing in some subfield of biochemistry (biophysical, bioanalytical, bioorganic or medicinal chemistry). Since all of the biology majors and a large number of chemistry majors will be involved in learning and researching biologically related topics, we believe that linking the common concepts in biology and chemistry together will facilitate the understanding and relevance of the topics in General Chemistry and help students better integrate the two disciplines. To facilitate this process, we are analyzing the topics covered in General Chemistry I and II in order to determine which topics have biologically relevant examples that can be easily added to the curriculum without taking away from the chemistry department’s mission as an American Chemical Society (ACS) certified program. The addition of biological examples and illustrations will help students make connections between the chemistry and biology. We hypothesize that adding biologically-related material will require the “weeding out” of some traditional topics which are no longer relevant, thus allowing a greater emphasis on the more relevant topics. This is the most recent addition to our action plan and is still in the infancy stages. Analysis of the Effect of Action Plan A ten year analysis of the 1151 course shows an increase from 239 students in 1998 to 361 students in 2008 (51% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 25.5% to 18.6%. The ACS scores are slightly higher. A ten year analysis of the 1152 course shows an increase from 208 students in 1998 to 333 students in 2008 (60% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5% to 20.1% in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7%. The ACS scores are statistically the same. Most of the gains in DFW rates have occurred over the past 5 years. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years. Departmental goals are 50% percentile or better. A ten year analysis of the 1211 course shows an increase from 497 students in 1998 to 779 students in 2008 (57% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 44.2% to 10.5%. The ACS scores are statistically the same (1211 was first given in 2001). A ten year analysis of the 1212 course shows an increase from 319 students in 1998 to 622 students in 2008 (95% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 34.2% to 11.4% in 2008. The departmental goals in ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years are statistically the same as in 1998. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years. Departmental goals are 50% percentile or better. A ten year analysis of the 2400 course shows an increase from 391 students in 1998 to 645 students in 2008 (65% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 38.2% to 31.9%. A ten year analysis of the 3410 course shows an increase from 196 students in 1998 to 564 students in 2008 (188% increase). There has
been a slight drop in ACS scores over this 10 year period. Upper Division Courses for Majors An analysis of all 4000 level courses required of majors indicates that all courses have less than a 15% DFW rate. The number of students taught in the past ten years has increased with the number of students taking four of the seven courses (4000, 4120, 4190 and 4600) was over double what was taught ten years ago. The ACS scores for the physical chemistry sequence have remained statistically the same as ten years ago and the number of sections offered has not changed. Freshman Retention Statistics In 2002 40 incoming freshman indicated that they were chemistry majors, of these 40 students 35 were still enrolled in the university in fall of 2003 (88%). After 6 years of the initial 40 students 18 (45%) had graduated with a degree (not necessarily in chemistry) and 7 (18%) were still enrolled in a program at Georgia State University. Unfortunately the university defines retention by completing a program which means there is no way to track what the students’ final major was. In fall 2007 a total of 65 students entered declaring as chemistry majors. As of Fall 2008 62 (95%) were still enrolled at Georgia State University. The 2007-2008 retention rate for freshman was the highest of any program with 10 or more majors in the College of Arts and Sciences. Again there is no way to tell if these students are still declared as chemistry majors or if they have changed majors as the University tracks only students that are retained in the University. Much of the improved retention at the Freshman level can be attributed to three programs that have been implemented in the past three years; increased opportunities for advisement, direct dialogue between the university advisors and the department, and an increase in faculty and staff that advise. The most common complaint among students in 2006 was the difficulty to schedule advisement appointments. Since 2007 there are advisement sign-up sheets outside the Undergraduate Director’s door so that students will not have to e-mail or call to make appointments. One of the major problems that the department has attempted to deal with 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 Honors program advisors that will hopefully be corrected during the upcoming registration for Fall 2009. The addition of an Undergraduate Coordinator has not only given the department another person capable of advisement at the Freshman level but has increased the amount of time that the Undergraduate Director can spend on advisement and other issues by shifting some of the workload.

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).

Glactone Program for elementary school students, Science olympiad.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 CTW Computer Information Systems**  
*(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST)*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Critical thinking through writing is demonstrated within Computer Information Systems by the ability to: Identify problems (and in some cases, opportunities) before they become critically important or demanding of immediate attention to ameliorate and address; typically these problems relate to organizational work processes and workflows that could best be addressed through computer-based solutions; Identify multiple, innovative, and creative solutions to these problems; typically these solutions are formulated as multiple alternative designs for computer-based solutions to the problem(s); Evaluate the possible solutions to these problems in such a way to rank order them, from best to worst, in terms of their relative efficacies and inherent costs in brokering the “best” solution; Exhibit a concern for, and appreciation of, pursuing solutions that are characterized by ethical and social responsibility; Propose an effective approach to implement the “best” solution. This CIS definition of CTW maps to the University’s definition in the following ways. 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**

**SLO 1: Articulate Requirements and Constraints (M: 1)**

Articulate Requirements and Constraints

**SLO 2: Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions (M: 1)**

Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions

**SLO 3: Consider Ethical and Social Issues (M: 1)**

Consider Ethical and Social Issues within potential solutions

**SLO 4: Select Best Solution with Justification (M: 1)**

Select Best Solution with Justification

---

**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 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 Fall 2012 changed the scoring range to 1 through 5. The new targets set are an average of 4 with fewer that 20% making less than 4.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Results for Fall 2012 & Spring 2013 are an overall average of 4.07 with only 14% making less than 4.

**Target for O2: Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions**

The CIS CTW Rubric Fall 2012 changed the scoring range to 1 through 5. The new targets set are an average of 4 with fewer that 20% making less than 4.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

The overall average was 3.9 with 32% less than 4.

**Target for O3: Consider Ethical and Social Issues**

The CIS CTW Rubric Fall 2012 changed the scoring range to 1 through 5. The new targets set are an average of 4 with fewer that 20% making less than 3.75.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

The overall average was 3.9 with 30% less than 4.

**Target for O4: Select Best Solution with Justification**

The CIS CTW Rubric Fall 2012 changed the scoring range to 1 through 5. The new targets set are an average of 4 with fewer that 20% making less than 3.75.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

The overall average was 3.9 with 31% less than 4.

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

**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:** 04/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CIS CTW ambassador (working with the MGS CTW ambassador).

**Analyze CTW lower scores**

The CIS 4980 enrollment has experienced a substantial increase going from 29 in Fall 2011 to 42 in Fall 2012. This substantially increased the load on our CTW GRA. During Fall 2013, student and CTW GRA interaction will be assessed to consider whether more efficient and effective methods can be employed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador & faculty working with the CTW GRA(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?**

The findings were successfully captured as individual elements within the rubric rather than as a consolidated single score. The comparison of CTW growth from the first CTW to this last CTW course (CIS 4980) was not accomplished. This action item has been retained with a new completion date of spring 2014. The enrollment in the CIS CTW courses has increased by over 44% over the last two years. More observations about this circumstance will follow.

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

No improvements during this assessment period.
CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Due to the increase in enrollment in the CIS CTW sections, additional CTW consultants were allocated for a single section. Findings fell perhaps partially due to the differing guidance and assistance given by the two CTW consultants (GRAs). This fall in finding values needs to be evaluated and addressed during the coming assessment period.

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 continues to focus students on the critical analysis and solution identification within the capstone projects. The individual component findings within the CIS CTW rubric will allow analysis of specific areas for improvement. CIS has begun to field part-time instructors for some CIS CTW sections. While these part-time instructors typically have substantial experience and insights to bring, their involvement within CTW will need to be addressed. Even if the coming multiple sections of CIS 4980 brought by the increased student enrollment in the CIS major are taught by full-time faculty, these full-time faculty will need to ramp up on how to successfully conduct the CTW component of this course.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Computer Science**

*(As of 12/12/2016 05:59 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 for the chosen solution, and test their solutions for correctness, completeness and accuracy. 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, completeness and accuracy.

---

**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 examples of student project reports and programming assignments. 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. [Preview Formatting]

---

**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 form groups to prepare a project over the course of the semester. Example homeworks and final projects are attached.

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...
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 with the goal of maintaining our high level of turn out.

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 the CTW is a waste of time and that they should not be graded for the documentation but just the program. But this is just a few students. A majority have indicated that by doing documentation, it better help them to develop solutions to their problems.

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 the students are continuing to do better when it comes to planning the solutions to their programming assignment and 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?
Maybe being able to use more accurate grammar to express themselves, especially for science based 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?
As it is, I don’t think there is any areas for massive improvements. There is a need to enforce the level we are at especially in the second class. There is always room for growth in the first class because these are new students to the program 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?
None.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
None.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
None.

Annual Report Section Responses

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.
Everything will hopefully remain the same, because I think we are doing fine. The only changes is that we have increased the size of the CTW classes from 24 students per class to 39. We have added an extra TA to assist the Instructor.

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
No.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
No.
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Goals

G 2: Generate coherent descriptions of extant knowledge
Students will explore, synthesize, and evaluate extant knowledge and scientific literatures on topics of interest to the field of criminal justice.
G 4: Identify ethical dilemmas in criminal justice decision making and processing
Students will become better at identifying moral dilemmas faced by criminal justice personnel and offenders.

G 3: Critically evaluate current issues in criminal justice
Students will become familiar with research processes, and will improve their evaluation skills.

G 6: Communicate effectively
Students will enhance their abilities to communicate their knowledge, analyses, evaluations, and decisions through writing.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses (G: 3, 6) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their ability to generate a thesis/hypothesis/statement of the problem in the generation of a critical analysis paper on a salient issue in the field of criminal justice.

SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 2, 3, 6) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate their retention of knowledge about the criminal justice system and salient topical issues in the field in written form. Students will effectively communicate facts about an issue and apply theoretical frameworks to demonstrate the depth of both their knowledge and their ability to critically synthesize relevant information about that specific topic in this paper.

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

SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 3, 6) (M: 1)
Students will develop and/or enhance skills in applying theoretical frameworks to contemporary issues in criminal justice. Students will be able to not only synthesize and interpret extant information, but also identify patterns within extant information, be able to compare and contrast different sides of a problem, and/or generate new predictions through their presentation in a written form.

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

SLO 4: Generation of conclusions (G: 3, 4, 6) (M: 1)
Students will be able to develop meaningful conclusions from literature reviews and/or data analyses and/or be able to identify policy implication given the evidence available.

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

SLO 5: Written communication (G: 6) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to effectively communicate their knowledge and analytical skills in written form (paper). Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively identify issues, develop and organize subtopics, and generate streamlined presentations of information. In addition, students will utilize appropriate grammar and syntax, as well as the ability to adhere to APA style guidelines.

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

SLO 6: Identification of ethical issues (G: 3, 4) (M: 2)
Students should be able to identify and evaluate the criminal justice system and issues that arise within it.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
This essay is designed to test students' ability to critically evaluate an issue in criminology and/or criminal justice. Students will identify a single issue from the internship experience that involves crime or the criminal justice system and discuss why it is of interest. Students must define and clarify the issue and provide background information describing its significance. Students also must apply a relevant theoretical framework to demonstrate their ability to more formally analyze the issue. Finally, students must assess the impact/potential impacts of the issues on the criminal justice system and/or personnel working within it and/or offenders and/or victims of crime and present potential responses/solutions.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data All” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 89% of the students (n=77) enrolled in CRJU 4930 during the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters received a score of 3 or 4 on a 1-4 rubric scale on the ID/Summarize Issue dimension. Sixty percent of the students received a 4 on a 1-4 scale on the ID/Summarize Issue dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 63% (n=56) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 6% (n=5) had a decrease in score and 20% (n=18) showed no improvement when possible on this dimension (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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data All” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 81% (n=72) of the students scored a 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale on the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric dimension. Forty-six percent (n=41) of students received the highest score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 69% (n=61) exhibited an increase in the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric or remained at the highest score (4 of 4) between the first and final submission. Only 4% (n=4) exhibited a decrease and 28% (n=25) showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

Target for O3: Application and analysis

The goal is that by the end of their senior year (e.g., for the capstone seminar), 80% of students should be rated as an 4, 3, or 2 in their ability conduct application and analysis of criminal justice subject matter. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 or 3 on a 46% (n=41) of students received the highest score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and show improvement over the first draft numbers in that 58% (n=52) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 3% (n=3) exhibited a decrease and 36% (n=32) 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).

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data All” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 95% (n=85) of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 during the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters earned a score of 2, 3, or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. Eighty-two percent (n=73) of students received a score of 3 or 4, and one-third (n=29) of these students earned a score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and show improvement over the first draft numbers in that 58% (n=52) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 20% (n=18) 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data All” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 80% (n=71) of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 during the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters received either a 3 or 4 on the ID/Summarize Issue dimension of the rubric. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and show improvement over the first draft numbers in that 46% (n=41) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 7% exhibited a decrease and 47% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

There was 1 section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2012 (n=43) and two sections in the Spring 2013 (n=42 and n=4). The attached file labeled “Capstone CRJU 4930 Rubric Data All” contains data for these 89 students. At the end of the year, 91% (n=81) of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 during the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters earned a score of 3 or 4 on the Writing Quality & Style dimension of the rubric. Forty percent of the students earned a score of 4 out of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 48% (n=43) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Measurement Answer:** 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

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty involved with Capstone seminar in conjunction with CTW Ambassador.

### Emphasis on student improvement over time

Gradation was added to achievement outcomes to enhance standards. Second, a recent policy change mandating that CJ majors complete the Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060) before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives raises the opportunity for linked assignments across CRJU 3060 and 4930. The department’s undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Application and Analysis measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**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 6 of the sections taught by the department in fall 2012 and spring 2013. 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.

**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).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 154 students who were enrolled in CRJU 3060 in the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters, 58% had an increase in their overall total rubric score across the initial and revised assignment for the Learning to Think Critically about Ethical Issues assignment (see attached rubric data for CRJU 3060).

**Target for O5: Written communication**

This is the third assignment of 3 in a junior level class, although it was only this year that the department was able to enact a policy that assures all 3000 level courses will be completed before they can proceed to register for 24 hours of 4000 level required or elective course work. The target is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the Mechanics rubric dimension for the third assignment. Additionally, at least 25% should rate as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Instructors for CRJU 3060 did not track or collect individual rubric data for students in such a way as to measure the Mechanics rubric dimension individually. Accordingly, this measure is not assessed this year.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 154 students who were enrolled in CRJU 3060 in the Fall 2012 or Spring 2013 semesters, 58% had an increase in their overall total rubric score across the initial and revised assignment for the Learning to Think Critically about Ethical Issues assignment (see attached rubric data for CRJU 3060).
**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.

**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.

**Develop set rubric for CRJU 3060 use**
The ad-hoc 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.

**Add book-end assignment to CRJU 3060 and CRJU 4930**
The ad-hoc CTW committee has proposed 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. The assignment will be implemented in the 2013-2014 AY.

**Pilot Grammarly.com**
One instructor of CRJU 3060 will be piloting Grammarly.com in the 2013-14 school year for use with at least one of the assignments in CRJU 3060. The instructor will have students submit their assignments first to Grammarly.com with the requirement of reaching a particular threshold before being able to submit the assignment for a grade. The same instructor will use the same assignment in another section of CRJU 3060 without the aid of Grammarly.com and compare rubric scores on the Mechanics dimension to assess writing improvement with the help of Grammarly.com.
Revision to Rubric for Issue Essay in CRJU 4930
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: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information
- Generation of conclusions | Written communication

Implementation Description: 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. The committee is working on revisions to the rubric and hopes to have finalized changes during the 2013 school year.

Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador, ad-hoc CTW committee, CTW 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?
One of the major accomplishments was having students in CRJU 3060 meet the goal of 50% of students showing improvement across assignments. This assignment in which students complete a critical thinking assignment at the beginning of the semester and then again at the end (a "book-end" assignment) is a way for us to assess whether students are in fact better able to critically assess information as they progress in the CTW Ethics course. Having over 50% of students improving on this assignment is a true accomplishment. Further, we have developed a strategy for using this same assignment in CRJU 4930 and tracking student progress further as they are ready to exit the program. We plan to implement this process in the 2013-14 school year, which was one of our action items from last year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
As noted, 58% of students enrolled in CRJU 3060 showed improvement in total rubric scores across the book-end assignments in that course. Further, in the CRJU 4930 Capstone course on the revision assignment, over half of all students improved on each rubric dimension except for the Writing dimension (on which 48% of students improved or received the highest score of 4 both times).

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 writing component still seems to be the weakest element for our students. Students also seem to struggle with generating valid conclusions. In addition, we continue to try to develop and implement the most effective rubrics for both instructors and students.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
We have been more thoughtful this past year about developing and implementing a book-end assignment that is used in all sections of CRJU 3060 that can assess student improvement in a variety of dimensions from the beginning of class to the end of class. CTW has allowed us to see the importance of assessing change in student outcomes rather than assessing a single time-point. We plan to implement this same book-end assignment in the capstone course CRJU 4930 so that we can further assess improvement across dimensions. In addition, we plan on piloting the use of Grammarly.com in CRJU 3060 to assist in improving student writing as a result of CTW program assessment.

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 will be piloting Grammarly.com in CRJU 3060 in one section and comparing student outcomes on rubric scores in another section, specifically on the Mechanics/Writing dimension to see if the use of this software improves student writing ability.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We will be piloting Grammarly.com in CRJU 3060 in one section and comparing student outcomes in another section on rubric data, especially on the Writing/Mechanics dimension to see if the software aids in improving student writing. We also will be piloting an assessment of basic math skills as well as knowledge in Criminal Justice and Criminology to be distributed to see if students are acquiring the knowledge and critical thinking skills we hope they receive in Intro to CJ (CRJU 1100) and Criminological Theory (CRJU 3410) and in their preparatory math class before enrolling in our Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice Course (CRJU 3610).
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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**

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**

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**

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.
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 2012-2013 - 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. Eighty-five percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 90% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Assignment 2: Literacy Autobiography (Fall 2012 assignment only). Seventy-five percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 80% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Assignment 3: Literacy Outreach (Fall 2012 assignment only). Seventy-nine percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 90% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Assignment 4: Good Writes (Spring 2013 assignment only). Eighty percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 90% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Assignment 5: Multimodal Compositions/Freedom Composers (Spring 2013 assignment only). Ninety-five percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 90% 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 2012-2013 - 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 criticizing arguments based on experiences, readings and conversations. Assignment 1: Exploring Children's Literature. Seventy percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 2: Literacy Autobiography (Fall, 2012) 65 percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 3: Literacy Outreach (Fall, 2012) 65 percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 4: Good Writes (Spring, 2013) 60 percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 5: Multimodal Compositions (Spring, 2013) 75 percent of students mastered indicator 3, 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 2012-2013 - 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. Sixty-five percent of students mastered indicator 4, aligned specifically with Outcome 3. Assignment 2: Literacy Autobiography (Fall 2012 assignment only). Fifty-nine percent of students mastered indicator 4, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 3: Literacy Outreach (Fall 2012 assignment only). Sixty percent of students mastered indicator 4, aligned specifically with Outcome 3. Assignment 4: Good Writes (Spring 2013 assignment only) ninety percent of students mastered indicator 4, aligned specifically with Outcome 3. Assignment 5: Multimodal Composition/Freedom Composers (Spring 2013 assignment only) eighty-eight percent of students mastered indicator 4, aligned specifically with Outcome 3.

### 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
GUMS (Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style) Mentoring
CTW Support for Instructors and Consultants

We plan to continue holding formal training workshops for CTW consultants. Additionally, as new faculty teach CTW courses, we plan to mentor them through the CTW process of designing assignments and providing feedback alongside the CTW consultants so the instructors and consultants may better work together.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Formal workshops will be held at the beginning of the semester and middle of the semester. A reflection session will occur at the end of each semester to better understand the strengths and needs of consultants and instructors during the course.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassadors
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

GUMS (Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style) Mentoring
The BSE offers voluntary supplemental instruction consisting of face-to-face one hour meetings and online modules over the course of one semester. The instruction is offered by an instructor who was also a former CTW consultant for the ECE BSE program. During these one hour sessions, the GUMS instructor supports students to meet the measures identified above with a specific focus on developing as writers and teachers of writing.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Measure for Early Childhood Education BSE CTW Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement | Recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments based on experiences, readings, and conversations

**Implementation Description:** Five, one-hour face-to-face sessions in which the students continue to practice and reflect upon specific grammar, usage, mechanics, and style techniques within the context of their own writing.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**Responsible Person/Group:** BSE Writing Support 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?**

The ECE BSE Program was successful in securing a full-time Clinical Assistant Professor position to support our students writing development. This position was designed due to CTW work and faculty members’ reflections on how CTW consultant support was seminal to the growth of BSE students confidence and self-identity as writers. We were thrilled to transition this writing support position to a full time position to better accommodate our students’ writing development.

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

Initially, students were often uncomfortable with having the freedom and space to write in a variety of genres and modalities. Because they were consistently getting feedback (audio, face-to-face, and written) on their writing, they became empowered to use writing a space for critical thinking and creative exploration.

**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 a better pool of CTW consultants to draw from. Because the BSE focuses on students as writers as well as the teaching of young student writers, we need CTW consultants who better align with our philosophy.

**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 ECE BSE Program was successful in securing a full-time Clinical Assistant Professor position to support our students writing development. This position was designed due to CTW work and faculty members’ reflections on how CTW consultant support was seminal to the growth of BSE students confidence and self-identity as writers. We were thrilled to transition this writing support position to a full time position to better accommodate our students’ writing development. The full-time Assistant Professor has helped the BSE faculty better understand our students as critical thinkers and writers across the curriculum.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Early Childhood Education (Birth through Five)**

**As of:** 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Birth to Five program in the Department of Early Childhood Education considers critical thinking to be an important aspect of teacher education. We 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 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 relate 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 understanding 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.
2.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
3.0 Students effectively evaluate, make decisions, and apply evidence to support stance.

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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 2: Professional/Ethical Quick Write Rubric

Criteria Excellent (2 points) Satisfactory (1 points) Unsatisfactory (0-5 points)

Purpose Fully reflects on the issue/critically discusses the dilemma posed Reasonably reflects on the issue/generally discusses the dilemma posed Surface treatment of the issue at hand and/or failure to address dilemma/problems posed Support & Citations Strong use of course-related texts to support stance; uses citations appropriately Statements drawn from readings are over generalized or under analyzed; uses citations haphazardly Unjustified assumptions and/or opinions; little evidence that class topics/texts are understood; lack of citations or incorrect citations Evidence Uses specific examples and/or strategies to support stance An example or strategy was provided in support of stance No examples or strategies used to support stance Communication & Reader Engagement Easy to read; avoids meaningless jargon; writer clearly wants to engage reader Some errors make it harder to read; writer sometimes shows awareness of reader Errors make reading difficult; writer shows no awareness of reader and makes no attempt to engage reader's interest Inquiry & Flexibility Considers complex alternatives; creatively applies ideas to new situations Differing views are considered; same evidence ideas are applied to new situations Other views are not understood or considered; does not apply ideas to new situations

Total Score: /10

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

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; same evidence 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
Emergent Language and Literacy Philosophy Evaluation

Student performance on this objective was high for the first semester of implementation. The utilization of class time and the opportunity to receive feedback on drafts assisted students in thinking and writing about their emergent literacy and language development. Additionally, scaffolds, or teacher and program supports, for students as they completed their CTW assignments. These scaffolds focus on (1) content and mechanics of their writing.

Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophy

During the 2012 academic year, we focused our attention on examining how our student outcomes (i.e., the quality of work our students were producing in their CTW courses and assignments) were related to the nature of the writing assignments, rubrics, and the time and support we gave students to revise their writing. Although we believe students were making considerable progress in their ability to use critical thinking in their writing, based upon our discussions and goals for last year, we still feel that our students should be making greater progress in their writing (in both content and form) during their two CTW courses. After meeting as a faculty and examining the CTW materials for both courses, we determined that we needed to make some changes to courses in order to ensure that our students have sufficient time and support in their writing. These changes were related to our challenges discussed in our 2011-2012 report and a result of our action plans. Specifically, we adjusted the amount of support we offered students in the summer, BRFV 4370 course, and we developed additional materials and assignments supports for the BRFV 3250 course. As a result of these changes, we believe that we have made considerable progress toward improving clarity and impact of our CTW goals during 2012-2013. 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 (BRFV 4370) and the Professional Development and Ethics (BRFV 3250) courses and by providing students with additional faculty initiated supports to assist them in improving the clarity, content and mechanics of their writing. Our final accomplishment this year was to design and implement a number of additional scaffolds, or teacher and program supports, for students as they completed their CTW assignments. These scaffolds focus on (1) providing additional instruction and support to students about the mechanics of academic writing, with specific attention to how to build an argument and cite sources academically, and (2) allowing students additional opportunities to give and receive peer feedback through in class discussions and small group work.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

During the 2012 academic year, we focused our attention on examining how our student outcomes (i.e., the quality of work our students were producing in their CTW courses and assignments) were related to the nature of the writing assignments, rubrics, and the time and support we gave students to revise their writing. Although we believe students were making considerable progress in their ability to use critical thinking in their writing, based upon our discussions and goals for last year, we still feel that our students should be making greater progress in their writing (in both content and form) during their two CTW courses. After meeting as a faculty and examining the CTW materials for both courses, we determined that we needed to make some changes to courses in order to ensure that our students have sufficient time and support in their writing. These changes were related to our challenges discussed in our 2011-2012 report and a result of our action plans. Specifically, we adjusted the amount of support we offered students in the summer, BRFV 4370 course, and we developed additional materials and assignments supports for the BRFV 3250 course. As a result of these changes, we believe that we have made considerable progress toward improving clarity and impact of our CTW goals during 2012-2013. 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 (BRFV 4370) and the Professional Development and Ethics (BRFV 3250) courses and by providing students with additional faculty initiated supports to assist them in improving the clarity, content and mechanics of their writing. Our final accomplishment this year was to design and implement a number of additional scaffolds, or teacher and program supports, for students as they completed their CTW assignments. These scaffolds focus on (1) providing additional instruction and support to students about the mechanics of academic writing, with specific attention to how to build an argument and cite sources academically, and (2) allowing students additional opportunities to give and receive peer feedback in their writing. We believe these two changes will allow students to more critically reflect on their writing practices.

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?

During the 2012-2013 academic year, improvement in student critical thinking through writing was evident in both the quality of student work, during the semester and student improvement from year to year. For example, BRFV students considerably improved the quality of their work from first drafts to final drafts on their BRFV 4370, Emergent Literacy, Language, and Philosophy paper. For example, students significantly improved their Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophies during the redrafting process with students, on average, increasing the quality of their writing by 47% points. This increase was slightly higher than last year’s increase and students’ ended the semester with higher scores than last year’s group. In BRFV 3250, learning was evident in students’ responses to the Professional and Ethical Practice Quick Write assignments. These assignments, in response to specific ethical and professional dilemma prompts, allow students opportunities to revise and redraft their work three times during a week’s time. Students made significant progress from first drafts to final drafts, as evidenced by 94% of students achieving assessment targets (a 9 out of 10) on the quick write assignments on their final drafts. This is a 4% increase from last years report. In addition to change over time in students’ performance on CTW assignments, course instructors in non CTW courses noted that students demonstrated improvement in their critical thinking and writing. Although concerns still exist about the overall quality of students' critical thinking and writing, these anecdotal data are encouraging as they help to reinforce the notion that students may be transferring what they are learning through their CTW courses into other coursework. During the last academic year, BRFV faculty met to discuss additional opportunities for students to practice critical thinking through writing in other BRFV courses. We continue to brainstorm and implement programs and supports in order to help students develop critical thinking through writing skills.

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

As a result of significant changes made to CTW assignments in 2011-2012, we spent time in 2012-2013 studying these changes and discussing their impact on student learning outcomes. Because BRFV 4370: Language, Literacy, and Cognition is a summer course,
one challenge we continue to struggle with is the limited time that students have for practicing, thinking about, and revising their writing. The shortened time frame of the summer semester also makes it challenging for faculty to give quick enough feedback to students to assist them in improving their writing. To address this challenge, peer editing and feedback were incorporated into the BTFV 4370 course. Students were placed into “peer writing support” groups designed to give them additional accountability, insight, and practice into their own and other students’ writing. Peer writing support groups appeared to be effective for many students in that they demonstrated quite a bit of growth, and increased understanding of the writing process, based upon experiences they had while reviewing other students’ work and/or being able to provide feedback. Students shared with the instructor that this experience helped them consider new perspectives, provided an opportunity to consider ways to integrate emergent literacy and language theory into their writing, and allowed them to make strong personal connections between their teaching, research, and their writing. For many students, this awareness was applied to their final CTW draft via the addition of details, relevant personal experiences, and the incorporation of academic resources. Despite these experiences, not all students made considerable improvement in their CTW drafts. A few students did not appear to make a significant shift in their writing. In response to this challenge, additional class time and out-of-class writer’s workshop time & support will be offered to all students, particularly those that don’t seem to be improving considerably between CTW drafts. In addition, a checklist will be created to assist students in the peer review process. This checklist will align with the rubrics currently in use in the course to evaluate student CTW work and will give students to self-reflect on their writing as well as reflect on the quality of other students’ work. It is believed that these changes will improve the quality of students’ drafting and editing process which, in turn, should strengthen their final drafts. Different challenges face students CTW work in BRFV 3250. Professional and Ethical Practice Quick Writes (BRFV 3250). As this is the first CTW course that the majority of students take, instructors have shared concern about the quality of writing and editing that students demonstrate upon entrance to the course. Although students demonstrate considerable improvement on critical thinking through writing activities during the course, concerns remain regarding the general writing abilities of students. As a BRFV faculty, we believe that students need (1) additional attention to and instruction about college writing and (2) opportunities to align CTW assignments with coursework and field experiences. In response to these concerns, we have recently revised BRFV 3250 quickwrite prompts to more effectively address course content and students’ field experiences. In addition, we plan to address CTW related content in other courses, particularly students’ first few courses, to build student knowledge of ethical writing practices (e.g., plagiarism) and how to write for an academic audience (e.g., mechanics, APA citations, etc.).

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

The BRFV CTW courses have been essential to our implementation of pedagogical practices that contribute to the critical thinking, writing skills, and dispositions that we expect a teacher of young children to possess. CTW has impacted the way that we think about student development and achievement and has helped us reshape our assessment practices to focus on timely, explicit, and objective feedback. For example, as noted earlier in this report, we have revised assignments and faculty supports to more explicitly address CTW goals and objectives. Further, we have developed opportunities for students to use self-reflection and peer critique in their CTW writing. Although these practices require a significant investment of time from CTW instructors, as they provide additional support and out of class support to students, we believe that the impact of these practices out weigts the cost. An additional instructional/intervention support that we emphasized this academic year was to provide students with more explicit information on correct citation of sources during writing activities and additional information regarding plagiarism. This module, developed by two co-instructors from BRFV 3250 has assisted us in being more explicit regarding ethical writing practices and plagiarism considerations. This information is crucial in assisting our students in developing critical thinking skills about the nature of information and how to effectively, and appropriately, utilize such resources, particularly as they gain more access to online resources that may or may not be trustworthy. One final practice that we plan to implement in the coming year is to tie student submissions to a self-assessment of their critical thinking through writing tools. We, as a Birth through Five faculty, highly value student self-assessment practices and believe that students will improve the nature of their CTW assignments if they are given opportunities to reflect on how their writing relates to the rubrics provided them. To this end, we will provide students with self-assessment checklists that align with CTW rubrics that will help guide student writing and redrafting. We plan to study the utility of these checklists in the coming year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Econ
(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 help them develop their critical thinking skills. The CTW components, embedded in problem sets for ECON 3900 and a book review and quizzes in ECON 4999, require the students to assess and evaluate concepts in economics as they relate to the real world and to be able to recognize (1) how economic theory relates to policy and (2) how many classical assumptions in economics do not apply in reality yet can still be a useful point of departure.

Goals
G 1: relate economic theory to policy
Students will recognize how economic theory relates to policy.

G 2: relevance of classical assumptions in economics
Students will recognize the relevance of classical assumptions in economics, and how they may not apply in reality yet can still be a useful point of departure.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: ECON 4999: Book Review (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Assignment 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 rate the drafts and the final report based on the rubric (on a scale of 1 – 4) Assessment There two critical thinking components embedded in the book review assignment: Economic Concepts: this requires students to read a (mostly) non-economics book and be able to recognize and tie-in at least two economic concepts. For example, if a student reviews a novel where a character had to make a tough choice, the student should be able to recognize opportunity cost/trade-offs as a relevant economic concept. Another common concept relates to the role of incentives – where rewards or penalties changed behavior. Valid own opinion: the component of the assignment requires a student to provide a valid opinion about the book. This is not about whether they enjoyed reading the book, but more of “why they enjoyed or didn’t enjoy reading the book”. Students are also expected to write about any lessons we can take from the book, and how relevant the story is to contemporary life, etc.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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
Targets (the first two of these targets are solely based on the final paper) At least 80 percent of students score a rating of 3 (out of 4) or better on the “economic concepts” component of the assignment. At least 80 percent of students score a rating of 3 (out of 4) or better on the “valid own opinion” component of the assignment. From the first draft to the final paper, there should be a significant improvement of at least 50 percent in the number of students scoring a rating of at least 3 (out of 4) on the two CTW components of the assignment – “economic concepts” and “valid own opinion”.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Targets met? We met target 1: 90 percent of the students scored a rating of at least 3 on the “economic concepts” component of the assignment - thus exceeded the target of 80 percent. We met target 2: 86 percent of students scored a rating of 3 or better on the “own opinion” component of the assignment. We partially met target 3: We observe a significant improvement on the critical thinking components of the assignment between the first draft and the final paper. The percentage of students that scored a rating of 3 (or better) on the “economic concepts” component of the assignment increased by 47.5 percent. Although this falls short of the 50 percent target, it’s evident that the feedback provided on the first and second drafts helped students’ critical thinking through writing skills. The percentage of students scoring a rating of 3 (or better) on the “valid opinion” component of the assignment increased by 168.75 percent between the first draft and the final paper. This way exceeds the 50 percent target. See the attached file for a graphical representation of the findings.

M 2: ECON 3900 Short Assignment 1 Rubric (O: 2)
Respond to prompts about applications of macroeconomic theory. See attachment for rubric used to assess such an assignment.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target for O2: ECON 3900 Short Assignment**

Students should show improvement from the first draft to the second draft of the assignment.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Coming soon! :)

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

**incorporate Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) elements into two required major courses**

The economics department plans to incorporate Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) elements into the following two required major courses: ECON 3900 (Macroeconomics) and ECON 4999 (Senior Capstone in Economic Policy). The CTW components, embedded in problem sets for ECON 3900 and a book review and quizzes in ECON 4999, require the students to assess and evaluate concepts in economics as they relate to the real world and to be able to recognize (1) how economic theory relates to policy and (2) how many classical assumptions in economics do not apply in reality yet can still be a useful point of departure. All CTW assignments will be redone after students incorporate the feedback they have been given by the instructor.

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

**Set more specific targets and establish more formal assessment reporting procedures**

Formal targets were not set this year. There were many different instructors for ECON 3900, and each of them had slightly different approaches to working CTW into their course, although all of them were appropriately working it into their course in some way. The ECON 4999 has more consistency across sections in terms of which specific assignments are done and how they are reported. More discussion needs to take place to set specific targets and more formal assessment reporting procedures for the ECON 3900 course across all sections.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Meet with all ECON 3900 instructors to discuss.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassadors and ECON 3900 instructors

**working with CTW consultants**

Several CTW instructors have expressed concern about the ability of CTW consultants to provide good and clear feedback to students on CTW assignments. Often times their comments on assignments are not clear or are written in a way that does not encourage students’ critical thinking. But even more concerning for Economics CTW instructors is that they don’t get to keep the same CTW consultant for more than a few semesters (at best). Most of our CTW consultants are Masters students (often in their second year). So going forward, we need to think about the most effective ways to train consultants so that instructors do not have to train a new consultant every semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Training workshops for CTW consultants. We are encouraged by the University CTW Office’s plans to conduct training workshops for CTW consultants.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Economics CTW ambassadors, economics department administration, GSU CTW office

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** meet with ECON 3900 instructors to discuss plans for assessment in future
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** undergraduate program committee, CTW ambassadors, ECON 3900 instructors

**change ECON 4999 course**

We have plans to revise the ECON 4999 course to allow for a more flexible format which should allow more instructors to teach the course. This should help with the excess demand we usually have for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** ECON Undergraduate Program Committee

**keep working for more consistency in ECON 3900**

We have several different instructors for ECON 3900 and the quantity and quality of assessment data we get from them is highly variable. We need to work with them to gather more useful assessment data from them all on a more consistent basis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** ECON 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?
We had no new instructors for ECON 3900, which is helpful for the instructor turnover we have experienced in that course in the past, and was part of our action plan from last year. We still need to work on getting more consistent high quality assessment data reporting from the course instructors.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
We saw marked improvement from earlier to later drafts and final products on the book reviews in ECON 4999 this assessment cycle. See the findings section of the report for more detail.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
We still need to work with ECON 3900 instructors to get better assessment data reported for that 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?
More students and faculty are familiar with the goals of the CTW program. We have plans to revise the ECON 4999 course so that more instructors might get involved with teaching it. While core components of the course will remain consistent across sections, we will allow each section to have a particular theme to it (e.g., poverty, urban/housing econ, behavior econ, etc.) Instructors can focus on the content in their own area of focus and students can self-select into the themes that interest them most. We are piloting this format for the first time in fall 2013.
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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 others 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
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 100% of all students to show competency with textual engagement; minimal competency means they will score a 2 or higher on our rubric scale. We expect 75% of all 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In all courses except one, 75% or more students scored a 3 or 4 in this category. In 4330, 100% of students scored a 3 or 4. While only 70% of students scored a 3 or 4 in the 4310a course, our CTW courses saw, on average, a 7% increase in the number of 3s and 4s otherwise. In 50% of our CTW courses, students scored a higher or the same percentage of 4s. The overall trend, then, is for an increase in engagement with ideas, despite the dip in higher scores in one senior seminar. We believe this finding reflects our focus on engagement with ideas in our workshops and in the refined rubric we used this year.

**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).

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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Three of our CTW courses saw an increase on average of 11% of students earning 3s and 4s. In 4330, 100% of students earned a 3 or 4 in this area. In 4310a and 4300, the percentage of students scoring 3 or 4 dropped below our target of 75%, to 63% and 72% respectively. Scores of 4 increased from last year’s cycle in 3050, 4320, and 4330. In the other courses, scores of 4 decreased slightly. While higher scores went up in our entry courses (3040 and 3050), our senior seminars saw a decrease in the percentage of students scoring 3 or 4, with an average decrease of 16% (excluding 4330 in which saw a rise of 5%). This is an area in which we saw gains and losses. We find that our revised rubric, which focused our attention on a smaller number of critical thinking categories, may have led to more rigor in assessing particular elements of critical thinking and might explain these decreases. Increased focus on conventions in the senior seminars is part of this trend.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

All of our courses met the target of reaching above 75% of students scoring 3 or 4 in this area except 4310a, which saw 65% of students reaching that goal. We see an average increase of 16% of students scoring 3 or 4 in this area in 3050 and 4300, while 4330 remained steady with 100% of students with higher scores. In our other CTW courses, we see a 9% decrease in the percentage of students earning 3 or 4 compared to last year. The number of students scoring 4 increased in 3050 and 4330 compared to last year. We see increased scores and mastery in some courses, and a slight decrease in these in others. While we have met our overall goals for this area, we would like to trend toward increased mastery for this area of assessment.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All courses met our target of reaching 75% of students earning a 3 or 4 in this area except 4310b with 72%. We see increases of the percentage of students scoring 3 or 4 in the 3040, 3050 and 4320 by 7%, but decreases in the overall percentage of students scoring 3 or 4 in the other courses by an average of 10%. We see increases in scores of 4 in 3050 and 4320. As with conventions, we find that our narrowed rubric created more focus and rigor in the area of effective writing, perhaps leading to the overall decreases we see. While we met our overall goal, we prefer a trend toward increasing scores overall.

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
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Workshops will be scheduled at the beginning of each semester for new faculty, with follow-up meetings of all faculty at the end of each semester.
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
- Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Lopez and Melissa McLeod

Maintain CTW English Website

We created and maintain a departmental CTW website. The site is for students majoring in English and for English instructors. For students, the site provides links to important information on the CTW initiative and identifies English CTW courses. For instructors, the site provides training documents such as the departmental rubric, tips on assignment design, information on assignment submission, etc. The site also contains sample syllabi and assignments. The site has been in use and maintained all year. For the coming year, we will work to transfer the website to the Red Dot platform now being used by the university.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: 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 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.
**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 text
- Demonstrates literary or rhetorical knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Encourage instructors to share assignments that teach students to use conventions effectively in CTW workshops.

*Projected Completion Date: 05/2013*
*Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Lopez*

**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*

**CTW website**

We will continue to maintain the English department’s CTW website to use for updates on changes in the departmental implementation of CTW. We plan to expand it to include an expanded repository for CTW assignments that faculty may access to glean ideas for their own classes.

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
*Priority: High*

**Faculty Workshops**

We continue to offer CTW workshops to all interested faculty, focusing on those actively teaching CTW courses in any given year. These workshops have focused on rubric use, pedagogical strategies for critical thinking, and assignment sharing. We plan to continue regular workshops in the coming year, increasing our attention on assignment design, discipline-specific conventions, and norming around the rubric.

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
*Priority: High*

**Focus on Engagement with Ideas**

We have worked to encourage CTW instructors to focus on idea engagement as they design their courses and assignments, making this one of four areas of focus in the revised rubric. Assignments developed by instructors show robust focus on this area of critical thinking and we met our overall target for this area in the last 2 assessment cycles. In fact, we saw an increase in higher scores this year compared to last, validating the workshops and rubric focus for this year. We will continue to develop assignments in this area, particularly for the creative writing seminars which desire an increase in student mastery.

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
*Priority: High*
Focus on Literary and Rhetorical Conventions

Based on the revised rubric for this year's assessment cycle, we generally met our targets for conventions and expression, although we saw some lower scores particularly in the areas of literary studies and creative writing. We will focus in next year's workshops on improved mastery of conventions and the development of assignments to encourage this focus.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Focus on Reflection

Based on increased focus in this area during this year's assessment cycle, teachers have developed assignments and assessments that address issues of reflection, judgment, and student point of view. While we met our target for this year, we saw small decreases in students' mastery in some courses and want to make this a key focus for the next cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Rubric Revision

The rubric was refined to more clearly address the aspects of critical thinking we desired to measure and was edited to contain fewer assessment criteria. This revised rubric was used for the duration of this year's CTW assessment. Our feedback from instructors indicates that the revised rubric more closely aligned with their own perceptions of critical thinking in their courses and that the editing to focus on four criteria allowed more concentrated teaching and learning on those areas. Teachers are using the streamlined rubric more often to model critical thinking skills on a day-to-day basis in these classrooms. Based on workshop feedback, we may continue in the next cycle to fine tune language for clarity, but the rubric worked well in this assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

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 accomplishments are two: 1) Last year, we strove to refine our assessment rubric; we wanted to continue that project into this year. We succeeded with our rubric refinement and found that faculty were generally pleased with the results, reporting that they found the rubric more closely aligned with their conceptions of critical thinking. 2) We changed our method of faculty reporting midway through last year. In all previous years, we had required faculty to assess online through the WAC assessment website. However, several faculty members have an aversion to assessing online, and the website experienced technical difficulties. The combination of faculty resistance and glitches in the technology led us to ask faculty to fill out Excel spreadsheets instead. We gave them the option to fill them out online or by hand. This change led to much greater faculty satisfaction with the reporting system, leading to greater data reporting and 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?

Because we refined the rubric, we found mixed results in our assessment of student critical thinking. Generally, we saw increases in the gateway classes (3040 & 3050), whereas in the capstone classes, we saw decreases in some categories. We attribute these results to more rigor in faculty's assessments in these capstone courses; we see this increased rigor as a positive sign. It tells us that faculty applying the rubric thoughtfully.

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

We need to address those mixed results that we mentioned in Reflection 2 through continued faculty support through the workshops and assignment sharing. Some faculty reported that they'd like to see more successful CTW assignments, so this is an area where we'd like to develop further.

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 greater the number of faculty who teach CTW courses, the greater an impact we see on the department as a whole. More faculty are seeing this kind of summative assessment as a valuable part of their teaching. As a result, their teaching more surgically targets those skills that students need to improve, leading to more efficient student learning.
**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 defensible 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 of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**
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. Effectively write a complete analysis of the case. Student always applies proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is clear throughout. The composition flows logically from start to finish. Student largely applies proper grammar and sentence structure. There is little difficulty in discerning meaning throughout and the composition has a rational if not ideal structure. Student shows difficulty with proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences occasionally difficult to infer. The structure of the composition is not tight and integrated. Student exhibits poor skills in grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is often difficult to infer. Haphazard organization of the composition

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. Student presents the ability to identify almost all of the relevant data within the case and generates a significant amount of additional meaningful data that is called for (e.g. ratios and similar metrics) Student presents the ability to identify much of the relevant data within the case, and generates some additional data that is called for (e.g. ratios and similar metrics) Student presents a weak ability to separate relevant data from superfluous data and often omits important relevant data. No or very little meaningful additional metrics are generated. Student shows very limited or no ability to separate relevant data from superfluous data and often omits important relevant data. No meaningful additional metrics are generated.

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.

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

Development of Critical Thinking Skills

In reviewing the initial and subsequent case write-ups, and in talking with the students individually when reviewing the initial write-ups, it was clear that students had little idea as to what critical thinking exercises entailed. Although this course is situated as the senior-level CTW class, these students did not have the junior-level CTW class not did they have the core CTW exercises that have been added recently (many did not complete their freshman and sophomore course work at GSU). Thus, unlike students who we hope will matriculate through the entire undergraduate CTW sequence, these students were encountering an explicit CTW approach for the first time in their semester of graduation. Action Plan: Following the 2010-2011 assessment using a more rigorous measure of Critical Thinking skills it is clear that we need to work harder at developing these skills in the course and in the assignment feedback on the case draft. 2012-2013 Actions: In the 2012-2013 cycle Dr. Gemmell assumed responsibility for the CTW initiative in the Entrepreneurship, replacing Kelly Robinson. Dr. Gemmell, working with the CTW ambassador and the Department Chair, redeveloped the course, MGS 4550, Managing a Family Business, to be the 4000-level CTW class. To improve the critical thinking development and feedback of students the course the revised class will add a preparatory CTW case that will precede the for-credit CTW case. By using a different case for the preparatory exercise the faculty members hope to develop critical thinking skills independent of any particular situation and show students how the skills are transferable. This new course will be offered in the fall semester of 2013.

| Established in Cycle: | 2009-2010 |
| Implementation Status: | In-Progress |
| Priority: | High |
| Implementation Description: | See the addendum to the Description for details on the implementation of this Action Plan item that exceeds the space limitation here. |
| Projected Completion Date: | 12/2013 |
| Responsible Person/Group: | Robert Gemmell |
| 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. In the 2013-2014 offerings of the 4000-level Entrepreneurship class, which will be MGS 4550 beginning that semester, a second case will be added to the syllabus that will serve as a preparatory case.

| Established in Cycle: | 2009-2010 |
| Implementation Status: | In-Progress |
| Priority: | High |
| Implementation Description: | In the Spring 2012 offering of the case 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. In Spring 2012 a preparatory case was added to the revised MGS 4550 class, which will be offered as the CTW class for the first time in Fall Semester 2013. |
| Projected Completion Date: | 12/2013 |
| Responsible Person/Group: | Robert Gemmell |
| 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) |

Transfer of 4000-level CTW Class to MGS 4550

During the 2012-2013 cycle the Entrepreneurship faculty changed significantly. Under the new leadership it was decided that the Department of Managerial Sciences could better serve students and deliver the CTW program effectively by changing the course designation from MGS 4650, Small Business Planning to MGS 4550, Managing a Family Business. This course was revised to include...
the CTW requirements. The CTW requirements were improved based on prior findings for the initial offering of MGS 4550 in the fall semester of 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This class will have its initial offering as a CTW class in the Fall Semester of 2013
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Robert Gemmell
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?

There were significant changes in the CTW offering to students in MGS that were concentrating in Entrepreneurship in the 2012-2013 cycle. In prior years the course had been offered by PTIs, while very competent, there was disappointment in the quality student improvement in both critical thinking in writing skills during the 4000-level CTW 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 prior years, based on the assessment findings, the ambassador proposed the addition of an additional exercise prior to the major case the students work on as their primary CTW assignment. That was done initially in the 2011-2012 cycle, following the Action Plan on this point. (In the current cycle the course was not offered.) As part of the revision that shifted the 4000-level CTW course to MGS 4550, the preparatory exercise was expanded to be a separate case write-up. This intention is to show better how critical thinking skills are transferable across contexts as an effective decision making tool. This transition will be completed in the fall of 2013 with the initial offering of this revised CTW 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 largest challenge in the entrepreneurship area has been faculty stability. Turn over in faculty members has led to staffing shortages that, in turn, resulted in PTIs teaching the CTW class in three of the prior cycles and no offering in the current cycle.

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 Entrepreneurship responses to the need for CTW in the undergraduate program has been well received by current faculty members. Recent hires have stabilized the faculty and there was a re-designation of the 4000-level CTW class to a more-regularly offered class. As a result there will be more offerings of the 4000-level CTW class, instruction will by a full-time faculty member, that faculty member will also become the ambassador to the CTW program, and the feedback from the class will be much more easily communicated to the other faculty members in the entrepreneurship area and the larger MGS department. Students easily see how, in their field, the twin abilities to think critically and communicate effectively are important to their success. This is an easy “sell,” it is now incumbent on the faculty to deliver improvement in student skills consistent with the initiative described in the Action Plan of this report.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Film
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 arrive at a consensus about which will be the core CTW practices for each class in the future, and they will also set student performance goals for future semesters (by consensus). The CTW Ambassador will update the assignments, rubrics, and syllabi in the Weave system.

**Source of Evidence:** Discussions / Coffee Talk

**Target for 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of the CTW faculty came to a consensus agreement on a standard grading rubric for Film Theory and Criticism. Achievement targets were established for the 2013-2014 year. Student performance will be monitored and reported in the 2013-2014 Film CTW Weave report.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
64% of the 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
76% of the 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
82% of the 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: Finished
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

Redesign of Project Structure Assignment
The CTW faculty will redesign the project structure assignment for Senior Seminar in Film as a Google form and will assess if the newly designed assignment structure encourages better integration of theoretical material into the writing.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Project proposal: Senior Seminar in Film | Outcome/Objective: Evaluating theoretical arguments about media

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?

During the 2012-2013 academic year, CTW faculty in Film taught 8 sections of Film Theory and Criticism (Film 4750) with a total enrollment of 167 students. The CTW faculty in film concluded a long process of coming to consensus on an assessment rubric for this course. Unlike Senior Seminar in Film (the other CTW course), Film Theory and Criticism is a course with a long history in our department, and the faculty who teach this course have considerable investment in their own distinctive pedagogical approaches. After several iterations, the faculty have arrived at a common rubric, and performance targets for the 2013-14 were set. This completes one portion of the action plan for curriculum development. Progress is well underway on the other portion of the curriculum development action plan item. In the fall, a subcommittee will present a new syllabus for Media Theory and Criticism to the full Film faculty for consideration for inclusion as a CTW alternative to Film Theory and Criticism. This will help "share the load" among CTW faculty, with those who are not specifically trained in the film studies tradition able to teach a CTW course grounded in television and cultural studies. During the 2012-2013 academic year, CTW faculty in Film taught 8 sections of Senior Seminar in Film (Film 4910, the capstone course in film) with a total enrollment of 147 students. 5 faculty members received CTW training and taught CTW classes for the first time.

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?
Both CTW courses in Film are at the 4000 level, so there is not separate assessment points at entry and exit level. There was notable improvement in student performance in the writing assignments for Senior Seminar in Film. 64% of the student assignments were at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level in their integration of theoretical perspectives, up from 42% last year. 76% of the student assignments were at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level in their use of supporting evidence, up from 53% last year. 82% of the student assignments were at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level in their written expression, up from 62% last year.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The CTW faculty remained concerned that not enough students are integrating the theoretical material from the Senior Seminar in Film into their project structure papers. After much discussion, we agreed that the problem was that the project structure paper was unlike any other assignment that students do in our program. The assignment asks students to justify their choices about how they will structure their overall final project; it is essentially a paper about how they will write their final paper (or create their final video). The current assignment simply serves too many different purposes simultaneously, and the integration of theory gets lost in the mix. The CTW faculty agreed to develop a Google form that breaks the assignment down into discrete parts and that requires students to provide a written response to prompts. One of these required prompts will ask the student to explicitly link their project to the theoretical concerns of the class. The CTW faculty hope that this newly redesigned assignment will provide clearer guidance to the student. The CTW faculty created a draft version of the prompts for the Google form, and they will implement this new assignment over the 2013-2014 year. Faculty will meet each semester to discuss the new assignment’s effectiveness and will make changes as needed, with the hope that a final version of the assignment will be approved by the end of the 2013-2014 year. Since the central assignment is being changed, the CTW faculty decided to keep the same performance targets for 2013-2014 as we used in 2012-2013.
CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

We continue to make progress in broadening and deepening our faculty's commitment to the CTW process. Those faculty who teach Film Theory and Criticism are a cohesive group, and we have been engaged in a long bottom-up process of developing an assessment rubric. While this process has been time consuming, it has produced better investment by faculty in the eventual assessment instrument (rather than implementing a top-down assessment method). Another group of faculty has been working together on the Media Theory and Criticism course, which (when adopted into our curriculum) will provide those faculty with more opportunities to take ownership in the CTW process. Students continue to respond well to the draft/feedback/final process of CTW, as the assessment of our Senior Seminar in Film course attests. We are in the process of redesigning the CTW assignment for the course, providing clearer instructions for integrating theory into that assignment.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
Our mission is to teach students to go beyond merely learning finance to applying and properly demonstrating the critical thinking skills of reasonable and reflective financial analysis in order to derive creative solutions to the types of multifaceted problems commonly faced by financial managers in the real world.

Critical thinking:
- Requires intellectual discipline
- Entails rigorous reflection
- Demands open-mindedness

Those who embrace critical thinking learn to appreciate and promote:
- Intellectual humility
- Diligence
- Veracity
- Personal and social responsibility

Business leaders who exhibit these qualities are more apt to find quality solutions to difficult problems.

Upon successful completion of this class, students will know how to apply appropriate financial management theories and practices, including mathematical and statistical analysis, to identify and evaluate business strengths and weaknesses in order to structure and effectively communicate creative policies and solutions, to both lay and professional audiences.

Goals

G 1: Learn financial analysis tools and techniques
Before one can critically analyze the current financial position or forecast the future of a firm, one must first first understand the proper tools and techniques of the trade. Good financial analysis requires understanding how to construct and evaluate cash flow statements, financial ratios, and pro forma financial statements. Students must how to use these tools and they must learn which tools and/or processes to apply to different problems. Only then will they be able to understand a firm's strengths and weaknesses so they can propose viable solutions to address specific weaknesses without negatively impacting business strengths.

G 2: Critically evaluate problem areas and/or situations
Students must learn how to apply financial analysis tools and techniques to both structured as well as unstructured problems. They must consider the nature of the problem and then apply the correct process to identify and assess the most pertinent facts of a case. In addition, they must learn to question in order to discover the "what" and the "why" behind every problem area and/or business situation. We want to teach our students to learn to seek out proof and evidence, from simply verifying the source/validity of the information to determining the difference between speculation and testing to establishing and properly presenting verifiable facts. Critical thinking in finance requires that problems must be approached with an open mind and every attempt must be made 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 3: Propose creative strategies and/or solutions
Financial management ultimately concerns determining how to allocate scarce resources (specifically, money) in order to achieve a specific goal (namely, maximizing shareholder wealth) with due and proper consideration given to all of the firm's other stakeholders (for example, creditors, customers, employees, vendors, suppliers, regulatory agencies and the community). Key in this process is making a decision. Decisions must be well thought out, creative and defensible. Critical thinking is part of the process, but in the realm of financial management, critical thinking by itself is insufficient. Unless critical thinking results in a decision that suggests a creative strategy and/or solution, the time and energy spent on critical thinking is wasted. Therefore, our primary goal in this class is to train students to use critical thinking as a process to develop creative solutions to the type of dynamic problems often encountered
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: In-class Exams (G: 1) (M: 1)**

In-class examinations are the main tools we will use to evaluate whether or not students have learned and understand the tools and techniques of financial analysis. Exams test knowledge of reading assignments and other material covered in class.

**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: CTW Assignment 1 - Writing for Business (G: 1) (M: 2)**

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).

**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 3: CTW Assignment 2 - "Case Name" Business Analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**

Assignments 2 and 3 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.

**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 4: CTW Assignment 3 - "Case Name" Business Analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 4)**

Assignments 2 and 3 are the same assignment applied to 2 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.

**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 5: Group Project - Business Plan (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 5)**
The business plan assignment involves writing a portion (mainly the financial section) of a business plan for an idea that a group of 3-5 students develop for establishing a start-up business. The business idea must solve a common problem that enough people encounter to make the business feasible. Thus, students must identify a business/market problem and propose a creative solution to the problem. One of the most important aspects of the solution (i.e., the proposed company) is that the company must be financially viable, and the viability of the company must be proved using financial methods processes and techniques learned in the course. The business must also be possible, given the knowledge, talents, etc. of the members of the group. Groups develop the plan over the entire semester in phases (a phase is due to the instructor for evaluation and feedback approximately every 3 weeks during the semester). On the last day of class, each group must present their business plan idea to the rest of the class. The class acts as a group of investors who vote whether or not to fund the project. If the project is funded, the group succeeds; if the project is not funded, the group fails. Because the total amount of capital that the class of investors is allowed to invest is limited, some (or perhaps all) groups will fail. Failure is a learning lesson in business; so, a final learning aspect of the project is that if the project fails, more work is necessary to re-craft the idea. Students are asked to brainstorm within the group, potential business ideas that best utilize the abilities, talents, and/or any other unique characteristics of the group. The selection of what business to enter requires considerable thought and involves a group-inventory of skill, knowledge, interests, aptitudes and a parallel examination of the environment to determine where opportunities may exist. Groups are encouraged to seek a good match between what they can offer as a group of entrepreneurs and the need for the good or service their company will deliver to consumers. Student groups are told to select a business that they can enjoy, that they believe they can manage, and that will be profitable for them as well as their investors. MAJOR LIMITATION: The maximum amount of money that the group can raise to start their business is $100,000.

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, 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)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: In-class Exams (O: 1)

There are 2 exams (mid-term exam and final exam) given by instructors during the regular semester. Material learned in the first half of the course provides the foundation for material covered in the second half of the course. Thus, improvement in the class average exam score can be used to assess student progress in understanding the tools and techniques of financial analysis covered in the class.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: In-class Exams

This is the first year that we used class exams as a CTW measure. Because all instructors give separate (and unique) exams, performance between classes cannot (nor should it be) measured. Besides, we were not looking for grades on an exam, but instead evidence that student understanding improved. We are still developing a way to numerically measure this assessment vehicle.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

Although we have yet to agree on a specific way to measure this item, all instructors who reported to the CTW ambassador indicated that they noticed "significant" improvement in the depth of understanding from the first exam to the comprehensive final exam.

M 2: CTW Assignment 1 - Writing for Business (O: 2)

This assignment was scored using the General Rubric for F14020 Assignments. The assignment was evaluated for items 1, 4, 6 and 7. The maximum score possible was 20 and the minimum possible score was 0. We divided the total score by 4 to derive an average score. The average score for all classes that used the assignment was 3.5. Overall, we believe that students enjoyed this assignment and it provided an excellent transition from writing for an English class to writing a good business document. As expected (after reviewing the associated readings), most students clearly identified the key ingredients of good business writing and properly contrasted the principles of good business writing with the principles of good writing that they learned in English composition.

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

Target for O2: CTW Assignment 1 - Writing for Business

The target grade for this assignment was 3.3.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average grade on this assignment across all classes was 3.5. We were very happy with the overall quality of the papers submitted. Student enthusiasm about this assignment was very high and students met/exceeded our expectations in nearly every way. We consider this assignment to be very successful.

M 3: CTW Assignment 2 - "Case Name" Business Analysis (O: 3)

This assignment was graded with the associated rubric. The maximum score was 20. For many students, the first business memo was challenging, mainly because they have never been challenged to critically think in this manner before. All instructors who teach the course are encouraged to provide as much feedback and guidance when grading this assignment as possible. Many devote half of a class period to teaching students the difference between a 20 rubric score paper and a 10 rubric score paper.
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 cases used in the class and case assignments are constantly being changed to remain current to shifting economic and market conditions. Thus, getting faculty to implement CTW in their courses is difficult. It also complicates recruitment of faculty to teach the course. Nonetheless, we will continue to work as best we can to make FI 4020 an effective CTW course. Our chairman is supportive of the program and he continues to work with me to address the issues noted above. We are confident that the writing assignments now developed for the course are sufficiently detailed and effective. Our major challenge moving forward is to rally new faculty to support the approach that we have developed, to develop consistent scoring guidelines and to collect and efficiently evaluate assessment data. Hopefully the data and evaluation we do next year will continue to strengthen the CTW aspect of FI 4020 as well as the overall program within our department.

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 case they use for a given assignment and when during the course they assign the task makes evaluation of the assignment across different classes essentially impossible. I plan to have all assignments completed before the start of the fall semester. FI 4020 is a very full and challenging course to teach without this extra burden. The cases used in the class and case assignments are constantly being changed to remain current to shifting economic and market conditions. Thus, getting faculty to implement CTW in their courses is difficult. It also complicates recruitment of faculty to teach the course. Nonetheless, we will continue to work as best we can to make FI 4020 an effective CTW course. Our chairman is supportive of the program and he continues to work with me to address the issues noted above. We are confident that the writing assignments now developed for the course are sufficiently detailed and effective. Our major challenge moving forward is to rally new faculty to support the approach that we have developed, to develop consistent scoring guidelines and to collect and efficiently evaluate assessment data. Hopefully the data and evaluation we do next year will continue to strengthen the CTW aspect of FI 4020 as well as the overall program within our department.

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 case they use for a given assignment and when during the course they assign the task makes evaluation of the assignment across different classes essentially impossible. I plan to have all assignments completed before the start of the fall semester. FI 4020 is a very full and challenging course to teach without this extra burden. The cases used in the class and case assignments are constantly being changed to remain current to shifting economic and market conditions. Thus, getting faculty to implement CTW in their courses is difficult. It also complicates recruitment of faculty to teach the course. Nonetheless, we will continue to work as best we can to make FI 4020 an effective CTW course. Our chairman is supportive of the program and he continues to work with me to address the issues noted above. We are confident that the writing assignments now developed for the course are sufficiently detailed and effective. Our major challenge moving forward is to rally new faculty to support the approach that we have developed, to develop consistent scoring guidelines and to collect and efficiently evaluate assessment data. Hopefully the data and evaluation we do next year will continue to strengthen the CTW aspect of FI 4020 as well as the overall program within our department.

CTW Assignment 4

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 case they use for a given assignment and when during the course they assign the task makes evaluation of the assignment across different classes essentially impossible. I plan to have all assignments completed before the start of the fall semester. In mid-August, I will meet with all instructors who will be teaching FI 4020 in the fall to discuss the new assignments and associated rubrics. I also plan to collect rubric grades throughout the semester instead of waiting to the end of the term to collect this data. If I do not receive data for an assignment from an instructor, I will meet with the instructor to stress the importance of all sections of FI 4020 giving the same CTW assignments and grading in a similar manner.

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

### Assessment vehicle being investigated

We are developing a rubric to measure the depth of knowledge based on question types that are similar from the mid-term to the final exam. As students learn more, they should be able to demonstrate their depth of knowledge in two ways: (1) choosing the correct process or analysis technique to apply to an unstructured problem and, (2) applying multiple analysis techniques to similar problems.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** In-class Exams  
- **Outcome/Objective:** In-class Exams

**Implementation Description:** We plan to have this rubric in place for the 2013-14 academic year.

**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2013

### 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 made SIGNIFICANT changes to the CTW aspect of our course. We began by rethinking our mission statement. As previously written, we realized that our statement was more of a definition than a mission. Therefore, we completely rewrote the CTW mission statement for FI 4020 as follows: Our mission is to teach students to go beyond merely learning financial tools and techniques, to apply and properly demonstrating the critical thinking skills of responsible and reflective financial analysis in order to derive creative solutions to the types of multifaceted problems commonly faced by financial managers in the real world. A more precise statement concerning our guiding CTW principle is: Critical thinking: • Requires intellectual discipline • Demands open-mindedness Those who embrace critical thinking learn to appreciate and promote: • Intellectual humility • Veracity • Social responsibility Business leaders who exhibit these qualities are more apt to find quality solutions to difficult problems. Upon successful completion of this class, students will know how to apply appropriate financial management theories and practices, including mathematical and statistical analysis, to identify and evaluate business strengths and weaknesses in order to structure and effectively communicate creative policies and solutions, both to lay and professional audiences. After rewriting our mission statement, we realized that our prior goals were no longer valid. In addition, our prior goals were too many and too vague. Moving forward, the goals of FI 4020 are to encourage and guide students to: 1. Learn financial analysis tools and techniques. 2. Critically evaluate problem areas and/or situations. 3. Propose creative strategies and/or solutions. A major outcome is that we desire to accomplish in this class is to give students the critical thinking tools in financial analysis that they need so that they can develop creative solutions and/or propose creative strategies. Although we understand the importance of critical thinking, thinking in business must go further. All individuals think in a critical manner about a problem. The depth of the critical thinking, however, often depends on the knowledge level of the individual concerning the problem. But merely using tools to think about a problem does not produce change. Critical thinking must produce some sort of proposal representing a solution to the problem. And the more creative the solution, the better – especially in the world of business, where competition is fierce and often the only true differentiator is the level of uniqueness and/or creativity of the solution. In many ways, we actually restarted our CTW initiative this year. I am confident that our new mission statement will form a solid foundation upon which we can build in future years. These annual reviews are good because our review from last year made it clear to us of some aspects of the program and course that needed attention. One of those was to have the CTW ambassador (me) teach the course during the year. Indeed, the single most important change that occurred this year was that I taught sections of the course in both the spring and summer and I am slated to teach the course at least next fall. Having me involved teaching the class keeps me also involved in working with other department faculty to experiment with and implement changes to the course that follow the CTW goals that we now have in place.

#### 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 believe that our new mission statement, goals and assignments will lead to significant improvements in student critical thinking in our course. We observed improvements in the few assignments which we used in previous years and for which we already had rubrics. We are developing assessment rubrics and processes for the new assignments in the course that we are certain will help us better measure and monitor progress in the future. General observations from this year indicate that we are on the right track (or, at least on a better path than we travelled over the past two years). Students demonstrated improvement in the area of applying learned tools and techniques to problems as the course progressed. And our experience with the initial group business plan project is very encouraging. Students displayed a high level of enthusiasm for the entire project, but in particular for the final presentations, as well as critiques of those presentations. We are confident that we will make significant progress this summer and next fall on figuring out how to best assess student progress in critical and creative thinking as demonstrated over the entire term in the group project.

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

We need to develop good assessment rubrics and/or plans for the in-class exams. As stated in the explanation of this assessment vehicle being investigated, we do not want to merely think of grades on an exam as assessment of learning or critical thinking. We believe that we can extract meaningful measures of the depth of understanding and analysis from student answers, if we develop good grading rubrics. Another area that needs development is the assessment rubric and/or plans for the group project business plan. We are confident that the project itself and the instructions for the project are now well vetted. Once we have an assessment process in place, we are confident that the entire project (which spans the whole semester, culminating in a final presentation to the rest of the class) will provide us with multiple time points during the semester (in fact, about once every 3 weeks) to measure progress as well as to provide meaningful feedback and direction. In past years, my main complaint about CTW in the finance department has been that I was not teaching the course. That problem was remedied this past academic year. I taught the CTW course in the spring and I am scheduled to teach again in the fall. When I am teaching the class, I am better able to work with other instructors to develop the CTW...
CTW has had a very significant and positive impact on our program, students and faculty. As more faculty buy into the CTW initiative in the department's CTW course, there has been increased discussion about critical thinking in general. This year's rewriting of the course's CTW mission statement and goals, has encouraged significant discussions, among even non-CTW faculty, concerning the relationship between critical and creative thinking in finance. Our students are benefiting from this discussion with course and assignment revisions. Overall, all parties involved are benefiting from the CTW initiative. The main change our department made since the last CTW Assessment Report relates to faculty scheduling. I am now teaching the department's CTW course on a regular basis and the others who teach the course are being scheduled to teach the course on a more consistent basis. Stabilizing the faculty who teach the course will only make the CTW initiative in the department stronger. The group who are consistently teaching the class is now meeting and talking more frequently and we are working in a more coordinated manner on CTW assignment as well as assessment rubrics and processes.

**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 to the CTW mission statement and goals are now leading to revisions in learning outcomes, measures and targets in the overall program. The changes were made in response to feedback received from the committee that reviewed last year's CTW report. We will continue to revise assignments in the course, as well as in related courses and programs, through this year in order to improve the overall assessment process during 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.

Currently the data collected and analyzed has had little if any impact on the department's educational degree program. The main reason for this lack of impact is that we are still working on developing assessment rubrics that can be used by more faculty and for other courses. Still, because the CTW course in the department is a required course that students must take early in their degree program, the critical and creative thinking skills that students develop in FI 4020 will soon be displayed in higher level elective courses. As we develop more general and useful assessment processes, we believe other faculty will use these to continue emphasizing the importance of critical and creative thinking in their courses, particularly to those not designated as a CTW course. Our overall hope is that all courses in the finance curriculum, along with all faculty and students, will benefit from the lessons that we are learning in this annual CTW assessment process.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW French**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**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 that are specific to the French-speaking world.

**Goals**

**G1: 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, including comparative components.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
In 2012-2013, the target was once again partially met, as only one course reached the target of 80% or more of students being rated at least 4 on the rubric (FREN 4103, spring 2013). The figures for that course are impressive: for the second assignment, 100% reached the target of a rating of 4 on the rubric. In the 3033 course, for the first assignment, 84% of the students reached the target but only 42% for the second assignment. The results are surprising because the first assignment was a text commentary, where students usually have more difficulties in writing, whereas the second was an essay question, which is usually easier for them. The instructor teaching the course explained this discrepancy: for the first assignment, the CTW rating was obtained from an entire draft (vs a detailed outline, which is what we do in French for the first phase), whereas for the second assignment, the CTW rating for the first phase was obtained from the detailed outline of the first phase only. In her report the instructor concluded that the linguistic component of the CTW penalized students who do not possess strong linguistic abilities (two sections of the rubric judge the critical thinking of students in the target language). Although those figures (see table Findings 1) seem to be unsatisfactory at first sight, when one compares the results from assignment 1 to assignment 2, the CTW improvement if students is obvious. For FREN4123 for example, 44% of students made a 4 for the first assignment whereas 81% reached that score for the second assignment, which shows the success of the CTW initiative in French. In 2012-2013 it was the first time that all instructors teaching CTW courses should report to the Ambassador with all students names, so that he could keep track of their progress throughout the CTW courses. During that time, only four students took the entire sequence of CTW courses, one in fall 2012 and one in spring 2013. See table Findings 2 listing all their ratings in those two courses: three of the four students made a real progress, one being really impressive (a major progress); this student graduated this semester and has already been accepted in our graduate program. The other student does not seem to be interested in the CTW exercise, and did not do any of the two CTW phases for the second assignment in the second course. There are still too many students that do not participate in the exercise and do not do all assignments: 2 in 2 courses, 3 in one course and 4 in another course. These students are not included within the percentages, as we decided last year.

#### M 2: Written papers (O: 1)
In civilization 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

### CTW Reflection Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**
Four CTW courses were taught: FREN3033 in fall 2012 and spring 2013, FREN4123 in fall 2012 and FREN4013 in spring 2013. Two new faculty members were trained to teach CTW courses and taught them (one in fall 2012, one in spring 2013).

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Goals

Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking is defined as “a wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” (Bassham, G., Irwin, W. Nordone, H., & Wallace, J., 2005. Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill, page 1.). For both geography and geology, critical thinking involves the ability to recognize and evaluate truth claims, synthesize different approaches to knowledge/scientific findings, and articulate coherent and logical arguments.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 18 students in the course, 15 students completed both assignments. Of those 15 students, 12 received an average of 4 on each element of the rubric for the final paper assignment, which is 80% of those who completed the assignment. Thirteen of the 15 demonstrated improvement between the two assignments, and two students received the same scores for the first paper to the last.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Sixteen students completed both the first synthesizing paragraph assigned and the final one. From the first set of assignments, 11 of the 16 students achieved a 26 or better on the seven combined elements. For the final paragraph, 16 of 19, or 84% of students achieved a 26 or better. All 16 students improved in their scoring from the first paragraph submission to the last.

M 2: Term Paper Rubric (O: 3, 4)
Please see the attached Term Paper Rubric for Geology of Georgia
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Research Project
80% of students would achieve at least a total rubric score of 20 (an average of 4 or better for each of the five elements) for draft 1 and draft 2. Ideally 80% of students would improve from draft 1 to draft 2.

Target for O4: Group Research Project
80% of students' assessment scores should equal or exceed 20, which represents working understanding of the rubric elements. 80% of students should improve from the first draft of the assignment to the final draft.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 30 students who completed the first and final drafts of the assignment, 29 achieved a score of 20 or above on the final draft. Twenty-seven of the 30 students improved from the first draft to the second; one student received the same score, and two students received lower scores on the final assignment.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
A new instructor taught the course for spring 2013 and did not define the specific goals associated with the assignment. He did, however, provide a rubric and a summary of the scores students achieved on the final submission of their term paper.

### 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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Paper Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Synthesizing Paragraphs

#### Strengthen curriculum for Urban Geography
In order to facilitate meeting the CTW goals for the urban geography course, the instructor will strengthen her curriculum to include more explicit teaching on various components of writing, providing more examples to students. She will make a more demonstrated effort to articulate clearly the strengths and weaknesses of the reflection papers that the students turn in so that they may learn from their own writing experiences. Throughout the semester, she will schedule one-on-one conferences with students to discuss their writing strengths and weaknesses.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Paper Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Reflection paper

#### Strengthen focus on structure of research paper
The instructor will focus her efforts on improving students’ understanding of the component parts of a research paper, which include identifying a problem, articulating an argument, identifying (and justifying) methods and data, and analyzing data and drawing conclusions.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Final Paper Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Research Project

#### Writing skills course
The instructor plans to devote several class periods to focus on critical thinking skills with less emphasis on technical writing skills.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Terminated
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Final Paper Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Research Project

#### Action plan for Urban Geography
The instructor has relied on individual feedback on reflection papers. 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
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Paper Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Reflection paper

  **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2011
  **Responsible Person/Group:** The CTW instructor

#### 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.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Paper Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Synthesizing Paragraphs

  **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2012
  **Responsible Person/Group:** The CTW instructor

#### 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.

Senior Seminar Action Plan
The CTW ambassador will conduct training sessions with the new CTW instructor (who was unavailable for training during spring 2013).

Urban geography action plan
The instructor spent more time explaining the writing process, the rubric, and the expectations for the CTW assignment during fall 2012. Students seemed to respond well and improved significantly on their assignments. The instructor will again devote similar classroom time for the fall 2013 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 major achievements for 2012-2013 were that in three of the four CTW courses for the department, our CTW goals were met. Instructors spent more time in the classroom explaining assignments, offering feedback to students, and the rubric scores improved. We followed through with our action plans for these 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?

We have not been able to discern much improvement, because often students take these courses either simultaneously or just one semester apart. What we have noted, however, is improvement during courses, as instructors are working more carefully during the semester to facilitate students' writing skills.

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

The Department of Geosciences will have new B.A. and B.S. degrees in Geosciences starting fall 2013. In addition, the department has a new chair. These changes likely mean that the curriculum for the degrees will be carefully scrutinized, and along with possible curriculum changes, the CTW courses may be changed and/or streamlined. I anticipate working with the CTW coordinator and the faculty to create and implement changes to the department's CTW 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?

It is unclear to me what the impact of CTW on our academic program has been. From my understanding, most professors already included writing-intensive exercises in their courses. Now, perhaps, students are more aware of the explicit goal of developing critical thinking through writing skills. The only change to the CTW program in our department is that a new instructor taught one of the CTW courses.

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 not made changes since last year--but we did implement our action plans to spend more time in the classroom discussing writing and critical thinking skills, which seems to have been effective. I plan to hold workshops with the CTW instructors during the 2013-2014 year to review the rubrics, targets, and measures with the CTW 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.

Our new degree program will likely take precedent over CTW findings. That is, we will be reviewing carefully the curricula for the B.A. and B.S. degrees, streamlining learning outcomes and objectives for our degrees, and incorporating CTW assignments and classes in a more intentional way.
projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

Our new degree programs may pose challenges for us in terms of refining the curricula for our B.A. and B.S. degrees.

---
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### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of German speakers, to promote their interest and involvement in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation and other areas. 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 = Auseinandersetzungsvermögen (Discussion/Debate/Looking into a subject + capacity/ability/assets/means). In terms more specific to the German major, the assignments in our CTW courses will enable students to gain a better understanding of literary and – more broadly – cultural and historical trends in the German-speaking world, and equip students with the tools necessary to query their intellectual and personal positions with respect to the long and complex tradition of Germanic cultural production, which at times intersects with other traditions with which students may be familiar, and at times diverges from them. Ultimately, students in our CTW courses will be able to comprehend German texts within their cultural, intellectual, and historical contexts, and engage these texts in ways that are both intellectually rigorous and personally meaningful. The challenge unique to CTW in a foreign language is the rigorous task of interpretation and evaluation in a non-native context of imperfectly mastered grammar and syntax and a 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

**G 1: 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. 5. Students will achieve the linguistic register to demonstrate both verbally and in writing a solid understanding of core issues central to German society and culture.

**G 2: Faculty Assessment Standards**

New and current faculty to be trained to assess student writing in CTW courses, even in those courses they seldom or never teach. Essays in introductory course distributed to all faculty in our section for rating. Results discussed in section meeting. Variations in assessment analyzed and documented.

**G 3: Student CTW Improvement**

Students in Entry Level Major CTW Course will show improvement between first and last essay of semester and between entry and exit course. Rubric goal is 4.

**G 4: Arguing From a Negative Perspective**

Student will think critically about the city in which he/she lives from a negative perspective using as many forms of negation as possible (e.g. what he/she does not like). Student will justify and explain assumptions and reasons.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 6: Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

1. Students will be able to write in the target language (German) with infrequent errors in grammar and syntax and in a style that does not interfere with communication. 2. Students will examine literary, cultural and historical trends in the German-speaking world through primary and secondary texts and will fair-mindedly follow the evidence, demonstrating the ability to identify relevant arguments, analyze, interpret and formulate inferences free from biased preconceptions. 3. Students 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.

### Strategic Plan Associations

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

**SLO 7: Analysis of Core Cultural Issue (G: 1) (M: 9)**

Students should understand, comment on and demonstrate a solid understanding of core issues central to German society and...
### 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

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 9: CTW Improved Scores (G: 3) (M: 11)

CTW entry level course will track student progress over the course of 2 semesters from first to last semester essay. Previously individual student progress had been tracked. The objective of this study was to assess overall student performance improvement or lack of improvement by averaging all student CTW rubric scores for the 2011 and 2012 semesters. Goal for the department is 4.

### SLO 10: Thinking Critically about Personal Perspectives (G: 4) (M: 12)

Student will clearly communicate ideas in German over 2 drafts by making personal connections to a familiar place from a negative perspective. Quality of German will be at the capstone (senior) level of B2/C1 under the CEFR - Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 8: Faculty Training and Consistency (G: 2) (M: 10)

Faculty should consistently determine that students have developed the skills requisite for critical thinking (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) by some mutual agreement on what these skills look like, how to assess them and how to improve the tools used to measure them.

### 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).

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 3: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology

**Outcome**: Student should demonstrate critical thinking through writing skills by supporting the main idea of the assignment and showing proficiency in fair-mindedly following where evidence and reasons lead. Measure: Student shall write a 350-400 word essay in German and in English which focuses on a moral concept based on a German speaking country's political and cultural philosophy of neutrality (Switzerland). Assessment of the assignment (how it is measured) is based on the ability of the student to distinguish between fact and opinion, explore relevant historical and cultural contexts and achieve a clear organization of ideas with concrete conclusions in the limited framework of a shorter essay.

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

#### 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.

#### M 5: Speed Essay German 3301 Entry Level Course (O: 6)

**Goal 4 Objective 2 Measure Speed Essay - Nudity (German FKK or Nudist Organization)**

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

**Target for O6: Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives**

100% of Students will score at the level of 4 or higher on this measure.

#### M 6: Entry Level CTW German Semester Development (O: 6)

Graph tracking CTW development (average) from first to last CTW assignment over the course of one semester. Benchmark group consisted of 5 German students, not necessarily majors. 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.

**Source of Evidence**: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Target for O6: Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives**

The target for this one-semester tracking of 5 students was to determine if critical thinking skills show measured development over the course of the entry level CTW major class (German 3301) and if the introduction of a portfolio (allowing students to collect and self-evaluate their work and progress) contributed to this goal.

#### M 7: CTW Average Score Entry Level to Capstone (O: 6)

Tracking 5 students in the major (German) from entry level course (3301) through capstone (4402) to determine if CTW skill development could be tracked.

**Source of Evidence**: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Target for O6: Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives**

The target for students from the entry level course to the capstone course is to score and/or maintain the departmental goal of 4.

#### 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

**Target for O6: Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives**

Target for each CTW assignment at the capstone level is 4 on the rubric.

#### M 9: Speed Essays (O: 7)

Speed Essays 1 and 4 to assess student progress over course of semester in entry level German 3301 course. Graded only by rubric as assignment was written in English. Only one student was chosen to track over the course of the semester.

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

**Target for O7: Analysis of Core Cultural Issue**

The target was a minimum of 4 on the department's rubric scale. (CTW Goals for Essay 1 and 4: Demonstrate a basic ability to analyze, interpret and formulate inferences/States or briefly includes more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences and points of views of others)

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

The student showed progress from a 2.5 to a 3. on the rubric. There was evidence of movement away from personal
commentary on the aspects of the target culture that simply summarized the student's prejudices or rather preconceived notions and exhibited little analysis of the nature of the basic cultural differences and their possible origins, justifications or aptness in a cultural or historical context. There was, however, no real in-depth analysis of the problem of cultural "dominance." Despite the assertion that the student had converted to Islam, there was no consideration of the non-inclusive nature of religious traditions that become dominant in the culture.

**M 10: Faculty Assessment of Essays - Blind Panel (O: 8)**
One speed essay from intro course evaluated by a panel blindly and then variations, measurement techniques discussed and fine tuned.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O8: Faculty Training and Consistency**
Consistent scoring of CTW assignments by all faculty in section.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Although only one essay is uploaded here, there was a remarkable consistency across the 3 faculty involved in assessing the speed essay. The presence or absence of multiple perspectives, the number and quality of examples and evidence of thinking through the core issue were noted in the margin in the blind peer evaluations. 95% of the 14 essays evaluated received the same CTW score from the rubric.

**M 11: Mirrored Essays over 2 Years (O: 9)**
Students were assigned essays on a variety of current and controversial topics based on the readings of the intro level CTW course for German majors. The CTW assessment over the course of the semester was tracked by averaging the first and last score from the rubric (essay 1 and essay 4). The students were to comment on demonstrate a solid understanding of core issues central to German society and culture with increasingly thoughtful and to sophisticated complex elements of structure and analysis. The measure was tracked over 2 semesters by averaging all of the students scores for essay 1 and essay 4 for 2011 and 2012. Previously the measure had been individual student performance over the semester. This measure was intended to qualitatively and quantitatively measure the effectiveness of new CTW assignments and the teaching of CTW skills as outlined in our action plan.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O9: CTW Improved Scores**
The target goal on each essay is a 4 on the departmental rubric, but the objective on this measure was to attain an overall class average of 4 by the end of the semester.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
As per the graph referenced here, the goal was met in 2012 but not in 2011. However, because the objective was to improve overall student performance on a class average from 2011 to 2012 by reevaluating the assignments used to measure CTW (see action plan) and to implement peer training and CTW skill mini-lectures, the finding is listed as target met. 2011 CTW score average 3.36 Essay 1 to 3.81 Essay 4 2012 CTW score average 3.86 Essay 1 to 4.23 Essay 4.

**M 12: Essay (O: 10)**
2 Drafts of essay on CTW topic with grammatical focus.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O10: Thinking Critically about Personal Perspectives**
CTW score of 4 (departmental goal) including minimal errors in grammar (German) in final draft.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Excellent final draft. CTW score rose from 3.5 to 5 and extensive "coded" grammatical errors corrected by student at senior level (B2/C1 Referenzrahmen - Common European framework for language assessment).

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

**Action Plan for CTW 2010-2011**
The German Section has plans to meet more regularly to discuss and develop a body of thematic exercises that can be used for critical thinking writing assignments in upcoming classes. Although generic in character, these assignments can be adapted to fit the goals of any CTW class in German, whether it be a writing assignment, a 5 minute speed paragraph, or a final exam topic. This should help us codify not only the type of assignment we feel can most fairly assess student learning and achievement, but also guide us in a more reasonable expectation on each assignment by limiting which CTW aspects from the rubric are actually being assessed. The faculty will come together as a whole to discuss and compare evaluations and brainstorm broad discrepancies or variables in assessment. It is expected that these discussions will lead to further fine tuning of the rubric itself. From previous CTW classes and pilots, we have discovered as well that the type of assignments we currently use to evaluate critical thinking are very limited (traditional essays with "controversial topics"). We plan to implement more "speed" paragraphs in which comprehension of and/or reaction to a class discussion point is "tested" immediately and then used to further 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Action Plan implemented through German section meetings
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Robin Y. Huff
**Additional Resources:** None
Action Plan for 2011-2012

Our major goals are revision of the rubric, a central repository for CTW assignments and CTW graded assignments used for measures and the switching of the CTW required course to a more appropriate one based on content. · The revision of the rubric is intended to effect improved student response to the CTW component of the course by making the rating scale more user friendly and the rating criteria more explicit as to what is needed for improvement. · The central repository will make it easier for faculty (continuing and new) to standardize assignments deemed to be most conducive to the goals of CTW and not be continually forced to draft new ideas for each semester/syllabus. The other faculty will also be aware of what is happening in that course and because many students are shared among courses, support can be given in non CTW courses in a subtle interdisciplinary way if core topics are mirrored in multiple courses. This will also prevent loss of data and student samples as occurred this past year. · The grammar capstone course has proven to be a stumbling block to CTW assignments which are perceived as onerous and contrary to the goals of mastering German grammar and syntax. The goal is to change the grammar course to a 3000 level course to ensure mastery at an earlier level, change the capstone course to a culture based interdisciplinary context course such as Literature and Film and add an advanced conversation and composition course to the entry level curriculum to facilitate the integration of CTW assignments into that more thematically based course. We anticipate a better student response to the CTW component, a clearer understanding of the goals of the initiative and subsequently better student performance. We plan to document the progress of the student for their and our edification in a portfolio format perhaps with “digication.”

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

Rubric Revision and Thematic Assignment Bank/Portfolios

Our major goals are revision of the rubric, a central repository for CTW assignments and CTW graded assignments used for measures and the switching of the CTW required course to a more appropriate one based on content. · The revision of the rubric is intended to effect improved student response to the CTW component of the course by making the rating scale more user friendly and the rating criteria more explicit as to what is needed for improvement. · The central repository will make it easier for faculty (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.”

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

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 reoccurring 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/inadequacies 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

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

New CTW Course and Rubric

Add new CTW course to supplement or replace current CTW capstone course German 4402 (Advanced Grammar).

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: New course would have to go through curriculum committee as it is not yet in the catalog and be
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

With the loss of and the addition of a new faculty member, we focused on training as part of our action plan from last year. Dr. Denzel was asked to do blind assessment of essays from the intro-level CTW course and as a section his critique was compared to the CTW ambassador’s (who taught the class) and the other full-time faculty member. 95% of the essays were assigned the same CTW score by each faculty. This was a major achievement in training and fulfilled our goal a) from last year for objective and consistent assessment. Addressing CTW inadequacies based on language competence (goal c) was somewhat side-stepped by offering to the students the option to write in English or German. The stronger students were able to meet the departmental standard of 4 and the weaker ones were able to meet or approach our goals by removing the time and structural constraint of writing in a foreign language.

Because of the arbitrary nature of assigning our learning outcomes for literature classes (see learning outcomes rubric in document registry), we decided to track our students’ progress over 2 semesters solely by our own rubric. In the intro CTW class (German 3301) we were pleased to see growth in the skill sets we targeted and by the end of the semester in 2012 the departmental goal of 4 was reached in the over all averaging of the students’ scores. This was a conscious decision to track overall rather than individual performance because the class composition was not the same as in previous years, where students taking 3301 took 4401 in the same academic year and thus could be tracked on an individual basis. The same set of essay topics and skills (objectives) were used in both academic years, thus partially fulfilling our goal (d) from our action plan of consistency in assignments for tracking purposes over at least 2 semesters. This was not the case for 4402 where a faculty new to CTW taught the course for the first time and was somewhat focused on grammatical usage in assignments marked for critical thinking.

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

Unfortunately we were not able to track the same students as in the previous year from 3301 to 4402 (entry to exit) in German. Also a faculty new to CTW was in charge of the exit course and the documentation of growth was not thorough on an individual student basis as in the past. That being said, if improvement in critical thinking is viewed as a whole from junior to senior year, then the departmental goal of 4 was met more consistently in the exit class for German majors as a whole. The faculty in charge reported that this may be due in large part to the assignment having 1-2 drafts: “You will have the opportunity to rewrite at least one assignment based on the instructor's comments on your first version. Essays will demonstrate writing and critical thinking skills on topics as diverse as language hegemony, topical cultural issues in the German-speaking world, and literary analysis of complex texts, focusing on the interpretive implications of grammatical structures.” (Syllabus 4402) What was new this year that made the grammar course more adaptive to CTW goals was the inclusion of singular grammatical structures as a tool for interpretation, effectively combining the academic goals of the course itself with the CTW expectations by providing new tools for implementing non-native rhetorical argument.

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 administrative coordinator who was to help with our goal of developing a central repository of CTW assignments in the M drive of our departmental common folder left for a better position and we decided to hold off on our centralization of documents until the new coordinator could be trained. In addition, there is still dissatisfaction of having the CTW exit course be a grammar course where the objectives of the assignments conflict with the free expression of ideas, the continuing issue of foreign language skills being imperfect and hindering the fair assessment of the underlying evidence of critical thinking. The change in rubric scoring for literature courses in our learning outcomes module necessitates a further revision of our common MCL rubric of 1-6. The new module being considered (see document repository) would rate only 7-10 (Developing, Acceptable, Proficient, Advanced) and would include grammar and spelling for the FL component, but the descriptions are not "user friendly" and students have had a hard time understanding the terminology such as "the use of the literary lens is inaccurate.” This vagueness is counterproductive to our goal (b) from last year of making an effort to "teach" critical thinking by example. However, the notion of teaching critical thinking has been quite problematic. The cooperative learning environments of Cooper (1995) with peer and teacher feedback in group settings have been difficult to implement in our classes and students have shown more pressing need of the course content itself (e.g. grammar/structure). Project based learning is also onerous in a course where there are already so many assignments purely based on mastery of the complex subject matter. The way to overcome these problems is to expand the CTW component to more 4000-level courses, but in a section our size the chance that additional courses for majors would meet the arbitrary 15 minimum class enrollment required is slim.

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 has been to train new and/or inexperienced faculty in developing goal-oriented and concise CTW assignments and tracking the development of students throughout the semester. There has also been an initiative to develop a new course that would have a thematic that is more integrated with the goals of the CTW initiative. This course would have a more intensive writing component independent of learning grammar or being subjected to a time-intensive reading list. (sample syllabus in document repository). The use of portfolios was scaled back due to student complaints that it was too time consuming and a new version of the portfolio is being developed that eliminates word lists and focuses more on creative writing and the requisite outlines and drafts.

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 changes have been geared toward reducing the number of ratings from 6 to 4 as discussed elsewhere in this report. The improvement to that process will be to clarify the descriptors so that the outcomes expected and the ways the assignments are assessed are well-defined and lucid. The measures were shortened as per Angelo's suggestion (1995) to use ongoing classroom assessment as a way to monitor and facilitate students' critical thinking. An example would be to have students write a "Minute Paper" on a topic discussed that same day in class. The main reason for the change was to give the students more chances to develop and receive feedback on their emerging skill sets, especially in the entry level course. This will be improved in
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 major impact of the findings is that, again, the current grammar course is not conducive to developing or evaluating critical thinking. The previously mentioned new course offering will be developed exclusively with CTW in mind and the readings and assignments pared down to offer more opportunities for revision, rethinking and reinvention. A possible scenario would be as follows:

An assignment sheet will be posted on Blackboard for every class period (except presentation dates). Student is expected to answer the short questions or complete other short tasks in writing before coming to class. Instructor will spot check these by requiring student to hand them in on some days. Students are expected to complete them and bring them every day! There will be short writing assignments due each week (typically between one paragraph and one page in length) marked by an “S” on the assignment sheets. These will require student to practice using various grammatical structures, vocabulary, and phrases correctly (thus removing the structural barriers before the major assignment is tackled). For each of the four thematic sections of the course, student will be assigned a three-page paper. These papers will require that student discuss critically and insightfully one or more of the themes addressed in that section. These papers can include material student has written for the shorter writing assignments (but student is expected to improve his/her writing and not to repeat old mistakes). The papers must be impeccably formatted (following the detailed instructions on the document “Rechtschreibung und Formatierung” exactly) and be very carefully proofread. They should be posted to Blackboard before class and should be brought to class in hard copy on the date posted on the syllabus.

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

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 perspectives; appreciates varieties of history Competent (3-4): Comprehends relationships over time between causes and consequences, change and continuity, and structure and agency Advanced (5): Sophisticated comprehension of historical change including (when appropriate) an awareness of non-teleological transformations

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students in the gateway course scored on average 3.08 on the rubric. The mean was slightly higher: 3.5. This represents competency, and we are meeting the targets in this field. However, there was a substantial decrease in competency from our findings last year, when the average score was 4.13. This year, the percentage of students not meeting expectations also increased significantly from last year. There are several possible reasons for this decrease in scores on the historical thinking measure in the gateway course. The first is controlling for the instructor. Our instructors change every year, and some are harder assessors than others. The second is the student quality may differ significantly from one year to another. We also changed collection methods this year. Last year the instructors were asked to pick out assignments at random. This year they submitted representative samples. The result may be that we have more self-selected top and bottom performers. It is noteworthy that the percentage of students exceeding expectations did not change dramatically, for instance.

**M 2: HIST 3000 Historical Context Rubric (O: 2)**

This rubric tracks students' ability to comprehend historical context on a five point scale, from absent (0) to advanced (5). Absent (0): Unable to place events in historical context in general as well as in his/her special field of interest. Awareness of both temporal and spatial contexts. Competent (3-4): A solid grasp of temporal/spatial historical contexts. Able to place events in appropriate context, including a meaningful chronological order. Advanced (5): A superior understanding of how to place events in appropriate temporal and spatial context, including a meaningful chronological order and within larger historical trajectories.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students in the gateway course scored on average 3.25 on the rubric. The mean was lower at 3. This represents competency, and we are meeting the targets in this field. However, there was a substantial decrease in competency from our findings last year, when the average score was 4.1. This year, the percentage of students not meeting expectations also increased significantly from last year. There are several possible reasons for this decrease in scores on the historical context measure in the gateway course. The first is controlling for the instructor. Our instructors change every year, and some are harder assessors than others. The second is that the student quality may differ significantly from one year to another. We also changed collection methods this year. Last year the instructors were asked to pick out assignments at random. This year they submitted representative samples. The result may be that we have more self-selected top and bottom performers. It is noteworthy that the percentage of students exceeding expectations did not change dramatically, for instance.

**M 3: HIST 3000 Interpretive Skills Rubric (O: 3)**

This rubric tracks students' ability to comprehend historical context on a five point scale, from absent (0) to advanced (5). Absent (0): Unable to differentiate between primary and secondary sources; cannot distinguish between conflicting interpretations. Developing (1-2): Able to ask relevant questions of primary and secondary sources. Able to distinguish basic interpretive differences within a literature or between two secondary works on the same subject. Competent (3-4): Able to probe various meanings in primary texts; shows a good grasp of interpretive methodologies. Able to distinguish and analyze differences (whether methodological, theoretical, or interpretive) within a body of secondary literature. Advanced (5): A superior understanding of interpretive, methodological or theoretical differences in secondary sources; Able to develop subtle readings of primary texts in order to produce knowledge about the past.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in the gateway course scored on average 2.67 on the rubric. The mean was higher at 3. However, fully 41% of students are not showing competency in interpretive skills. This represents a decrease from reporting from the previous cycle, and as such it appears that we are at best only partially meeting this objective. At worst, we are not improving. There are, of course, potential reasons for the decrease in scores in the interpretive skills measure in the gateway course. The first is controlling for the instructor. Our instructors change every year, and some are harder assessors than others. The second is that the student quality may differ significantly from one year to another. We also changed collection methods this year. Last year the instructors were asked to pick out assignments at random. This year they submitted representative samples. The result may be that we have more self-selected top and bottom performers. It is noteworthy that the percentage of students exceeding expectations did not change dramatically, for instance.

**M 4: HIST 3000 Communication and Presentation Rubric (O: 4)**

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): Aware of the requirements if not always the mechanisms for differentiating
his/her work from that of others. 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

**Target for O4: Historical Communication**

Students in the gateway course (HIST 3000) should display competency, scoring between 3 and 4 on the rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in the gateway course scored on average 3.17 on the rubric. The mean was lower at 3. This represents competency, and we are meeting the targets in this field. However, there was a substantial decrease in competency from our findings last year, when the average score was 3.85. This year, the percentage of students not meeting expectations also increased significantly from last year. There are several possible reasons for this decrease in scores on the communication and presentation measure in the gateway course. The first is controlling for the instructor. Our instructors change every year, and some are harder assessors than others. The second is that the student quality may differ significantly from one year to another. We also changed collection methods this year. Last year the instructors were asked to pick out assignments at random. This year they submitted representative samples. The result may be that we have more self-selected top and bottom performers. It is noteworthy that the percentage of students exceeding expectations did not change dramatically, for instance.

**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.

**Target for O1: Historical Thinking**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students scored on average 3.96, with a mean of 4 in this category. This represents a general mastery of the subject. Competency was achieved by virtually all in the representative samples. While the scores decreased from last year, the transition to a representative sample likely affected the number of bottom performers, as with the gateway course. A comparison of scores between the gateway and capstone course reveals that students generally perform better in the capstone at both ends of the curve. That is, those that exceed expectations do so with higher scores and those who do not meet expectations nonetheless perform better than those who do. The Historical Thinking graph shows this difference.

**Target for O2: Historical Context**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated consistent competency and mastery of understanding historical context, scoring on average 3.93 in this category, with the mean arriving at 4. This represents a general mastery of the subject. Competency was achieved by virtually all in the representative samples. While the scores decreased from last year, the transition to a representative sample likely affected the number of bottom performers, as with the gateway course. Over the past two years, this has been one of the consistently high measures in both the gateway and the capstone course, indicating that some of the most successful teaching of the History Department is the ability to get students to understand the nuances and complexity of historical context. The related graph shows the general parity between gateway and capstone performers this year.

**Target for O3: Interpretive Skills**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students met expectations in this field, scoring on average 3.89 on the rubric with a mean of 4. Scores in this category have traditionally been lower than those which measure progress in historical thinking and historical context. While this remains true, the disparity was smaller than in previous years. Nonetheless, more work remains to be done on developing specific interpretive skills in history courses.

**Target for O4: Historical Communication**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Students generally showed mastery of this field, scoring on average 3.89 on the rubric with a mean of 4. Nonetheless, more than 1/3 of the students did not meet expectations, and nearly 1/5 performed at an unacceptable level. These results are, in keeping with the rest of the report, generally lower than last year, but the change in sampling likely accounts for this. A compelling change, however, is the significant difference between the writing of students in the capstone course versus the gateway course.

---

**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
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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Self-evaluation of the rubric to see if it continues to hold meaning as an assessment instrument.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Jared Poley

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

Assessing Weaknesses in Specific Analytical Skills and Communication
I will develop a pretest for piloting in both the gateway and capstone course that will seek to isolate problems in individual analytical skills. The pretest will be used to assess how successful mastery of the material is by the end of the semester.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: HIST 3000 Communication and Presentation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication | Interpretive Skills
Measure: HIST 3000 Interpretive Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Interpretive Skills
Measure: HIST 4990 Capstone Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication | Interpretive Skills
Implementation Description: The pilot test will be implemented in one HIST 3000 course and one HIST 4990 course. The results will be used to individuate and differentiate instruction, and then correlated against final grades to see if skills improved remarkably.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014

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?
While scores appeared to demonstrate a downturn in performance by our students in this year, likely the refined data collection methods (one of my action plans this past year) produced results which will help us specify which skills are in need of most work. This data will be helpful in formulating new teaching techniques this year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Students consistently score better in the capstone course than in the gateway course on all measures in the rubric. This is true in both years I have collected data. The result is sometimes difficult to quantify, as the qualitative differences between senior-level communication skills and nuanced thinking are apparent in ways that do not show up on the rubric. As such, many students who score a 4 or 5 (advanced) at the gateway level will score similarly at the capstone 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?
We need to develop methods of individuating and differentiating instruction. One of the best ways to do this is to develop individual
assignments that target specific student needs. This will require piloting some pretests to assess student needs and then seeing if small exercises might help develop skills, especially in advance of putting together a final research paper (which is usually the result of both the gateway and the capstone course).

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

The model of a gateway to capstone course has been part of the History Department curriculum since before the CTW initiative. As such, most of our faculty are comfortable with the process and integrate CTW techniques into their specialized course offerings. After last year's data became available, the faculty responsible for CTW courses talked about refining data collection in order to target specific weaknesses of students. This certainly worked this year, and we now have a better bank of data from which to construct new approaches to teaching Critical Thinking through Writing.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Hospitality Administration**
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*Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*

### 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: 3, 4)**

This course, Hospitality Strategic Management, regularly has the opportunity for the class to undertake an applied research project involving a current industry need. The project selected for assessment, undertaken spring semester 2013, involved Stone Mountain Village and the goal of the village to increase its tourism destination capacity. The first outcome of the project was for the students, working in groups, to thoroughly collect data, analyze and evaluate these data and identify business factors that would be relevant to study in order to make recommendations of what the village should do in trying to achieve this goal. The data had to also include competitive data from a variety of surrounding businesses (hotels, restaurants, attractions, events).

**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: 3, 4)**

The second objective of the Stone Mountain Village feasibility study was to make recommendations in five hospitality operational areas: hotel development; an existing bed and breakfast inn; restaurant and foodservice operations; event management and destination marketing. The criteria for these recommendations included sound research, thorough analysis of data, realistic evaluation of current resources and clear communication of the recommendations.

**SLO 3: Knowledge of what factors support high-level team performance (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 3, 4)**
Each group member was required to complete an analysis of the team's functioning including an analysis of leadership, individual performance and what supported the accomplishment of the group goals as well as what prevented the group from performing to its highest level.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 3: Feasibility Study (O: 1, 2, 3)

The project for Spring Semester 2013 was a feasibility study of Stone Mountain Village and the potential for developing this small town into a tourism destination. The students worked in groups with each group taking a focus of the hospitality industry. The project included an analysis of business factors, prioritization of strategies that had potential for building tourism capacity for the village and communicating the results to the village’s leadership team.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

#### Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors

It was expected that each group would develop a list of three to five factors to be evaluated for each broad topic that was assigned the respective group. For Stone Mountain Village, the sectors included: hotel development; enhancing event management and marketing; increasing revenue for the local bed and breakfast inn; increasing revenue for the restaurants; and destination marketing.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Each group did effectively list at least three business factors there were relevant to the leadership of Stone Mountain Village in increasing their tourism capacity. Each group had consensus on these factors and there was input from all group members on what the focus of the project. In providing feedback to each group, the Stone Mountain Village leadership team considered the identification and prioritization of the business factors to be on-target and based on sound preliminary research in interviewing the leadership team, business operators and other stakeholders. This objective was achieved by 100% of the students.

#### Target for O2: Prioritization of recommended operational practices

Each group was expected to generate recommendations for their respective topics. Although there was not an exact number of recommendations required, it was expected that the number and depth of detail offered would be sufficient to cover the initial goal of Stone Mountain Village in increasing their tourism destination capacity within the next two years. The recommendations had to be based on an analysis of factors including, but not limited to, business patterns in Stone Mountain Village, competitive data, current population and demographic data, growth projections of population, demographic information and hotel development information for a radius of 20 miles.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The objective of gathering relevant data, analyzing the data, making operational recommendations that were prioritized was achieved by each group. This objective required sound research skills, analytical abilities based on knowledge of various hospitality business sectors and application of supply and demand theories in a recovering economy. Each group member contributed to the completion of this outcome. The level of effectiveness on an individual basis in what was contributed to the group's work, for this objective, ranged from 70% effective to 100% effective in meeting the criteria for these recommendations. The class, overall, delivered at least a 90% accomplishment of this objective. The Stone Mountain Village leadership team considered the results to be at a higher level than 90%. One comment from a town leader was that the class had delivered more than a consulting firm that they had paid thousands of dollars. The leadership team felt that the project results were more targeted to their needs, more comprehensive in the research completed, reflected a greater understanding of the hospitality industry and was delivered with more passion and interest.

#### Target for O3: Knowledge of what factors support high-level team performance

Each student was required to complete an in-depth analysis of their team's performance. This analysis included leadership roles, accomplishment of goals, communication patterns and a rating for each individual member in different performance areas as well as an explanation for the ratings.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Each member of the class completed the individual analysis of the functioning of their respective teams. Every student demonstrated an understanding of factors that supported the achievement of their team's results. Overall, 86% of the class had a comprehensive view of the team dynamics, sufficiently described the group and individual challenges and provided thorough feedback on each member’s performance. The remaining 12% completed the assignment but at a 75% level of thoroughness in describing the team dimensions and providing a comprehensive rating for each team member.

### M 4: Strategic Written Career Plan (O: 1, 2, 3)

Each semester in HADM 4800, Hospitality Strategic Management, students are required to write an in-depth strategic career plan. This involves taking the components of a strategic plan, as would be done for a business, and adapting those components to an individual career plan.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

#### Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors

The target is for 100% of the students to identify and prioritize factors that will impact their individual career plans. This is done through an environmental scan of the industry segment in which the students plans to work. The environmental scan should also be targeted to the city or cities in which the student is interested in working. The environmental scan factors should include an internal perspective of companies of interest as well as an external scan of factors that can influence a career decision. Internal scan items can include the company's culture, their current and projected growth plans, record of promotion from within, the company's diversity and at what organizational levels, financial stability and any issues of concern such as litigation history, media coverage and public perception. The external factors would encompass the economy (particularly for the city/cities of interest), stability of the particular type of business, industry forecasts and projections, governmental and regulatory issues or expected changes, sustainability/environmental issues and demographic shifts. Students can select the factors most significant to their
particular business sector and the location in which they would like to work. The students should achieve at least 75% of the allocated points for the external scan section.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

All students did include this section in their individual strategic career plans. Of the class, 84% achieved at least 75% of the points allocated for this section.

**Target for O2: Prioritization of recommended operational practices**

For the written strategic career plan, the prioritization of the recommended operational practices include a list of defined goals related to one’s career and corresponding action plans. The identification of the goals and action plans is based on an analysis of individual strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (a SWOT analysis) and the environmental scans. It is expected that 75% of the students will include delineated goals that meet the SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Specific) and action plans that are clearly linked to these goals.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Regarding prioritization of operational practices, 92% of the students indicated goals meeting the stipulated criteria. All students provided an action plan. The action plans were more detailed and relevant when linked to strong goals that met the expected criteria.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of what factors support high-level team performance**

In earlier classes, students completed the in-depth personality inventory, Herrmann Brain Dominance Inventory. The results from their individual preferences were discussed in class in relation to working with others on teams (informal teams and formal teams) as well as other interpersonal interactions. The goals was for 70% of the students to include the HBDI inventory information in their career plan (in the SWOT analysis or other sections) that would demonstrate knowledge of their individual preferences and the positive and negative implications of these preferences on high-level team performance.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The goal was for 70% of the students to include reference to their HBDI inventory results as related to working effectively as a group for maximum results. Approximately 73% did make this connection.

**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

**Continuation of real-life applications of knowledge**

The continuation of projects involving real-life learning is planned. Not only did students gain experience in working with current data and business information, they had the invaluable experience of working with industry representatives as well as civic leaders. There is a possibility of the Stone Mountain Village project continuing. The elements of what this involves and the logistics of the distance from campus have to be evaluated as well as other possible projects that could be selected for the future.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Feasibility Study | Outcome/Objective: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors
  - Prioritization of recommended operational practices
- Implementation Description: Discuss future needs (for fall semester 2013) with the Stone Mountain Village leadership team as well as
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 focus of Hospitality Strategic Management has consistently been to help prepare soon-to-graduate seniors with knowledge of the most recent trends in the hospitality and tourism industry and the most relevant issues that are facing the industry both domestically and globally. An essential part of this course is that it is not just providing information but creating a classroom environment in which each student analyzes how he or she has been prepared to handle the issues and trends as each soon begins a career position in the industry. This self-knowledge of individual strengths and weaknesses, the ability to think critically, and the understanding of working with others in achieving goals has determined the content of this course over the years. Cases have always been used along with industry guest lecturers who challenge students with real-life scenarios of operating a hospitality business. For fall 2012, while a variety of assignments were used, particular attention was put on the self-knowledge of leadership and team-building abilities with the use of the Herrmann Brain Dominance Inventory (HBDI). Used in a number of graduate business programs, including Wharton, this tool was used with discussions of personality types and how this influences job choices but also directly impacts team dynamics and business interactions. The Strategic Career Plan linked to this self-awareness information. The HBDI was also used spring semester 2013 using similar learning opportunities. The Career Strategic Plan, which has always been an assignment in this course, was used this year for assessment purposes. In getting feedback from recruiters about college students across the nation, they emphasized that students are often not focused in interviews; the interview is used as a time for career exploration and that is not their mission nor do they have time for this exploration. The Career Plan requires the student to complete the analysis of what job positions might fit best based on an analysis of individual strengths, weaknesses, and preferences. The plan also requires students to look at the business environment and analyze what opportunities will most likely be available that will best fit their qualities and goals. In spring 2013, the class completed, in addition to the career plan, a feasibility study for a small town desiring to grow their tourism capacity. This real-life experience emphasized many of the changing dynamics in the hospitality industry, helped the student analyze his/her abilities to apply knowledge and involved working with a team. The action plans of last year and previous years have emphasized current, real-life learning experiences and both the strategic career plan and the feasibility study met this goal.

**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 have observed improvements in the critical thinking abilities of students. From conversations with hospitality faculty regarding how to incorporate CTW at all course levels, more of our courses include higher-level learning opportunities. We have discussed in our faculty meetings Bloom's Taxonomy and the importance of application, analysis, evaluation and the creation of new ideas and concepts. When students reach the senior course of Strategic Hospitality Management, they are better skilled in their critical thinking abilities than years ago. The communication component of these critical thinking abilities remains stronger for most student in oral communication than written communication. There are still students who have outstanding written communication skills and those who are below average.

**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?**

As the instructor for the CTW course, I feel that this course is constantly changing which is positive in terms of keeping information up-to-date and relevant. I try to incorporate team exercises, project work, cases and a variety of teaching methods. Student evaluations typically include a few comments that I did not lecture "enough." I strongly believe that group/team exercises are important in learning team dynamics. Students seem to dislike group projects. My dilemma is always what teaching methods to use in accomplishing the learning objectives based on such surprising student comments.

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

CTW is extremely important for this academic program. Our industry recruiters place an emphasis on both critical thinking abilities and excellent communication skills. With the job market still very competitive, it is important that students mention to recruiters the emphasis placed on CTW by Georgia State. That is impressive both inside and outside the campus. As mentioned previously, more faculty are involved in the CTW approach even in courses not designated as a CTW 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?

The hospitality program has not made major changes in the overall assessment process. We have had numerous conversations with industry representatives on the increasing importance of students understanding data and being able to apply analytical skills in working with data. The communication component is also important in being able to explain the evaluation of the data - whether it is to a hotel owner or an investor or a franchisee. This past year, we piloted a program in certifying our students in Hospitality Industry Analytics. This certification program is one of the few for undergraduate students and is sponsored by the American Hotel & Lodging Association, Smith Travel Research and the Council of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education. Six students were...
certified in the fall of 2012 with this program. The same program was piloted spring 2013 with approximately five students volunteering to take the certification exam this summer. We will continue to integrate analytical data into all hospitality courses and will make the certification option available to all majors starting this fall.

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

The impact of the data from this, and previous, years is that the CTW emphasis needs to be incorporated, at some level, into all major courses. While this has been done in most hospitality courses, the tracking of data and the analysis of data has not been done for each course regarding the CTW-related assignments. Starting with the 2013-2014 academic year, we will endeavor to develop a more systematic way of tracking the CTW assignments throughout the junior and senior years (which is when students take their major courses in hospitality).

### Annual Report Section Responses

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

- Debby Cannon - University Senate; Sustainability Committee; Student Life and Development Committee
- Ray Ferreira - Advisory Board, Student Recreation Center

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

- Joe Perdue - Trip in October 2012 to China to teach in a club management professional development program; Exchange student at GSU fall 2012 from the Institute for Tourism Studies in Macao; International exchange agreement to be signed this fall (2013) with Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

- Starting fall 2012, the School of Hospitality established a Faculty Mentor program. Every hospitality major was assigned a faculty member who would act as a mentor throughout the student’s time at Georgia State. The role of the faculty mentor is not to replace the academic assistance advisor. Instead, the faculty mentor helps with career advice, ways for the students to get involved in student organizations and other campus events and providing help in how to combine or maximize course offerings.

**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).

- School of Hospitality participated in the Panthers Care Program on Saturday, March 9 by working at the Atlanta Community Food Bank

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Human Resources**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST)*

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

### Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking has four components: identifying consequential issues, generating alternatives, anticipating outcomes, and drawing correct conclusions. When making HR decisions that have a legal component, managers need knowledge of the law, HR practices, and strategy. Furthermore, it is important to consider all forms of risk, not just legal ones. Effective decision-makers generate 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

**SLO 1: Specify Relevant Facts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will differentiate important information from trivial or unrelated facts

**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...
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 2: Identify Pertinent Legal Issues (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will identify pertinent legal issues.

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 3: Explain Underlying Legal Principles. (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to explain underlying legal principles associated with statutes, cases, and regulations.

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. Beyond CT

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

I taught six 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 relevant facts” because it is impossible to draw reasonable conclusions (criteria four) and write persuasively (criteria five) without distinguishing relevant from trivial facts. Students have their first vignette by the second class. Some students do well immediately but most require several assignments measures before they learn to distinguish relevant from trivial facts. I return assignments quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class and provide “outstanding” examples.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

I taught six 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 relevant facts” because it is impossible to draw reasonable conclusions (criteria four) and write persuasively (criteria five) without distinguishing relevant from trivial facts. Students have their first vignette by the second class. Some students do well immediately but most require several assignments measures before they learn to distinguish relevant from trivial facts. I return assignments quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class and provide “outstanding” examples.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, 95% of students scored at the “Marginal” level or higher. Depending on the section, between 65% and 70%
scored at the “Satisfactory” level or higher and between 25% and 35% 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 distinguishing relevant from trivial facts. Students have their first vignette by the second class. Some students do well immediately but most require several assignments measures before they learn to explain the underlying legal principle. Most students can remember, understand, and apply legal principles (http://www.unco.edu/cell/sir/statute/documents/Krathwohl.pdf) after a few assignments, but many struggle with supporting their arguments. For example, a student may correctly identify discriminatory behavior as adverse impact but be unable to explain why. I return assignments quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class. To help students distinguish between application and analysis, I added a new activity this cycle. Students “grade” a sample of responses for extra credit.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was fairly consistent across the sections. By the end of the semester, about 90% of 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. Some students who successfully perform the first three objectives (specify relevant facts, identify pertinent legal issues, explain underlying legal principles) still 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. Organizationally sensible versus legal-centric approaches to employment decisions. Human Resource Management). To help students better understand the link between analysis and synthesis, I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class and provide “outstanding” examples. Also, I added a new activity this cycle. Students “grade” a sample of responses for extra credit.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end of 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 20% scored at the “Outstanding” level or higher.

M 2: Situational Judgment Test (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

I added several situational judgment test items. I used these early in the semester to “ease” students into writing critically. Writing short (50 to 100 words) justifications still required critical thinking and knowledge of employment law but less writing. Because SJTs demand less grading time, I could offer more student assessments early in the semester. Generally, I returned assignments by the next class allowing the students to quickly build CTW abilities. Students perceived SJTs are the typical multiple-choice test. This reduced their anxiety to writing, although justifying a response required complex thinking. Based on student comments, I found SJTs fostered more positive attitudes toward performing meaningful CTW tasks and improved self-efficacy about CTW performance. Because it was possible to have more than one right answer based on the student’s reasonable interpretation, it was relatively easy to evaluate students' ability to apply domain knowledge to realistic situations. Memorizing a few key cases and reciting regulations and statutes have little value in the real world where HR situations are intricate and context-bound. For instance, context is a key factor in sexual harassment cases. An identical behavior could be illegal in a law office but legal in automobile repair shop.

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; 80% will score at the “Satisfactory” level or higher; 60% will score at the “Outstanding” level or higher.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end of the semester, 95% of 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, 95% of 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end
to the semester, 95% of students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 65% and 75%
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

I taught six sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end
to the semester, 95% of students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 50% and 65%
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 on-line vignettes. I asked students to provide a written justification for their answers. A review of the literature indicates this format can be effective in assessing domain knowledge (Ballin, S., Case, R., Coombs, J. R., & Daniels, L. B. 1999. Common misconceptions of CT. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31: 269-293) 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Vignette | **Outcome/Objective:** Draw Reasonable Conclusions
  - **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Situational Judgment Test | **Outcome/Objective:** Draw Reasonable Conclusions
  - **Measure:** Vignette | **Outcome/Objective:** Draw Reasonable Conclusions
  - **Measure:** Vignette | **Outcome/Objective:** Explain Underlying Legal Principles.

**Implementation Description:** Based on a review of the literature, develop strategies to improve student metacognition.

- **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?**

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 twelve courses including six CTW sections. Providing quick
turnaround and sufficient feedback is a challenge. The addition of SJT items was useful for time management and to reduce student
anxiety. However, I did not see much improvement in higher order thinking or persuasive writing. This spring, I added an "extra credit"
eexercise. After receiving my feedback on a 20-minute in class vignette they analyzed previously, students used the rubric to evaluate examples of "effective" and "ineffective" writing. Sadler and Good (2006) found metacognitive benefits with this type of peer-grading. My paper titled "Overcoming Resistance To Critical Thinking Through Writing, has been accepted for presentation at the 2013 Academy of Management Meeting, August 9-13, in Lake Buena Vista (Orlando), Florida. This summer I begin research on how the inverted classroom may be useful in improving critical thinking skills. Inverting the classroom is about shifting emphasis in 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 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. There was an appreciable decline in the amount of student "nagging" 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). While the percentage is low, I do have a few students who struggle 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?

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. I hear from students and employers describing the career benefits of this course. 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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW International Business
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The Institute of International Business does not offer an undergraduate major. However, it does provide a core required course for all RCB students. The course is also the gateway to the International Business Certificate. This course is the one being used for the first phase of CTW. Each department in the College will offer the higher level discipline-specific CTW course. CTW criteria are applied in the course writing assignment called the Individual Term Paper (international business proposal). This addresses basic international business functions in the context of the challenges of globalization, and involving corporate international business analysis and international data gathering.

Goals

G 1: International Business Issues

Students will become knowledgeable about different different cultural norms as well as economic and political systems recognizing their interconnectedness and understanding the consequences for international business operations. Then, within their respective majors, students will be able to critically raise questions about the adjustments to globalization required for successful operations in distinct business disciplines.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Term Paper (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)

With the CTW assignment (Country Market Report) the students will demonstrate an understanding of the requirements for making a clear and concise international business proposition. The students will also effectively support the proposition in a manner that could be persuasive for making an investment decision. In particular, students will improve skills in analysis, communication, and research 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)

Grading Strategies Applied to BUSA 3000 "Globalization and Business Practices." To date, BUSA 3000 continues to not formally add rubric scores across section or across time. 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 and up-dated in 2012 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. Moving forward, we will have fewer PTIs teaching the course. Thus, it will be possible to have more consistency across sections offered by full-time, Institute faculty. As we adjust, we will be able to use the results of the new survey of 2012-13 GRAs and professors to obtain their feedback on the progress of the course. Given that the term has just ended, we await the responses of those surveyed. The survey instruments have been posted in the text box. The evaluation will include observations on using the new platform of Desire 2 Learn. In addition, it will be necessary to revisit our goals and objectives as we move to a new edition of our textbook. We have begun looking at the progress of students throughout the draft process. Using two drafts posted on D2L and then a final hardcopy for the professor, we have considered what implications are suggested by “draft/no draft” and changes in the drafts in response to the comments of the CTW grad students. Surveying 2 sections (90 students) it was clear that only around 75 percent of the students posted any drafts. Of those, the final product did show...
application of the recommendations in 60% of the cases. On the other hand, for those never submitting drafts, there was no significant difference in the final score on the assignment. We emphasize to students that the drafts are not graded. We want to encourage the students to view the CTW process and the advice as coaching and non-threatening. Thus, faculty members remain divided on the question of requiring that the drafts be posted and applying penalties if they are not.

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

### M 3: 2013 Surveys (O: 1)

BUSA 3000 Faculty Survey 2013: 1. Are most students turning in the drafts? 2. Would you suggest making the rough drafts mandatory? 3. If so, should we assign partial grades to the drafts? 4. Do you think the length of the CTW paper is appropriate? Why? 5. What would you add/change in the assignment? 6. What is your assessment of the D2L platform for managing the assignment? 7. How effective was your GRA in helping you with the CTW/D2L assignment? 8. Would you like to have this person assigned again to you in the future? 9. What are some techniques you use in your classroom to keep the students interested/motivated to complete the CTW project to their best ability? 10. If you have electronic versions of the papers, please attach an example of a very good and a very poor paper. 11. Please attach any handouts that you use to enrich the class.

GRA Survey 2013 1. Are most students turning in the drafts? 2. Would you suggest making the rough drafts mandatory? 3. If so, should we assign partial grades to the drafts? 4. What would you add/change in the assignment? 5. Did you use the D2L? 6. Were there problems for the students in getting the drafts posted on the D2L? 7. Would you recommend that we continue using the D2L? 8. The RESULTS OF THE RESPONSES from the faculty and the GRAs are posted under "Documents." There is consensus that the submission of drafts needs to be required, including consequences for the final grade. In other words, there is agreement that the draft process is valuable and thus all students need to participate. In impact of using drafts and GRA feedback can be seen in the samples of spreadsheets prepared by the GRAs. A minority of students post well developed documents at the time of the first draft. In the case of these good students, there is less improvement throughout the semester. Others do not show much improvement from draft to draft. However, the majority demonstrate responsiveness to the suggestions of the GRAs. For BUSA 3000 we have a number of measurement challenges. In the past we used a number of PTIs. Now, most of the sections are taught by full-time faculty so that moving forward, we are likely to get more consistency across sections. Having said this, these regular faculty members have expressed great concern as to what methodology should be used to evaluate the program. They do not feel that there could be a logical application of average rubric scores. There concerns include: 1. the number of sections taught by different professors 2. since all undergraduates in the College of Business must take BUSA 3000, the inputs certainly change every year, especially with increases of SAT scores for in-coming GSU students 3. the scheduling of sections brings in distinct groups of student characteristics depending on the time of day and the number of sections per week 4. the value of comparing rubric scores across sections and over time is hard to defend since the key issue is the effect of any particular class over the progress of the semester 5. conducting a fair test of either writing or critical thinking would require pre- and post testing or the use of control groups taking the class without the CTW assignment and the coaching provided by the GRAs 6. creating control groups might require "human subject" approval and would also mean that some students would miss the CTW experience 7. consequently, our faculty would like to focus on the progress of completing the assignment throughout the semester 8. improvement results most likely can be emphasized through the process of improving the assignment and its delivery. For example, the attached documents section includes a GRA recommended revised rubric. At the same time, the faculty would like to consider that recommendation combined with the writing criteria applied by our premier graduate program, the Global Partners MBA (see documents). Also, the document section includes a paper format revision that has been used by some faculty members.

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.
### 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 faculty teaching the course has changed substantially. As in the past, we have had to select and train a number of new GRAs each semester. In the past that also applied to faculty members as we used several PTIs. The PTIs have been reduced to a minimum. Full-time faculty are now the majority. Thus, with this new make-up we need to meet with those new instructors to rethink rubrics and processes. Some taught for the first time in Spring, 2013. Now we have them as returnees and they can add their perspectives to our goals and processes.

#### 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 has been noted most across the progress of each semester as the students receive feedback from the GRAs.

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

We need to be assured that the majority of instructors will be our full-time faculty for the next several semesters.

#### 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 the involvement of more full-time faculty.

### 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 department does not offer an undergraduate degree. However, we have developed a Certificate in International Business. The CTW course on globalization helps greatly to provide awareness of the Certificate and the need to take other international business courses and study abroad programs. The CTW effect is less clear.

### 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 curriculum may be substantially revised in the near future under the leadership of a new Associate Dean for Programs and an Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs. The latter individual has already been involved with CTW so he will easily be able to incorporate CTW concerns as part of any curricular change.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Kinesiology and Health**

As of: 12/13/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

"Critical thinking is a reflective process of acquisition, analysis, and evaluation of information, ideas, and actions that leads to the
development and active implementation of reasonable and defensible solutions to problems, issues, and situations related to physical activity, exercise, and sport."

**Goals**

**G 1: Acquisitor and critical evaluator of information and data**
Students should be gatherers, organizers, classifiers, and analyzers of pertinent information, materials, data, and activities and critical evaluators of assumptions, evidence, ideas, and information.

**G 3: Integrators of information and developers of comprehensive conclusions**
Students should be integrators of new and disparate ideas, information, methods, systems, and beliefs and developers of rational, reasonable, and informed conclusions.

**G 6: Articulate presenter of conclusions and applications to new problems**
Students should be articulate presenters of conclusions, judgments, and solutions and practical applications of understanding and knowledge to new and different problems and situations.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Original Research Evaluation (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 3)**

Students will examine original research paper(s) in exercise physiology from a scholarly journal and write a concise summary of the important aspects of the research study. The purpose of this assignment is to examine reports of original research in exercise physiology published in scholarly journals in order to: 1) identify and understand the purpose of the research; 2) summarize the important methods and of the study and determine whether the methods and study design are appropriate to the purpose; 3) identify and analyze the important results; 4) express how this research study contributes to our knowledge in the field of exercise physiology; and 5) apply this knowledge to practical situations in physical activity, exercise, and sport. The journal articles will be provided to you in pdf format on Desire2Learn. 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: 4)**

Students will collect, analyze and synthesize data from the laboratory and use this information to solve complex problems.

**SLO 5: Field-based facility or program evaluation (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 2)**

Students will visit a commercial, community, corporate, or clinical fitness facility and evaluate the facility using national standards for safety, programming, equipment, personnel, space utilization and layout, etc.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 2: Fitness Facility Evaluation (O: 5)**

Percentage of students who complete the fitness facility evaluation assignment with a score of 80% or higher.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O5: Field-based facility or program evaluation**

Achievement target was set at 85% - 85% of the students taking the course scoring 80% or higher on the written Fitness Facility Evaluation project.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

93.0% of students taking the course scored 80% or higher on the fitness facility evaluation project/assignment.

**M 3: Exercise Physiology Journal Article Assignment (O: 1)**

Percentage of students who each complete the journal assignments with a score of 80% or higher.

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

**Target for O1: Original Research Evaluation**

Achievement target was set at 85% - 85% of students taking the course scoring 80% or higher on the journal article summary assignments.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

95.7% of students scored 80% or higher on Journal Article Assignments.

**M 4: Exercise Physiology Laboratory Assignments (O: 2)**

Percentage of students who complete the written laboratory assignments with a score of 80% or higher.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement target was set at 85% - 85% of students taking the course scoring 80% or higher on the written laboratory assignments.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
83.0% of students scored 80% or higher on all written laboratory assignments

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: Field-based facility or program 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

Implementation Description: Raise target measure.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
Based on student performance it appears as if the assessment target was set too low. Target will be raised to 83% for the next review cycle.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Exercise Physiology Journal Article Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Original Research 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 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: Field-based facility or program 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: Field-based facility or program 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - Implementation Description: Original Research Evaluation

Journal assignments
No anticipated changes for next year.
  - Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  - Implementation Status: Planned
  - Priority: Medium

Journal assignments
No anticipated changes.
  - Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  - Implementation Status: Planned
  - Priority: High
  - Implementation Description: Original Research Evaluation

Journal assignments
No anticipated changes.
  - Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  - Implementation Status: Planned
  - Priority: High
Laboratory Assignments
Consider raising achievement targets.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Exercise Physiology Journal Article Assignment | 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
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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Review targets with relevant faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Coordinator and course instructor

Evaluate laboratory assignment scoring
Investigate students' scores on individual laboratory assignments to determine if there are any specific laboratory assignments and corresponding written reports that have a higher number (or percentage) of scores below target.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Exercise Physiology Laboratory Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Student Laboratory Assignments

Implementation Description: Investigate students' scores on individual laboratory assignments to determine if there are any specific laboratory assignments and corresponding written reports that have a higher number (or percentage) of scores below target. If identified, examine those individual laboratory assignments to determine the cause(es) and proposed improvements, e.g. clarity of purpose, methods, instructions, feasibility of completion, appropriateness of discussion questions, etc.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise

Annual Report Section Responses

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

Gurvitch, R.: Presentations

International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
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 will be 3 or greater out of 4. The categories are as follows: 1 corresponds to "Poor", 2 is "Not Yet Adequate," 3 is "Adequate" and 4 is "Excellent".

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Student scores for the 6 sections of the course that are represented in these results averaged a 3.24 indicating that the students scored a bit higher than a 3, the target, which is defined to be "Adequate." Scores for 99 students are represented.

**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 should be a 3 or more on problem definition. The rubric has 4 categories: the lowest is "Poor" which is represented by a score of 1; the next category, a 2 is defined as "Not Yet Adequate;" a 3 is "Adequate," and a 4 is "Excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score on the problem definition dimension was a 3.2 out of 4. Students in six sections of the course, Marketing Problems, are represented. Scores for 99 students that enrolled in the course are included in the analysis.

**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 target score on alternative identification and evaluation using the rubric categories is an average of 3 or greater on a four point scale. A score of three is "Adequate" and a 4 represents "Excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

The average in the six classes and 99 students on the alternative identification and evaluation dimension was a 2.89. Since the target was a 3 or greater, this average score is below what is desired. It suggests that this is an aspect of critical thinking to which more attention should be devoted by the instructors that teach the course. While the score is only slightly below the target, it is not surprising. Experience suggests that this result is consistent with a subjective perception of the instructors.

**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 score for the Recommendation portion of the case analysis process is a 3 or greater out of a maximum of 4. In other words, the desire is that students perform at an "Adequate" (a score of 3) or more where the highest score possible is a 4 which is described as "Excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 99 students that took the class in the six sections or classes during the fall and spring semesters was a 3.1. The score of a 3.1 slightly exceeds the minimum score desired.

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

**Alternative Evaluation**

Student scores averaged 72.5% which is below the 75% target. The problem is believed to reside in the depth of evaluation of the alternatives and not in the initial step of identifying the relevant alternatives. Greater attention to describing the evaluation process including enhanced examples of excellent evaluations will be provided.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alternative Identification and Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Alternative Evaluation

Implementation Description: Starting Summer Semester 2011 more time will be devoted to describing the case analysis process with particular attention given to the alternative evaluation portion of that discussion.

Responsible Person/Group: Hiram Barksdale
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Recommendation Depth and Detail**

Students scored 74.1% on the Recommendation which is below the target score of 75%. It is believed that the issue results from failing to provide sufficient detail and explanation to sufficiently justify their recommendation rather than recommending an irrelevant course of action. The case analysis pedagogy, may not be familiar to the students. To address inadequate depth and detail given to support their recommendation, an example case will be assigned and discussed prior to assigning a case to be written up for a grade.
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 new action plan was devised to improve the dimension of “Alternative Evaluation.” The recommendation score which was slightly below the target last year has improved and it now slightly above the target. The targets for each of the dimensions has changed to reflect the rubric score system instead of a percentage so that the scores no longer appear to be grades. The faculty agreed to adopt an initiative whereby all undergraduate courses in the major would have at least one comprehensive case analysis including a significant amount of quantitative analysis. The goal is to introduce the case method earlier in the curriculum and not in their final semester. It is hoped that if the pedagogy is familiar then students will be more comfortable and perform at a higher level, especially in the capstone course which emphasizes case. To aid in implementation, the department chairman has agreed to bring up the need to faculty teaching undergraduate courses to emphasize the importance of the initiative. Unfortunately, it appears that many if not most faculty have disregarded the initiative. The annual performance review by the department chair will be used going forward to remind individuals of this requirement. Exposing students to cases earlier and more often should help improve the score on the one dimension that is below target: "Alternative Evaluation."

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?

Unfortunately, my perception is that students are not very serious and as a result they invest a surprisingly small amount of time and energy in their studies. Doing case analysis is demanding and they simply don’t understand the process or what is required of them to do a superior job. Students simply don’t focus or concentrate or read in the way that they did when I began my career. This means that their critical thinking abilities are often quite limited because they don’t invest the necessary time and energy into the process. The few students I encounter that have some commitment to learning seem to enjoy the case analysis process and see it as a useful method of solving problems in business and other areas as well. Most perceive the class as too demanding. A larger and larger...
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 issue is that my colleagues have no idea about assessment or anything related to CTW. They think the two of us that handle it are suckers. The biggest problem with implementing CTW is the CTW process itself. Theoretically it is fine but the collegial, help/aid culture that once permeated it is gone. It is a chore and a burden. The WEAVEonline system is terrible. The questions we are asked to address are puzzling and unclear and when we make an honest effort to write a report we get criticized by our fellow CTW drones. Not at all fun!

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 has been partially responsible for the creation of a new course in the undergraduate program, Marketing Metrics. It has brought about a lot of happy talk about doing a better job by our students by getting them to write more but the reality is that even for those of us that teach CTW designated courses, it hasn't happened. I wish I was not so cynical about the departmental initiative to implement one or more cases in each and every undergraduate Marketing course but I am afraid that based on what the students are saying, nobody on the faculty has actually followed through by actually adding one or more cases. They talk a good game and agree that it is important and even say they will do it but they don’t. As a result of the last CTW Assessment Report I have changed the scoring in the document so the measures and the targets are now all tied obviously to the rubric with no percentages anywhere.

This way I can't get the criticism that percentages look too much like grades. Who really cares? Nothing has changed except the unit of measure. It is an easy conversion to make. To be criticized for using percentages strikes me as petty and ridiculous. Only two members of my department teach CTW courses. We are considered suckers by out colleagues. We spend too much time on grading papers, etc. That is not a good feeling. Everyone is happy to allow us to do the CTW tasks because then they don’t have to and when you suggest that they make their course a CTW course, they scream in agony.

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?

Targets have changed to reflect the criticism of last year’s report that percentages look too much like grades. Now they don’t look like grades because you are not supposed to assess using grades, I get that. It is fundamental. Who cares that much about the unit of measure. It is cosmetic. The conversion is simple but it is all about appearances I guess.

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 impact? I guess it is a factor in the request to change the curriculum in several different ways but most importantly to implement one or more cases in every marketing undergraduate class so that they have some real critical thinking exercises sooner and before they arrive at the capstone course at the end of their major. The Marketing Metrics class was also added as a consequence, in part, of the Marketing Problems course and the fact that students could go through their entire major without any exposure to marketing from a quantitative analysis standpoint until they got into the capstone course. Metrics is also a hot topic in the field so it fits several criteria simultaneously not just better preparation for the capstone Marketing Problems.

Annual Report Section Responses

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 action plan that involves the case analysis pedagogy is dependent on the faculty actually implementing cases in their classes along with the chair checking up on them to insure they do it. So far, most people do not seem to be using cases but they seemed enthused when we adopted the idea as a faculty a year ago. The students claim that they have never seen a case before. Who’s telling the truth? The faculty who say they are using them or the students who say they are not?

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

I altered the targets to avoid any chance that anyone might interpret a percentage as a grade!

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, 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).

UAC? Undergraduate Assessment Committee.

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

Does this refer to assessment related articles? I have no idea what this is asking.

International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

I am not sure I understand what this question is asking or why. Many of my colleagues are engaged in teaching, consulting, etc. internationally.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

We met with the Provost a year or two ago and she told us our standards were to high and that we needed to not drive students away by having admission standards in the Business School.
### 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 I am aware of

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Mathematics**

*As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST*

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

#### Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking in math usually means (1) analyzing and evaluating mathematical arguments, (2) formulating and presenting a proof or a counterexample in support of conclusions, and, (3) deriving an abstract claim from examples and solving a problem by applying known results.

#### Goals

**G 1: Analysis**

Students will be able to analyze and evaluate mathematical arguments.

**G 2: Deductive reasoning**

Students will be able to formulate and present a proof or a counterexample in support of conclusions.

**G 3: Problem solving**

Students will be able to derive an abstract claim from examples and solve a problem by applying known results.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In fall 2012 total 33 students took Math 3000. Among them, 12 scored Excellent, 13 did Satisfactory, 4 Marginal, and 4 did Poor. In spring 2013, total 26 students took Math 3000. Among them, 13 scored Excellent, 2 did Satisfactory, 7 did Marginal, and 4 did Poor. Overall, Excellent: 25/59= 42%, at least Satisfactory 40/59= 68%, at least Marginal: 51/59= 86.4%. Comparing with Target, only the percentage of students who scored at least Marginal does not meet the target. To improve, we will continue our action plan "Improve student scores on proofs" initiated in 2009-2010.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In fall 2012, total 22 students too Math 4991 with 20 Excellent, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 poor. In spring 2013 total 15 students with 13 Excellent, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 Poor. Altogether there were 37 students, 94.6% scored at least Marginal, the same scored at least Satisfactory, 89.2% scored Excellent. Thus the target is met.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In fall 2012, 22 students took Math 4991 with 12 Excellent, 5 Satisfactory, 2 Marginal, and 3 Poor. In spring 2013, 15 students took Math 4991. Among them, 11 scored Excellent, 2 Satisfactory, and 2 did Poor. Altogether, among 37 students, 86.5% scored at least Marginal, 81% scored at least Satisfactory, and 62% scored Excellent.

**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
  - Writing proofs or disproofs

**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
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. Thanks to higher enrollment, more students have taken CTW courses this year -- in the past we usually had one session of Math 3000 each semester, now we had two sessions each semester. 2. The students that took Math 4991 showed better writing skills. 3. The student performance of using Math software is better than previous years, due to our related action plan.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
In Math 4991, the instructor has seen the improvement of students' writing skills. This may come from several seasons: 1. Math 4991 have matured and the materials become standard (thus it is easier for students to follow). 2. Students have obtained more training on how to write from other math classes (including, but not limited to, Math 3000).

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
We still need to work on the fundamental skill of writing proofs in Math 3000. We met the target on writing proofs in 2011-2012 but partially met the target this year. All the instructors of Math 3000 (and those who teach its prerequisite Math 2420) need to work together on this action plan.

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 initiative has matured in our program: faculty members and students are more familiar with it and this makes the CTW classes running more smoothly. We had more faculty teaching CTW courses this year due to the increment of our enrollment.
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: 5)
Students demonstrate critical thinking processes through written reflection. Student reflections include (1) discussions of how they make decisions about teaching and learning, (2) how they challenge assumptions and bias they come across with group members, fellow teachers or professional readings, (3) analysis of critical events that led to changes in thinking about teaching and learning, and (4) a description of what was learned (or yet to be learned) related to the teaching and how that effects their professional development.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

SLO 3: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments (G: 3) (M: 3, 4)
Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning. Students demonstrate the ability to communicate their opinions and uses of teaching and learning strategies presented in professional texts and journals. Students demonstrate the ability to use data to support or refute specific teaching and learning strategies for specific students, and write about those data findings with a critical lens. Students demonstrate an ability to analyze their own teaching as it relates to major theories of teaching and learning.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students will score at the "2: partially proficient" level or higher for all areas of the rubric. At least 90% of students scored at the level of "3: proficient" for all elements of the rubric that apply to critical thinking through writing (i.e, not timeliness or completeness). Our target was met.

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".

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
85% of students scored at the exemplary level for all components of the rubric (excluding timeliness), and 100% of students
scored at the "proficient" level or higher. This target was met.

**M 5: Social Capital Project Rubric (O: 2)**

Social Capital Project Rubric

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Students demonstrate the ability to think critically through written reflection**

100% of students will score at the "partially proficient" level or higher. At least 80% of students will score at the "proficient" level or higher. At least 50% of students will score at the level of "exemplary".

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

98% of students scored at the "proficient" level or higher for all components of the rubric. 67% of students scored at the "exemplary" level for all components of the rubric. Target was met.

**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. Collecti/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)
- **Additional Resources:** Because our first BSE Middle Level Education cohort will have 34 students, we will need the help of a graduate teaching assistant to grade CTW assignments.

**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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** This 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 Yarborough and Stephanie Behm Cross
Revised rubrics
We will create a new rubric to be used in 2013-14 for multiple CTW assignments and courses.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: All of our targets were met this year, but we are not happy with our rubrics across courses and assignments. These rubrics are specific to each assignment and we therefore have a hard time comparing across courses and assignments. We will develop a generic rubric to use for multiple assignments across both CTW courses.
Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Cross, CTW ambassador
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 utilized the same rubrics again this year -- we wanted to have several years of the same assessments/rubrics before making any changes. Our results indicate that students are doing well on individual CTW assignments. All targets were met.

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 results indicate that students are doing well on individual CTW assignments. In fact, this year all students met all targets. They did especially well on the critical reflection component of the last assignment in their final CTW course.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Our results indicate that students are doing well on individual CTW assignments, but we are having a hard time comparing across courses and assignments. We are planning to create one generic rubric for use in 2013-14.

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 on the faculty involved in the CTW initiative has been extended conversations around what it means for preservice teachers to write and think critically. This has had a major impact on our doctoral students who serve as CTW consultants in many of our courses. We have made no changes to the CTW initiative since the last CTW report, but we plan to meet more regularly as a middle level group this upcoming 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

Annual Report Section Responses

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.
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 eliminated the "critical incident video project" rubric and added the "social capital project" rubric. This is because we changed assignments and therefore needed to change rubrics. As mentioned earlier, we will be creating a generic CTW rubric that will work for all assignments moving forward.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
No modifications were made.
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. In the two world music courses (MUS 4820: Summer 2011 and Fall 2012) and the music history course (MUS 4810 Spring 2013) that are being assessed the overall goal will be achieved through the implementation of a three point method of assessment: (1) a proposal for a research paper, an outline for the paper, and an annotated bibliography, (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. All three CTW instructors agreed to require the same three-part assignment so that methods of assessment would consistent and therefore the result from one semester to the next in the two courses would more accurately reflect how students where understanding the critical thinking components of the assignment and completing the required tasks based on the quality of their work. In the world music course two of the eight components of the CTW research project and rubric are discussed in this report: Analysis of Data and Synthesis of Personal Findings (referred to as Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research on the rubric). 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, in the music history course the required research paper should be based on some aspect (style, composer, composition, etc.) of Western European or American art music. The instructor for the music history course created a rubric for her class based on the basic components found on the rubric used in the world music class. I will provide information on one of the four components of the CTW research project and rubric for music history. This component is Critical Thinking in the Content of the Paper and it primarily includes that which is emphasized in the Analysis of the Data and the Synthesis of Personal Findings section of the world music rubric. Therefore this report of assignments in all three classes assess essentially the same critical thinking components.

Syllabi for the Summer 2012 and Fall 2012 world music courses (MUS 4820) and the Spring 2013 music history course (MUS 4810) are located in the Document Management section of this report. Also located in the same section are the three rubrics used in the world music course, the: (1) proposal and annotated bibliography, (2) draft of the paper, and (3) final revised version of the paper. A single rubric was used in the music history course. It was designed to be used for the first version of the paper and revision.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Analysis of the Data (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students should be able to (1) show evidence of the analysis of music and/or song text, or historical or cultural data, or comparative research, (2) explain the synthesis of data and (3) explain the results of the analysis.

SLO 2: Synthesis of Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students should be able to demonstrate the ability to (1) synthesize personal findings and (2) show with proper citations that cultural and/or historical research and data are supported by scholarly sources.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking in the Content of the Paper (M: 2)
This outcome/objective is specific to the Music History course. Upon the completion of this assignment students should be able to demonstrate the ability to: 1) clearly state the objective and point of view of the author (student), (2) examine musical features beyond mere description of the piece, (3) appropriately choose examples that demonstrate the primary goal of the paper, (4) connect musical observations/examples to historical or cultural observations in ways that demonstrate critical thinking, and (5) show that the analysis of music and synthesis of data are presented in a clear and logical progression from the thesis to the conclusion.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Rubric for Research Paper (O: 1, 2)
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 proposed primary objective is being addressed, the relevance of the sections on personal findings and concluding thoughts, and 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. 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" (referred to in this report as "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 - Fall 2011, and Summer 2012 2) World Music MUS 4820 Findings Fall 2011. 3) World Music MUS 4820 Findings Summer 2012, Central Position and Primary Objective - Differential = +0.5; Methodology, Concepts
and/or Theories of Inquiry - Differential = -1.5; Organization of Data - Differential = -1.1; Context of Data and Scholarly Support = Differential = + 0.6; Analysis of Data - Differential = +0.1 Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research - Differential = +0.3

Relevance and Implications of Concluding Thoughts - Differential = +0.2 Writing Style and Quality of Communication - Differential = +0.2

Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 - Overall Differential = -0.1

In conclusion, though the comparison of the findings from Fall 2011 to Summer 2012 show a differential of -0.1, a comparison of the individual components identified on the rubric demonstrate an increase in 6 of the 8 components. A comparison of the findings from Fall 2011 to Summer 2012 in the two components to be assessed for the 2012-2013 report shows an increase in the section entitled "Analysis of Data" of 0.1 and in the section on the rubric called "Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research" it shows an increase of 0.3. The total increase of 0.4 between the two sections is significant though not major. I think this shows some improvement on the part of the students in their area of analyzing the data (evidence of the analysis of music or historical and cultural data, and the synthesis of this data accompanied by a clear explanation) and in the area of providing personal findings to support scholarly research (evidence that personal findings and cultural/historical research and data are supported by scholarly sources with proper citations). Since target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing finding from one semester to the next, the comparison of the Fall 2011 and Summer 2012 findings show that the target figure was missed by 0.1 points. Included in the Document Management Section is the rubric entitle Final Rubric Findings - Fall 2012 for the World Music course taught by another instructor. Because this is the first semester findings data were submitted by the instructor of this class I am including the rubric only. No comparison data is available yet for this instructor's CTW courses.

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

Target for O1: Analysis of the Data
The target score for Analysis is 11.4, representing an increase of 0.5. (Target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of at least 0.5 when comparing 2013 to 2014 findings.)

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
A comparison of the findings from Fall 2011 to Summer 2012 in the two components to be assessed for the 2012-2013 report shows an increase in the section entitled "Analysis of Data" of 0.1. This does not demonstrate enough improvement on the part of the students in their area of analyzing the data (evidence of the analysis of music or historical and cultural data, and the synthesis of this data accompanied by a clear explanation). Since target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing finding from one semester to the next, the comparison of the Fall 2011 and Summer 2012 findings show that the target figure was missed by 0.4 points. The following achievements should be noted concerning the objective called "Analysis of Data" 1) 75 percent of the students (9 out of 12) demonstrated a mastery of this component. 2) 25 percent of the student (3 out of 12) demonstrated a competency of this component. (Solely based on these figures the target of 25 percent showing a mastery of the component was exceeded threefold.)

Target for O2: Synthesis of Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research
The target score for "Synthesis of Personal Findings" is 10.9, 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 2013 to 2014 findings.)

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
A comparison of the findings from Fall 2011 to Summer 2012 in the two components to be assessed for the 2012-2013 report shows an increase in the section on the rubric called "Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research" it shows an increase of 0.3. Though this is not enough, I think this shows some improvement on the part of the students in their area providing personal findings to support scholarly research (evidence that personal findings and cultural/historical research and data are supported by scholarly sources with proper citations). Since target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing finding from one semester to the next, the comparison of the Fall 2011 and Summer 2012 findings show that the target figure was missed by 0.4 points. The following achievements should be noted concerning the objective called "Synthesis of Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research": 1) 75 percent of the students (9 out of 12) demonstrated a mastery of this component. 2) 25 percent of the student (3 out of 12) demonstrated a competency of this component. (Solely based on these figures the target of 25 percent showing a mastery of the component was exceeded threefold.)

M2: Critical Thinking in the Content of the Paper (O: 3)
This measure is specific to the Music History course (MUS 4810) and is based on the completion of the following objectives. Upon the completion of this assignment students should be able to demonstrate the ability to: 1) clearly state the objective and point of view of the author (student), (2) examine musical features beyond mere description of the piece, (3) appropriately choose examples that demonstrate the primary tool of the paper, (4) connect musical observations/examples to historical or cultural observation in ways that demonstrate critical thinking, and (5) show that the analysis of music and synthesis of data are presented in a clear and logical progression from the thesis to the conclusion. It is based on data derived from a class of 39 students in which 33 students completed all three components--1) proposal-outline and annotated bibliography, 2) First version of the paper, 3) Revision of the paper). The instructor stated that a few students chose not to revise their papers. These students had an A on the first version and therefore demonstrated mastery by these standards. In the component entitled "Critical Thinking in the Content of the paper" the instructor provided the following data: 1) In the section entitled "Demonstrates Mastery" - 2 students were given this ranking in the draft and 12 (36 percent of 33 total students) were given this ranking in the revision of the paper. 2) In the section entitled "Demonstrates Competency" - 5 students were given this ranking in the draft and 16 (48 percent of 33 total students) were given this ranking in the revision of the paper. 3) In the section entitled "Demonstrates Development" - 25 students were given this ranking in the draft and 5 were given this ranking in revision of the paper. 4) In the section entitled "Insufficient" - 2 students were given this ranking. In the draft and none were given this ranking in the revision of the paper. Please see the file entitle Music History (MUS 4810) Rubric for the 1st Version of the Paper and the Revision for the complete rubric and numerical data.

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

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
Emphasis on Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research

I will continue to report findings in these two areas because the improvement demonstrated.

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.

Continued Use or Rubrics and More Departmental CTW Meetings

The plan for 2013 - 2014 will be to continue using the current rubrics (draft and final revised rubrics) for the course. The components on the rubric used in the music history course may have been revised so that more specific outcomes/objectives can be measured. As the ambassador, I will continue to monitor the progress of students from one semester one year to a semester of the previous year.

Action Plan for CTW Music Courses for 2013-2014

The action plan for CTW music courses for the 2013 - 2014 year is two fold: 1) To provide further training for the three faculty members, in addition to myself, in the areas of music history and world music who will be teaching the 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 an annotated bibliography, 2. draft of the research paper, 3. final revised paper) and provided students her own rubrics for the first version of the paper and reviewed the papers. The instructor in the second section of the world music course used the rubric I provided in her course. This instructor provided me with a final rubric showing how students ranked in each of the sections/components of the rubric. This information is now available in this report. Plans are to help this instructor compile data that can be compared to that submitted on this report so that a comparison of the students progress can be demonstrated. 2) Plans are to again compare findings in the two components areas entitled Analysis of Data and Synthesis of Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research. I will continue to report findings in these two areas because the improvement shown was not significant enough in one class and because this was the first time numerical data was presented for the other two CTW courses. Plans are to continue to discuss the use of the rubrics to gather student assessment information for the purpose of reporting on these two objectives for the 2013-2014 CTW report. Target figures for the Action Plan for 2013 - 2014 in the areas as Analysis, Synthesis of Personal Findings and Critical Thinking in the Content are as follows: 80% of students should exhibit at least a low level of competency (7) 40% of students should exhibit a mastery (8 to 9) 25% of students should exhibit a mastery (10 to 12 on rubric)

Emphasis on Analysis of Data

Because the target was not met, additional emphasis will be placed on the students ability to demonstrate evidence of the analysis of music or historical and cultural data, and the synthesis of this data accompanied by a clear explanation.

Emphasis on Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research

Because the target was only partially met, additional emphasis will be placed on the student's ability to demonstrate evidence that personal findings and cultural/historical research and data are properly synthesized and supported by scholarly sources with proper citations.
**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.

---

**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 in the School of Music for the 2012-2013 academic year are as follows: 1) For the first time assessment data was submitted by each CTW instructor. 2) The first formal CTW workshop/meeting was held at the beginning of the Fall 2012 semester. As the CTW ambassador for the School of Music, I reviewed the goals and objectives of the CTW initiative as they relate to the Quality Enhancement Plan for the University. We discussed the specific three-part assignment and reviewed the rubrics and the type of data that is requested for the annual CTW report.

**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 emphasis in both music CTW courses is on the ability to analyze data, interpret it, and support personal findings with scholarly research, instructors have noticed a significant improvement in how students critique data related to music and how they express this critically from the first phase of the three-part assignment to last phase and from one semester of a CTW course to the next. Students have a better understanding of the assignment the second time they take a CTW course and do better on the 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?**

There are no major areas of needs concerning CTW in the School of Music. All instructors of the courses have a better understanding of the CTW initiative, the value of the assignment, and why the data is of value to the university for the report.

**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?**

Concerning the impact of CTW, instructors of the courses generally agree that the quality of student papers has improved tremendously. The rubrics provide a more concrete guideline for students. As a result our music students are also thinking more critically about the repertoire they perform. The department as a whole has not made any additional changes to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW assessment report. There has however been more participation and support from faculty concerning the initiation.

---

**Academic Program Question 1:**

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

Since last year's report the CTW initiative in the School of Music has decided to focus more on the findings associated with two specific outcomes/objectives: Analysis of Data and Synthesis of Personal Findings with Scholarly Support. The report in previous years was too broad and there was an attempt to cover too much information in the report. By identifying two major objectives for the report, the data presented in the report better informs the reader/observer of progress made relative to specific learning objectives. Since this was the first year that data was reported specific to the two learning objectives more time (an additional academic year) is needed to adequately assess student improvement. This will also allow for more uniformity concerning the data which is included in future reports.

**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.

At the moment the department does not foresee the need to make changes to the curriculum based on findings of the CTW report. However, discussions have been made concerning the possibility of making other core courses CTW courses in the future.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Uses critical thinking effectively (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
- a. Evaluate the quality of information, including differentiating empirical evidence from speculation and the probable from the improbable b. Identify and evaluate the source, context, and credibility of information c. Recognize and defend against common fallacies in scientific thinking d. Avoid being swayed by appeals to emotion or authority e. Evaluate popular media reports of neuroscience research f. Make appropriate connections between different facts, theories, and observations

**SLO 2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
- a. Identify components of arguments (e.g., conclusions, premises & assumptions, gaps, counterarguments) b. Distinguish among assumptions, emotional appeals, speculations, and defensible evidence c. Weigh support for conclusions to determine how well reasons support conclusions d. Identify weak, contradictory, and inappropriate assertions e. Develop sound arguments based on reasoning and evidence

**SLO 3: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
- a. Intentionally pursue unusual approaches to problems b. Recognize and encourage creative thinking 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 hypotheses and predictions g. Match appropriate methods for testing of predictions h. Evaluate the quality of hypotheses and revise as needed

**SLO 4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
- a. Demonstrate professional writing conventions (e.g., grammar, audience awareness, formality) appropriate to purpose and context b. Use accepted scientific writing styles in empirical reports, literature reviews, and theoretical papers

**Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively**

In the 2012-2013 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. 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. In the 2012-2013 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. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for Organization and Logic for both the first and last written products was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and all but one 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 both the first and last written product was 3, which are both in the 'developing' range. All of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher on both the first and last written assignments. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are
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 research paper, using several peer-reviewed papers that covered a particular topic in neuroscience; assessment was on the post-feedback product.

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

**Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively**

In the 2012-2013 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 an associative 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 in a manner appropriate to 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 2012-2013 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 Developing 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. Supports claims with evidence, but this evidence is usually inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant. 2. 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 2012-2013 - 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 85% and 100% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher, respectively. The median score for Use of Evidence for both the first and last written product was 3, 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 Outcome 1 Figure NEUR 3020 Spring 2013.

**Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments**

In the 2012-2013 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. 1. Does not take a consistent position on the issue; the logical connections between ideas are consistently unclear. 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 addresses 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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for Position and Balance for both the first and last written product was 2 and 3 respectively, 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 Outcome 2 Figure NEUR 3020 Spring 2013.

**Target for O3: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively**

In the 2012-2013 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for Use of Evidence for both the first and last written product was 3, 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 Outcome 3 Figure NEUR 3020 Spring 2013.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Grammar and Mechanics on the...
scale. 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 75% of the 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 2012-2013 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 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 these 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 2012-2013 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 the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Citation and Use of Sources. 0. The student has committed intentional plagiarism by copying and/or 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

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the first written product was 2, which is in the lower end of the 'developing' range, and 62% 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 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 Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is in the lower end of 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 Content and Development for the 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 Content and Development for the last 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 Citation and Use of Sources was 3 for both the first and last written product, which are both in the 'developing' range. 82% 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 first written product was 2, which is in the lower end of the 'developing' range, and 92% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher.

In the 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for 75% of the students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final assignment. 0. Is unfamiliar with the assignment, or the assignment is inappropriate to the final assignment. 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 evidence is incorrect or missing 5. Consistently and thoroughly supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence.

### Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively

In the 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final assignment. 0. Is unfamiliar with the assignment, or the assignment is inappropriate to the final assignment. 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 evidence is incorrect or missing 5. Consistently and thoroughly supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The median score for Organization and Logic for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 1 Figure NEUR 4910 Fall 2012. The median score for Use of Evidence for the first written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 67% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 83% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 1 Figure NEUR 4910 Fall 2012.
**Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments**

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Position and Balance on the final 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 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for Position and Balance for the first written product was 3.5, which is in the high end of the 'developing' range with 50% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Position and Balance for the last written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 83% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 2 Figure NEUR 4910 Fall 2012.

**Target for O3: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively**

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final assignment. 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims. 1. Skeptical, but it 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for Use of Evidence for the first written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 67% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 83% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 3 Figure NEUR 4910 Fall 2012.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Grammar and Mechanics on the final 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 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Content and Development on the final 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 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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 4910, our advanced 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 the final assignment. 0. Has committed unintentional plagiarism by copying and/or paraphrasing one or more sentences from a source 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the first written product was 3.5, which is in the higher ‘developing’ range with 50% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the last written product was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range with 83% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development for the first written product was 3.5, which is in the higher ‘developing’ range with 50% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development for the last written product was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range with 83% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910 Fall 2012.

The median score for Citation and Use of Sources for both the first and last written product was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range with 83% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910 Fall 2012.
### M 4: NEUR 4910-Spring 2012a: First and last written products (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

NEUR 4910 provides neuroscience majors with more advanced experience in interpreting and analyzing research papers in a sub-discipline or topic area of neuroscience. Course assignments varied according to topic areas and instructor interest but all focused on developing students' abilities to present persuasive arguments, and describe ideas clearly and thoughtfully in writing. Using the CTW Neuroscience Rubric, CTW assessment for all sections of this course compared the student's first written product and the last written product. The nature of these written assignments was different across sections of the course, both the first and last written products were review papers that described and analyzed several peer-reviewed papers covering a particular issue within the course ("Introduction to Neural Systems"); all assessment was on the post-feedback product.

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

#### Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Organization and Logic on the final assignment. 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. Target In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final 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.

#### Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Position and Balance on the final 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 addresses 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

#### Target for O3: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final 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.
The median score for Use of Evidence for the first written product was 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range with 63% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 100% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 3 Figure NEUR 4910a Spring 2013.

Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes

In the 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Grammar and Mechanics on the final 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 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Content and Development on the final 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 2012-2013 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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 4910, our advanced 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 the final assignment. 0. Has committed intentional plagiarism by copying and/or paraphrasing one or more sentences from a source and not using quotation marks or a citation to indicate the ideas are not her/his 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the first written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 75% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the last written product was 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range with 87% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910a Spring 2013. The median score for Content and Development for the first written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 75% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development for the last written product was 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range with 87% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910a Spring 2013. The median score for Content and Use of Sources for both the first and last written product was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range with 75% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910a Spring 2013.

M 5: NEUR 4910-Spring 2012b: First and last written products (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

NEUR 4910 provides neuroscience majors with more advanced experience in interpreting and analyzing research papers in a sub-discipline or topic area of neurosciences. Course assignments vary according to topic areas and instructor interest but all 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 all sections of this course compared the student's first written product and the last written product. The nature of these written assignments was different across sections of the course. For this course, the first written product was a short reaction statement based on a question done by the instructor about an assigned paper. The final written product was a "synopsis-and-critique" paper that described and analyzed a peer-reviewed paper covering a particular issue within the course ("Brain Mechanisms of Reward and Reinforcement"). The substantial difference between assignment formats precluded analyzing pre-post rubric scores for two categories: "Grammar and Mechanics" and "Citation and Use of Resources".

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

Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Organization and Logic on the final assignment. 0. Ideas are arranged in a chaotic, disorganized, or circular manner; the logical connections between ideas are consistently unclear. 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. Target In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final assignment. 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims. 1. 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
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Address rubric scoring
The assessment data indicate considerable variation in rubric scores across sections of our advanced course (NEUR 4910). This is perhaps not surprising as the entire NEUR 4910 faculty had never taught this course nor had they taught CTW courses before. Nevertheless, we will address this issue in the coming reporting period by meeting prior to each semester to confirm broad agreement 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The median score for Organization and Logic for the first written product was 2, which is at the low end of the 'developing' range with none of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Organization and Logic for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 46% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 8% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 1 Figure NEUR 4910b Spring 2013.

Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Position and Balance on the final assignment. 0. Does not take any position on the issue. Does not take a consistent position on the issue. 2. Takes a consistent position on the issue, but ignores relevant evidence 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The median score for Organization and Logic for the first written product was 2, which is at the low end of the 'developing' range with none of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 23% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 2 Figure NEUR 4910b Spring 2013.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 8% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 3 Figure NEUR 4910b Spring 2013.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 8% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910b Spring 2013.

Target for O3: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively

In the 2012-2013 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 4910, our advanced CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on the final 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 8% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 3 Figure NEUR 4910b Spring 2013.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The median score for Use of Evidence for the last written product was 3, which is at the high end of the 'developing' range with 8% of the students rating a score of 4 (the lower end of the 'mastering' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Outcome 4 Figure NEUR 4910b Spring 2013.

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

Address rubric scoring
The assessment data indicate considerable variation in rubric scores across sections of our advanced course (NEUR 4910). This is perhaps not surprising as the entire NEUR 4910 faculty had never taught this course nor had they taught CTW courses before. Nevertheless, we will address this issue in the coming reporting period by meeting prior to each semester to confirm broad agreement in rubric assessment (perhaps by mock grading of an assignment by all CTW faculty). Between these interactions and faculty re-teaching the same CTW we anticipate refinement in both specific assignments and in reporting.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Address rubric scoring

The assessment data indicate considerable variation in rubric scores across sections of our advanced course (NEUR 4910). This is perhaps not surprising as the entire NEUR 4910 faculty had never taught this course nor had they taught CTW courses before. Nevertheless, we will address this issue in the coming reporting period by meeting prior to each semester to confirm broad agreement in rubric assessment (perhaps by mock grading of an assignment by all CTW faculty). Between these interactions and faculty re-teaching the same CTW we anticipate refinement in both specific assignments and in reporting.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: NEUR 4910-Spring 2012b: First and last written products | Outcome/Objective: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively

Address rubric scoring

The assessment data indicate considerable variation in rubric scores across sections of our advanced course (NEUR 4910). This is perhaps not surprising as the entire NEUR 4910 faculty had never taught this course nor had they taught CTW courses before. Nevertheless, we will address this issue in the coming reporting period by meeting prior to each semester to confirm broad agreement in rubric assessment (perhaps by mock grading of an assignment by all CTW faculty). Between these interactions and faculty re-teaching the same CTW we anticipate refinement in both specific assignments and in reporting.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: NEUR 4910-Spring 2012b: First and last written products | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates critical thinking effectively

Refine rubric use

The CTW program in Neuroscience is now fully operational as we offer both the junior/entry level course (NEUR 3020) and the senior/exit-level course (NEUR 4910). As in previous years, NEUR 3020 will be taught both in Fall 2013 and in Spring 2014 whereas we will offer one section of NEUR 4910 in Fall 2013 and one section of this course for Spring 2014. Different faculty will teach each of these 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 growing, major for 2013-2014. Nevertheless, a main goal will be to staff and train instructors for three to four sections of NEUR 4910 for the successive reporting year (2014-2015) as we anticipate demand for this course to grow with our increasing major population. 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. In addition, the CTW Ambassador will work with the existing CTW faculty to refine and improve their instruction. In particular, there is a need to increase the consistency in application of the rubric among NEUR 4910 instructors as evidenced by the highly divergent rubric scores across sections. The CTW Ambassador will meet with CTW faculty prior to each semester to go over the rubric and engage in mock grading exercises so that there is closer calibration of scoring/grading.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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?

There were several major accomplishments this year: First, we offered all of the CTW courses as well as multiple sections of each course. Second, we recruited three faculty to teach three different sections of NEUR 4910. Lastly, at the end of this reporting period, we revised our CTW rubric (for the 2013-2014 reporting period) to accommodate a diversity of topics taught in NEUR 4910. Specifically, we changed the "Position and Balance" criterion to "Position and/or Balance" to allow for grading of written work that does necessarily require a particular theoretical position to be supported.

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

All but one of our courses (NEUR 4910b Spring 2013) met our rubric expectations ("Developing" for our entry level course and...
SLO 2: Integration from research to practice

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 mastering 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

94.36% 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 88.5% 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 6.55% 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 and Integrative Thinking Rubric

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

Findings for 4600 Section-A:10. 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. 87% of the students reached the upper mastery level (between 4 & 5) on the rubric. 23% reached the upper mastery level between (5.5 and 6) on the rubric. Only three students came to my office for assistance after the first paper. There were several students that made minimal adjustments to their papers. Findings for 4600 Section-B: 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. 50% 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.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
4600 Action Plan
Meet with the consultant prior to, during, and at the end of the course to assess grading technique and consistency of paper evaluation. Course Coordinator will provide examples of papers that the students will be able to view and in essence get a visual understanding of expectations. Course Coordinator will continue to encourage students to seek help from professor, consultant, and writing labs. Course Coordinator will have students sign a sign-in sheet to encourage and hold students accountable for taking advantage of the services the course coordinator and CTW consultant(s) offer inside and outside of the classroom setting.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric for 4600 | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Course Coordinator

Action Plan 4600
Provide additional review of the assignment and rubric with students where greatest challenges occur.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric for 4600 | Outcome/Objective: Integration from research to practice

Implementation Description: Ongoing review sessions will be set up
Responsible Person/Group: Course Coordinator

2080 Action Plan
The Professor will continue to review the assignment in class, provide an example paper, and hold classroom time for students to discuss the critiques to their paper. The CTW consultants will provide a time for students to come see them outside of class. Course Coordinator will have students sign a sign-in sheet to encourage and hold students accountable for taking advantage of the services the course coordinator and CTW consultant(s) offer inside and outside of the classroom setting.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric for 2080 | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: The new CTW Ambassador is unknown at this time

4600 Action Plan
The Course Coordinator will continue to review the assignment in class, encourage students to seek out assistance from the professor and the CTW consultant and the writing lab. The Course Coordinator will provide an example of the paper for students to see content and visual expectations of the paper. The Course Coordinator will have students sign a sign-in sheet to encourage and hold students accountable for taking advantage of the services the course coordinator and CTW consultant(s) offer inside and outside of the classroom setting.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric for 4600 | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
- | Integration from research to practice

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Course Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
A major accomplishment in our program is that the level of critical thinking improves from entry to exit level. Last year we specified the importance of consistency within each course to ensure the data we compare from entry to exit level is the most accurate.

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?
A higher percentage of nursing students are in the mastery level of the rubric upon exiting the curriculum than entering the curriculum.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The CTW program in nursing struggles with competing with the clinical aspect of nursing. Trying to relay to the students that critical thinking can be developed through writing and assist the students with implementing tactile skills has been difficult. Students do not appear to put the same value on the writing aspect of critical thinking as they do the hands-on clinical skills. Students taking advantage of the services the professors and consultants offer regarding the CTW assignments has been problematic. Some students do not make this assignment a priority. Maybe we can involve someone from the Center of Instructional Innovation to speak with the students about the importance of critical thinking through writing. This may provide another perspective for the students.

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

A major change that occurred within a CTW course (2080) was that the professors changed in the middle of the academic year. The professor did schedule meetings with the oncoming professor to discuss the CTW assignment; however, this change may have affected the data collected from the fall 2012 semester to the spring 2013 semester.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Nutrition
As of 12/13/2016 05:59 PM 03:37
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Division of Nutrition defines critical thinking as the ability to identify a nutrition or dietetics-related question and to select, critique, analyze, synthesize and communicate information that address the question. To function effectively as future nutrition and dietetic professionals, dietetic students must be able to access and accurately interpret the scientific literature and make practice-related decisions based on strength of evidence and evidence-based guidelines.

Goals
G 1: Interpretation
Students will demonstrate the ability to translate information from the nutrition literature without altering the intended meaning.

G 2: Analysis
Students will demonstrate the ability to access and accurately analyze the scientific literature and make practice-related decisions based on strength of evidence and evidence-based guidelines.

G 3: Evaluation
Students will be able to integrate ideas, context, assumptions, and evidence when reaching conclusions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Interpretation (M: 2, 3)
Assignments: Research Paper (NUTR 3010) and Review (NUTR 4950) For NUTR 3010, students are expected to search the literature, and identify evidenc-based articles for their nutrition research paper. These articles are the foundation of their research paper. The students demonstrate their ability to identify and understand the authors' interpretation of the research interpretations and provide their independent interpretations. As the students advance through the program, they should strengthen these skills, and in NUTR 4950, their papers should reflect their ability to interpret research articles.

SLO 2: Analysis (M: 1, 2, 3)
Assignments: Research Paper (NUTR 3010) and Review or Position Paper (NUTR 4950) For NUTR 3010, students are expected 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.

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:

- Presents and analyzes the major findings by using supportive evidence Limited proficiency 0 -1 Some proficiency 2 Proficiency 3 High proficiency 4 Dismisses evidence without adequate justification Confuses cause and correlation Treats the findings as absolute Does not identify any biases or does so superficially Use of evidence is appropriate Able to distinguish between cause and correlation at a minimal level Explores findings in a limited context Is able to recognize bias in sampling and results and any conflict of interest; but reports them in a routine manner Examines evidence and its source Distinguishes between cause and correlation Explores findings in the context of the real world Is able to differentiate fact from opinion and addresses bias in a thoughtful manner Examines evidence and its source; questions its relevance and accuracy Able to distinguish causality from correlation by providing evidence Major findings are presented in the context of subordination and impact Identifies the different types of biases Offers explanation of how to overcome bias Points:

- Evaluation includes and assesses conclusions, implications and consequences Limited proficiency 0 -1 Some proficiency 2 Proficiency 3 High proficiency 4 Evaluation/conclusion is simplistic Does not raise any additional questions Does not adopt a clear idea. Does not question Assesses conclusion appropriately and begins to see a connection between conclusions and implications Adopts limited ideas with little questioning. Does not integrate ideas Consider context, assumptions and evidence in reaching conclusions Asserts
own conclusions by providing evidence. Ideas are integrated, but in a rudimentary manner. Questions Implications are clearly developed and consider ambiguity. Clear integration of conclusions and implications. Fully integrates ideas and positions and clearly justifies viewpoints.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points:</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Failures include omission or inclusion of key points.  

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

**Target for O2: Analysis**

We expect 85% of the students to receive at least 2 on the Introduction section of the Rubric.

**Target for O1: Interpretation**

We expect 85% of the students to receive at least 2 on the Content/Body of Paper section of the Rubric.

**Target for O2: Analysis**

We expect 85% of the students to receive at least 2 on the Content/Body of Paper section of the Rubric.

**M 3: Measure of Progress from NUTR 3010 to NUTR 4950 (O: 1, 2)**

The rubric scores for the review paper for each student in NUTR 4950 are compared to their rubric scores for the research paper completed in NUTR 3010. Both rubrics use the same criteria for evaluation (Introduction, Content/Body of Paper, and Conclusion). The rating scale levels for the rubric for NUTR 4950 are Developing (1 point), Developing (2 points), and Goal Oriented (3 points). The descriptions for the criteria under Developing and Goal-Oriented are the same for both rubrics. Rubrics are located in Document Management.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Interpretation**

One-hundred percent (100%) of students receiving "Emerging" scores in the Introduction section of the rubric in NUTR 3010 progress to Developing or Goal-Oriented levels in NUTR 4950. Seventy-five percent (75%) of students in NUTR 4950 move up one level in the Introduction section of the rubric from their level on the NUTR 3010 rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eighty percent (80%) of students in NUTR 4950 move up one level in the Introduction section of the rubric from their level on the NUTR 3010 rubric.

**Target for O2: Analysis**

One-hundred percent (100%) of students receiving "Emerging" scores in the Introduction section of the rubric in NUTR 3010 progress to Developing or Goal-Oriented levels in NUTR 4950. Seventy-five percent (75%) of students in NUTR 4950 move up one level in the Introduction section of the rubric from their level on the NUTR 3010 rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eighty percent (80%) of students in NUTR 4950 move up one level in the Content/Body of Paper section of the rubric from their level on the NUTR 3010 rubric.

**Target for O1: Interpretation**

One-hundred percent (100%) of students receiving "Emerging" scores in the Body of Paper section of the rubric in NUTR 4950 are Developing (1 point), Developing (2 points), and Goal Oriented (3 points). The rating scale levels for the rubric for NUTR 4950 are Developing (1 point), Developing (2 points), and Mastery (3 points). The descriptions for the criteria under Developing and Goal-Oriented are the same for both rubrics. Rubrics are located in Document Management.

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

**Target for O2: Analysis**

One-hundred percent (100%) of students receiving "Emerging" scores in the Body of Paper section of the rubric in NUTR 4950 are Developing (1 point), Developing (2 points), and Goal Oriented (3 points). The rating scale levels for the rubric for NUTR 4950 are Developing (1 point), Developing (2 points), and Mastery (3 points). The descriptions for the criteria under Developing and Goal-Oriented are the same for both rubrics. Rubrics are located in Document Management.

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

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

**Revision of Rubrics for Grading Papers**

The rubric for NUTR 4950 was revised to better evaluate student progress in CFW 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 scores for the review paper for each student in NUTR 4950 are compared to their rubric scores for the research paper completed in NUTR 3010. Both rubrics use the same criteria for evaluation (Introduction, Content/Body of Paper, and Conclusion). The rating scale levels for the rubric for NUTR 4950 are Developing (1 point), Developing (2 points), and Goal Oriented (3 points). The descriptions for the criteria under Developing and Goal-Oriented are the same for both rubrics. Rubrics are located in Document Management.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.
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 that will improve their performance level in NUTR 4950 from NUTR 3010 (e.g. Developing to Goal Oriented or Goal Oriented to Mastery).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** NUTR 4300 (juniors) and NUTR 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 NUTR 4300 and NUTR 4400.

### 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 discuss how to incorporate critical thinking assignments at all levels of the curriculum. Faculty continue to use the “guiding principles” documents for rubrics. Faculty continue to identify evaluation tools that allow students to see the connections between course content 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?

We are able to evaluate how 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. More students reach the mastery level this year. This may be related to two factors: 1) faculty doing a better job with incorporating critical thinking assignments in the the courses between the entry and exit courses; 2) the type of student (higher academic achiever) accepted in the program.

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

We will continue to improve our rubrics and assignments. Faculty buy in and involvement has improved and those who do not teach CTW courses are more engaged in the 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 continue to incorporate CTW principles a variety of courses in the curriculum.

### Academic Program Questions

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

   Two measures with corresponding targets were added. These measures better reflect what we are evaluating in our students. In addition, these measures are part of our program assessment for accreditation.

2. **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.

   Targets were met, and a greater percentage of students progressed to a higher performance level.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**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 faculty member who has taught NUTR 3010 for the past 6 years departed at the end of the 2012-2013 academic year. Interpretation and grading of course rubric may be affected.

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

Two measurements were added for SLO Interpretation and SLO Analysis: 1) Review Paper NUTR 4950 and 2) Measure of Progress from NUTR 3010 to NUTR 4950.
**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 CTW Operations Management**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 (process analysis/ mapping). 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. The writing exercise is a eight page paper with diagnostic tools used in the analysis as attachments.

**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 balance of the paper.

**SLO 2: Execution of First Draft - Business Plan (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Contains portions of all 8 sections of the Business Plan. 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. The results of the discussion component added in 2012 and continued in 2013, reflects a better understanding of the "Process Analysis" by the students.

**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. Students understand that the rubric scoring is an indication of how their service concept is developing over the course of the semester.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score for the target was 2.00. Of the 24 students who fulfilled the assignment, 16 scored a "2" or better which is 66%.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average for the 1st draft exercise was 2.50. For this assessment measurement, 22 out of 24 or 92% scored a "2" or better. 12 out of the 24 scored a "3" or better, representing a 52% of the population. There were 2 students who scored a "4", the highest rubric score representing 8% of the class.

**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, 50% 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. (Target of 20% of students scoring a "4" out of a "4" is being changed to 50% as a result of better scoring against the rubric for this period 2012-2013.)

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average for the Final Business Plan based on the 4 point rubric was a 3.50. 88% of the students who participated in the final business plan, scored a "3" or better. Interesting that this was the same percentage as the results recorded for 2011-2012 time period. This was 8 percentage points above the goal. Secondarily, 15 students scored a "4" on the final business plan or 63% of the participating students. This was a significant achievement as it was 43 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
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric for Service Operations Management | Outcome/Objective: Executive Summary

**CTW Business Plan**

On-going review of the Service Management, CTW Business Plan for MGS 4770 to ensure students understand the key components of the paper and instructions for developing the paper are clear and concise.
Mission / Purpose

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. 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, therefore, to foster critical thinking amongst our CTW students.

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, therefore, is to foster good writing skills amongst our CTW students.
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. This is associated with our first goal.

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. This is associated with our second goal.

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 attached. 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 than 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Critical Thinking

Papers of 3000 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.25 in critical thinking; those of 4990 students should be at 2.50.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking skills were assessed a 2.38 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking skills were assessed a 2.88. In both cases, then, we are exceeding our targets. 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 attached. 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 than 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Writing Skills

Papers of 3000 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.25 in writing; those of 4990 students should be at 2.5.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 3000 student's writing skills were assessed a 2.39 and the average 4990 student's writing skills were assessed a 2.93. In both cases, then, we are exceeding our targets. 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 Persons/Groups: Andrew Jason Cohen
Additional Resources: none

New rating system proposal

Assessment Coordinator has proposed to the Department that we replace the current scale used in assessment with the following:
**Proposed Assessment Scoring Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due</th>
<th>4990 Assignments between 7 and 10 with a target of 7.25, the 1010 Assignments to be scored between 1 and 4 with a target of 3.25, the 2010 Assignments to be scored between 3 and 6 with a target of 5.25, the 3000 Assignments between 5 and 8 with a target of 7.25, the 4990 Assignments at 7 and 10 with a target of 9.25, and the MAs between 11 and 14 with a target of 13.25. This proposal was discussed extensively at the Department’s February 2013 meeting (2/8/2013) and after some debate regarding having too many categories, was accepted as is. We realize that its implementation will cause a discontinuity with previous years’ data, but we expect that the increase in accuracy warrants the change.</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- We've added classes, removed classes, improved classes, always making use of all available data, including that derived from the assessment process.

- We've added Phil 3000 and Phil 4990, but CTW essentially is what Philosophers do.

- More years of data needed.

- Our CTW classes are fully operational and appear successful.

**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 classes are fully operational and appear successful.

**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?

More years of data needed.

**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 can always benefit from more WAC consultants.

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

We've added classes, removed classes, improved classes, always making use of all available data, including that derived from the assessment process.

**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 now--starting in 2013-2014--a new scoring method.

**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've added classes, removed classes, improved classes, always making use of all available data, including that derived from the assessment process.

**Goals**

- Prospective students majoring in Physics should be able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class.

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Physics & Astronomy prepares students in the B.S. in Physics program for a wide variety of career paths including scientific research, high technology commercial, military, and education. In all these paths, physics majors are expected to exhibit scientific critical thinking and to be able to communicate in writing using appropriate formats. The department incorporates these expectations in its definition of critical thinking which follows the basic scientific method:

- **a. Students develop research questions appropriate for research.**
- **b. Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.**
- **c. Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.**
- **d. Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.**
- **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.**
**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
In Fall 2012, 23 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 to be 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
In Spring 2013 a total of twelve students registered for Phys4900, Research Project. One student stopped attending and failed the course while two other students received grades of incomplete. Nine students completed and passed the course with high marks. Each of these students performed a research project with an existing research group in the department of physics & astronomy. Each student wrote a research proposal in the first two weeks of the term and received comments from the course coordinator and two fellow students. This research proposal then served as the starting point for a long research report in the appropriate style for scientific journals. The research report was written consecutively in sections: introduction, methods, results, discussion, abstract, and conclusion. Each section was shared and the student received feedback from the course coordinator and two other students. Final evaluations of all five students based on the completed long research report were completed by the course coordinator using the physics rubric. All nine students scored 3 (competency) or 4 (mastery) in all seven criteria in the final assessment with 30 out of 63 scores rated as 4 and the remaining 33 scores being 3. In comparison with our targets, 100% of students achieved at least 3 (competency) on each criterion in the rubric and 48% of the scores were 4 (mastery). The average score on each of the criteria in the rubric were: A. Develop research questions - 3.2 B. Collect appropriate data - 3.4 C. Analyze and interpret data - 3.6 D. Formulate new questions - 3.6 E. Appropriate communication - 3.2 F. Scientific writing - 3.6 G. Appropriate audience - 3.6.

### 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, space 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.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Brian Thoms, Xiaochun He, Ramesh Mani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Brian Thoms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change instructor in Phys3300
CTW assessment data has not been adequately collected over the last two years. There will be a change of instructor in this course to assure more reliable assessment and reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</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>Change instructor for Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Brian Thoms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New lab room and experiments in Phys3300
To accommodate growing enrollments the department is creating a dedicated room of larger capacity for upper division labs including the Advanced Physics Lab. The department has also purchased equipment to add more sophisticated, modern experiments which will require higher critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</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>Move Phys3300 to new room and integrate new experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2013</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?
The major achievement for this cycle is successfully accommodating increased enrollments in the Advanced Physics Lab and the Research Project classes. The larger enrollments in the lab course were accommodated by dividing the class into two halves as we proposed in our action plan from last year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Due to the lack of data in recent semesters from the entry class (Advanced Physics Lab), there is no way to determine the improvement in critical thinking. It has been observed that the performance of the students on the CTW assessment in the exit class was lower this year than last year. It was observed that some of the elements initially established in the entry class to develop critical thinking and writing skills were no longer being taught consistently. In the coming year, a new instructor in the entry class will bring back intentional instruction on critical thinking and writing into the Advanced Physics Lab.

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 Advanced Physics Lab needs some improvements. Elements of the original course design that explicitly taught critical thinking skills and writing were not being used. Correspondingly, the performance of students in the exit course CTW assessments was on the decline. These elements will be returned to the entrance CTW course along with redesign of space and experiments to improve critical thinking development.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Brian Thoms, Xiaochun He, Ramesh Mani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Brian Thoms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change instructor in Phys3300
CTW assessment data has not been adequately collected over the last two years. There will be a change of instructor in this course to assure more reliable assessment and reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</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>Change instructor for Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Brian Thoms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New lab room and experiments in Phys3300
To accommodate growing enrollments the department is creating a dedicated room of larger capacity for upper division labs including the Advanced Physics Lab. The department has also purchased equipment to add more sophisticated, modern experiments which will require higher critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</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>Move Phys3300 to new room and integrate new experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2013</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?
The major achievement for this cycle is successfully accommodating increased enrollments in the Advanced Physics Lab and the Research Project classes. The larger enrollments in the lab course were accommodated by dividing the class into two halves as we proposed in our action plan from last year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Due to the lack of data in recent semesters from the entry class (Advanced Physics Lab), there is no way to determine the improvement in critical thinking. It has been observed that the performance of the students on the CTW assessment in the exit class was lower this year than last year. It was observed that some of the elements initially established in the entry class to develop critical thinking and writing skills were no longer being taught consistently. In the coming year, a new instructor in the entry class will bring back intentional instruction on critical thinking and writing into the Advanced Physics Lab.

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 Advanced Physics Lab needs some improvements. Elements of the original course design that explicitly taught critical thinking skills and writing were not being used. Correspondingly, the performance of students in the exit course CTW assessments was on the decline. These elements will be returned to the entrance CTW course along with redesign of space and experiments to improve critical thinking 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 largest impact is on the attitude of the students as they embrace the thinking and writing skills. They increasingly see these skills as part of what it means to be a professional in this field and are anxious to master these skills. There are some indications that the faculty are seeing a difference in the students doing research projects with them and more students are completing research that is close to publication quality. The only change made this last year was to accommodate more students in these courses. In the coming year a new instructor for the first CTW course will bring back some of the originally used intentional instruction in critical thinking and writing into the first CTW course.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Political Science
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 of research 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

241 students completed POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2012-2013. 10 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 61.1% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 30.2% scored a 1(Developing) 8.5% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 64.6% of our students scored a 2 (Competent), 32.3% scored a 1(Developing) 2.8% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off. Data from all sections were not available at time of report.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 56.2% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 37.5% scored a 1(Developing) 5.8% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off.

**Target for O3: Effective Communication of results**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the presentation portion of the rubric.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill 62.6% of our students scored 2 (Competent), 36.0% scored 1 (Developing) and 2.1% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

191 students completed POLS 4900 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2012-2013. 9 sections of the course were taught during the period. 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 - 44.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 47.1% scored 3-4 (Competent) 8.5% scored 3-4 (Competent), 10% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 45.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 39.3% scored 3-4 (Competent) 5.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 41.4% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 38.6% scored 3-4 (Competent) 15.7% scored 3-4 (Competent), 15.7% 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 2012-2013 - 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 - 44.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 45.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 30.2% scored 3-4 (Competent) 10% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 48.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 41.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 10.0% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.
**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 - 45.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 41.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 12.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). 7. Presentation of conclusions - 35.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 52.9% scored 3-4 (Competent) 11.4% 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 in the rubric. In POLS 4900 student scores on the rubric were as follows - 34.4% scored 5 (Sophisticated), 40.6% scored 4 (higher end of Competent) and 21.9% scored 3 (lower end of Competent). The plan is to devote more time and learning to developing this skill in POLS 4900. In particular differences between a thesis, a hypothesis and a conclusion and developing a hypothesis that is testable and not leading to a single conclusion.

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

**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

**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 past years two major areas of weakness in critical thinking skills among our students had been identified; developing a testable hypothesis and integrating other perspectives in analysis. The action plans in place to deal with these weaknesses have been in place for several years. As the data from this years assessments show, the actions plans have resulted in remarkable improvements in assessments in these areas of past weakness. These higher assessment scores are especially notable because there has been a simultaneous tightening of assessment standards in CTW courses that have made high scores more difficult to achieve.

**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 addition to the discussion in Reflection One above, comparing scores of students in CTW course POLS 3800 with those in CTW POLS 4900 show consistently higher scores in all areas of critical thinking. POLS 3800 is a prerequisite for pols 4900. Since this pattern has been consistent over the years of the CTW program it is safe to assume that even though we are not tracking individual student assessment over the two courses, assessments have improved for each cohort as it has passed through the two courses. Within those sections of POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 that involved pre-testing, the end of course scores were also consistently higher.
**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 operationalize 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1) (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

a. Evaluate the quality of information, including differentiating empirical evidence from speculation and the probable from the improbable
b. Identify and evaluate the source, context, and credibility of information
c. Recognize and defend against common fallacies in thinking
d. Avoid being swayed by appeals to emotion or authority
e. Evaluate popular media reports of psychological research
f. Demonstrate an attitude of critical thinking that includes persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, and intellectual engagement
g. Make linkages or connections between diverse facts, theories, and observations

**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)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 2: Engages in Creative Thinking (APA 3.2) (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

**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)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 3: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3) (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

a. Identify components of arguments (e.g., conclusions, premises/assumptions, gaps, counterarguments)
b. Distinguish among assumptions, emotional appeals, speculations, and defensible evidence
c. Weigh support for conclusions to determine how well reasons support conclusions
d. Identify weak, contradictory, and inappropriate assertions
e. Develop sound arguments based on reasoning and evidence

**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)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: 3530 Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

PSYC 3530 provides psychology majors with experience in research design, data analysis, and scientific communication needed for higher-level understanding in 4000-level courses, the development and writing of senior-year theses, and graduate study. Topics include experimental and quasi-experimental design, statistical techniques for comparing multiple groups, and the structure and style of scientific writing in psychology. The form of the final paper varied across sections and consisted of an APA-style synthesis or critique paper utilizing 1-5 recent peer-reviewed articles as primary sources. The data below reflect a sample of the sections from the two terms.

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

**Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)**

In the 2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students’ submissions for effective use of critical thinking on a 0-5 scale. 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 PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be at least in the Developing (2-3) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)" was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 98.6% 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**Target for O2: Engages in Creative Thinking (APA 3.2)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors may -- but are not required to -- rate the students' submissions for creative thinking on a 0-5 scale. 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 PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be at least in the Developing (2-3) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Engages in creative thinking (APA 3.2)" was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 99.6% 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**Target for O3: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students’ submissions for use of reasoning on a 0-5 scale. 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 PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be at least in the Developing (2-3) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)" 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 1, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**Target for O4: Approaches problems effectively (APA 3.4)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students’ submissions for effectively approaching problems on a 0-5 scale. 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 PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be at least in the Developing (2-3) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Approaches problems effectively (APA 3.4)" 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.
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. Most students prepare some form of paper or project that requires them to synthesize information from the course and peer-reviewed research articles relevant to the topic to address a novel thesis or test a hypothesis.

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

**Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students' submissions for effective use of critical thinking on a 0-5 scale. 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 PSYC 4800, our senior/exit CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)" was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 71.5% 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**Target for O2: Engages in Creative Thinking (APA 3.2)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students' submissions for creative thinking on a 0-5 scale. A score of 0-1 is considered Emergent 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 PSYC 4800, our senior/exit CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Engages in creative thinking (APA 3.2)" was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 79.1% 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**Target for O3: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students' submissions for use of reasoning on a 0-5 scale. 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 PSYC 4800, our senior/exit CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)" was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 65.5% 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**Target for O4: Approaches problems effectively (APA 3.4)**

In the 2012-2013 CTW Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the students' submissions for effectively approaching problems on a 0-5 scale. A score of 0-1 is considered Emergent 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 PSYC 4800, our senior/exit CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The median score for "Approaches problems effectively (APA 3.4)" was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 73.7% 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, with mastering in greens, developing in yellows, and emerging in reds.

**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

**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The revised CTW rubric will be ready for use in Summer 2012 courses and will be used thereafter.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassadors

### Compare critical thinking outcomes for hybrid and standard versions of PSYC 3530

Since Spring 2012, several faculty have offered hybrid sections of our junior/entry level CTW course, PSYC 3530, in addition to sections taught with a traditional face-to-face approach. Because our department gathers a wide variety of learning outcome assessment data from all sections of PSYC 3530 (e.g., critical thinking, writing in the sciences, technology use, understanding and application of quantitative concepts), we plan to compare results from the two types of courses to determine if there are any differences. In particular, we are interested in determining if there are differences in students' demonstrated critical thinking skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** We will compile and analyze data across sections of PSYC 3530 using the instructional format as the independent variable and performance on the established learning outcome measures as the dependent variables.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassadors

### Explore additional options for the exit level course

Convert existing 4000-level courses that already have the entry level CTW course as a prerequisite to exit-level CTW courses (e.g., PSYC 4100 - Cognitive Psychology) Assign each existing version of PSYC 4800 to one of the three categories for Advanced Requirement. Courses for the major (i.e., Applied Topics, Cognitive Topics, and Diversity Topics) Implement PSYC 4000 (Laboratory Experience in Psychology), the other approved senior/exit level CTW course Establish cross-listed sections of 4800 that will have instructors from two different programs with 25 students enrolled from each program (i.e., Psychology of Gender, with the Institute for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies)

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Address the options above in the order given with the goal of reducing the substantial backlog in student demand for the exit level course while enhancing the available offerings to students and faculty.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassadors

### Explore hybridization of PSYC 4800

Given the apparent success of the hybridization of some sections of PSYC 3530 (based on student and instructor feedback), as well as the increasing interest at the university level for more courses to be taught in a hybrid format, we are now exploring options for hybridizing some sections of our senior/exit level CTW course, PSYC 4800.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** First, we will talk with faculty who teach PSYC 4800 about their interest in creating a hybrid version of their course and help them identify what kinds of resources they might need to implement their vision (e.g., technology, training, mentorship). We will then provide those faculty with the support they request and/or help them make connections with others in the department and at the Center for Instructional Innovation who can provide appropriate guidance.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
**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 “Revise Rubric (Again),” we successfully converted our rubric to one in which the measures directly map onto the objectives for critical thinking provided by the American Psychological Association (APA). For example, we used to measure students’ ability to “use critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)” with rubric elements regarding “Organization and Logic” and “Use of Evidence.” Now we simply ask faculty to assess each student’s performance on the exact criteria listed by the APA for this outcome. Because each outcome incorporates many different skills (e.g., there are seven different skills for APA 3.1), faculty choose which of the skills are relevant to the given assignment and provide a score between 0 and 5 for each outcome; students are not necessarily assessed on every item listed for a given outcome for a given assignment. This revision particularly streamlines the mapping of measures to objectives in that each objective is measured by a unique set of skills; no set of skills applies to more than one objective. The new rubric also separates two APA outcomes (APA 3.2 and APA 3.4) that had previously been combined. In keeping with the action plan on “CTW Instructor Workshops,” Dr. Darnell and Dr. Tusher conducted a workshop prior to the start of fall semester for all faculty teaching PSYC 3530 or PSYC 4800 during the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, both ambassadors met individually with faculty who were unable to attend the workshop or required additional support over the course of the year. The primary purposes of the workshop were to introduce and explain the scoring for the new rubric, to emphasize the importance of
enforcing the plagiarism policy, and to reinforce the necessity of reporting all CTW learning outcome assessment data. For 2012-2013, we approved and offered three new versions of PSYC 4800, including Personality, Psychopathology, Early Social and Developmental, and Family Relations. Two other versions, Neurobiology of Love and Decision Making, have been approved and will be offered for the first time in Fall 2013. These additions bring our total number of unique exit-level seminar topics to 19.

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

From the entry level CTW course to the exit level CTW course, students are improving in their critical thinking skills. Specifically, median scores on all measures (i.e., APA 3.1 - APA 3.4) 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). We find that the majority of students in the entry level course (52.3%) are at the developing level across all measures, whereas the majority of students in the exit level course (72.4%) are at the mastering level. This shift suggests that about half of the students in the developing range at the end of the entry-level CTW course have moved to the mastering range by the end of the exit-level CTW course. This transition is readily apparent when comparing the corresponding columns in Figure 1 (PSYC 3530) and Figure 2 (PSYC 4800) in the relative size of the yellow (developing) and green (mastering) sections.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Many of the problems described in our 2011-2012 report remain the same. Of greatest concern is the lack of regular faculty available to teach CTW courses. This issue limits students' progress through the major and their degree program, particularly because we have a backlog of students who need CTW courses to graduate in addition to rising juniors and seniors. Although almost every faculty member teaches at least one CTW course every year (and many teach at least one every semester), we are unable to staff all of the sections we offer with regular faculty and now have visiting lecturers teaching both our entry-level and exit-level CTW courses. As a result, it is possible for psychology majors to complete the CTW sequence without having a CTW course with a regular faculty instructor. Despite ongoing efforts to limit the number of Psychology majors, we have been unable to get approval from the College to implement any of our proposed strategies that would result in a reduction of any meaningful size. Furthermore, it is very difficult to get the College to provide the data we need to develop effective strategies even when it is the College that requests the data and uses it to motivate our proposals.

Regardless of faculty concern that offering CTW courses in the summer term is pedagogically unsound, particularly in the case of our entry-level course, our department, as well as the College, has been concerned in response to student complaints about delays in their academic progress. In short, to meet the goals of the CTW initiative as it is intended without further delaying our students' progress toward graduation, we continue to need the College to approve and fund 10 or more new regular faculty lines (TT and NTI) so that we can meet the demand for CTW courses without relying on VLS as CTW instructors. We also need the College to be timelier in providing us with the data we need and more supportive of the pedagogical decisions we make relevant to our CTW course offerings. In addition to these ongoing concerns, several new issues have arisen during this academic year. Delays in setting teaching assignments for CTW courses result in students' inability to tell what faculty member is teaching a given section (both PSYC 3530 and PSYC 4800) and the topic of the course (PSYC 4800). Considering the value that the universe places on CTW courses, it seems extremely unfair to deny students the opportunity to take these courses with the instructor of their choosing and/or on a topic that is relevant to their future plans. Forcing a student with no interest in a particular subfield of psychology (e.g., clinical) to take a challenging senior seminar in an area he or she finds counter to the goals of the CTW initiative and the department's efforts to get students to make more thoughtful, organized choices about their course of study. In addition, this situation creates animosity and frustration in the classroom for students who were looking forward to taking a course on a particular topic (e.g., psychology of language) and instead have to take it on an unrelated topic (e.g., substance abuse counseling). In the case of our entry-level CTW course, students already have a great deal of anxiety about the topic (i.e., research methods, statistics, and scientific literacy) and the likelihood they will successfully pass the course, which has a one retake limit. Uncertainty about who their instructor will be adds to this anxiety and can result in an unnecessary level of tension during the course if the students end up with an instructor whose approach is not suited to their learning style and/or someone with whom they have already had an unsuccessful classroom experience. Delays in assigning particular instructors to sections also result in students not knowing the modality of instruction (i.e., face-to-face, hybrid, or online) until after they have already registered and typically not until they arrive on the first day of class. This is because the instructor generally determines the modality of the course, and several faculty who teach CTW courses are already in the College's most innovative and technologically savvy in the department. Although we have had good success with hybrid versions of courses, some students prefer and are more likely to succeed in traditional face-to-face learning environments. Because demand for our CTW courses is so high, a student who finds himself/herself in a course on an undesirable topic or taught in an undesirable modality will not give up the space hoping to get a seat in a different section, because it is much more likely that the student will lose his/her space altogether, further delaying graduation. Instead, students bombard faculty with replacement (e.g., a student who cannot answer a question about a request for special treatment (e.g., to be “secretly” overflowed into a course with a College-mandated enrollment cap) that the faculty cannot accommodate. In both the entry-level and exit-level courses, faculty report that a substantial subset of students struggles with writing skills to a degree unexpected of students who are on the verge of graduation. Although we do not track writing skill as part of our CTW assessment any more, CTW instructors agree that students' poor writing skills present one of the greatest impediments to assessing their ability to think critically. Statistical analysis of our students' grades from ENGL 1101/1102 and our CTW courses revealed no significant correlation, suggesting that students can do well in the English courses without having mastered basic, college level writing skills. This deficit leaves them unprepared to apply these skills to critical thinking tasks in our major-specific 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?

Although we continue to 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 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 although demand for individual tutoring has made it impossible for individual tutors to co-teach workshops for C-class and PSYC 1000. At an end-of-the-year faculty meeting the 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 setting. New faculty have had good success teaching CTW courses and many of our incoming faculty request to teach the entry level
course during their first semester on campus. Moreover, some TT faculty who were initially very resistant to teaching the entry level CTW course have reported to the department chair that they now enjoy teaching the class a great deal and actually prefer teaching it to some other undergraduate courses.
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Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking in Public Management and Policy involves evaluating arguments and making and justifying claims based on theoretical understandings and/or empirical assessment.

The Department of Public Management and Policy is committed to community service with the goal of improving government, society, and quality of life in the Atlanta area, the Southeast region, and throughout the United States and other countries.

Goals

G 2: Understand links between theory and research
Students must demonstrate the ability to connect theoretical issues involving policy with empirical assessment techniques.

G 3: 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.

G 1: Policy Process and Outcomes Paper
Exhibit critical thinking about the policy process and policy outcomes in a written policy paper.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Preparation of a final CTW paper (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
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.

PMAP 3311 Critical Policy Issues Final Project Assignment

SLO 2: Prepare final CTW paper (G: 1)
Students will draw on an understanding of the public policy process to examine a number of broad policy arenas as well as specific policy that is currently under debate. Students will have the opportunity to think critically about how the policy process influences policy and its outcomes and whether a given policy is delivering what it should. They will also apply their critical thinking skills to defend their positions on given policy issues.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubric (O: 1)
Description of rubric. See repository.

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

Target for O1: Preparation of a final CTW paper
80% of students achieving at least the partially demonstrated skills/objectives for the final CTW paper assignment in CTW courses.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In the 2012-2013 academic year 85% of PMAP 3311 and 80% of PMAP 4051 students achieved at least the partially demonstrated skills/objectives for the final CTW paper assignment in the respective courses.

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

Final CTW paper assignments
Improve student outcomes on final CTW paper assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Rubric
Better use of refined rubric(s) in scoring assignments.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014

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?
PMAP 3311 Critical Policy Issues replaced PMAP 3021 as a CTW course. Students completed CTW related writing assignments in PMAP 3311 beginning in Fall 2011 and continuing through Spring 2013. This related to our specific action plan to make PMAP 3311 a 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?
The percentage of students performing in the "Excellent" category on their final written assignment in PMAP 4051 improves significantly from the percentage of students who achieved this category in the PMAP 3311 course.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Rubrics need to be refined for both CTW courses and aligned more closely with the overall course assessment tool.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
Students' critical thinking and writing skills appear to be improving however more so it appears for those that already came into the courses with some basic skills in this area. We have switched one of the CTW designated courses from PMAP 3021 to the more appropriate PMAP 3311 Critical Policy Issues course since the last 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?
Some instructors refined the rubrics they used however no standardization or formalization of these revised rubrics was done.

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.
More assistance needs to be provided to those with the least critical thinking and writing skills. These students appear to be among the slowest to show progress over the period of the two CTW courses.

Annual Report Section Responses

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 is a steady increase in the number of students in our undergraduate policy degree which makes for larger CTW class sizes and more difficulty for one instructor to meet students needs even with CTW assistants.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Real Estate
As of: 12/13/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The BBA real estate major provides the student with the real estate knowledge and analytical skills necessary to support real property decisions in business environments as well as the requisite skills to effectively communicate them. Critical thinking through writing in Real Estate is defined as using writing to assist students in developing the ability to apply problem-solving skills to formulate and communicate convincing solutions to real estate business problems.

Goals
G 1: Problem solving
Students will be adept at solving real estate business problems.

G 2: Clear communication of real problem solutions
### 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 International Place 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 International Place 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 International Place 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 International Place 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 International Place case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item in the rubric “Develop rational, reasonable, and informed 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 International Place 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 student written analysis of the 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. The case does not contain specific questions that match the individual objectives or items in the rubric. The case revolves around real estate cash flow analysis, valuation, foreclosure issues, bankruptcy, and negotiation. Students are expected to summarize and organize the relevant facts, perform a cash flow analysis, compare valuations, analyze options, propose a logical recommendation supported by their analysis, and discuss the possible implications in and organized and clear fashion.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1: Data Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.17; 94% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2: Analytical skills</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.39; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3: Evaluation of evidence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4: Integration of materials</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O5: Conclusions
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.

Target for O6: Communication
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Average 2.67; 89% of students met standard of 2.0 out of 3.0 on International Place case.

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

Continued instructor training
In order to ensure consistency and that the rubric scoring is consistent, the Ambassador will hold 1 workshop at end of each semester with the assigned instructor for the upcoming semester to review the previous semester's experience along with the planned syllabus, CTW assignment, grading, and assessment for the upcoming semester. This will be the time to review any questions and direct instructor to CTW materials.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric
- Outcome/Objective: Analytical skills
- Communication
- Conclusions
- Data Evaluation
- Evaluation of evidence
- Integration of materials

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Ambassador

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rubric
- Outcome/Objective: Analytical skills
- Communication
- Conclusions
- Data Evaluation
- Evaluation of evidence
- Integration of materials

Implementation Description: The previous instructor remained at GSU for an additional year, so the training was delayed.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Ambassador

Add CTW designation to RE4160
Apply to the CTW leadership team, the Undergraduate Assessment Committee, and the RCB Undergraduate Program Council to add CTW designation to RE4160 Investment Analysis and Income Property Valuation to make it easier for real estate majors to fulfill the CTW requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Ambassador and Interim Department Chairman.

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?
Review and change of case used for revise and resubmission to assess CTW. A result of the ongoing review and discussion between the Ambassador and the instructor.

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?
Almost all students demonstrated improved capacity to summarize key information and details. Students sharpened their analysis skills dramatically during the course of the semester. Writing styles also become more business-like and less casual during the semester. The scores on each section of the rubric improved between draft and final grading. Examples are attached. They are classified as Inferior, Satisfactory, or Superior. Inferior – Did not address most of the questions or key issues. Summary of relevant case facts was weak. No analysis of the case options provided. No improvement over the draft submission. Satisfactory – Addressed most, if not all, of the questions and key issues. Analysis of recommendation provided but no analysis of other options. Superior – Addressed most, if not all, of the key issues and questions. Analysis of all case options provided as well as an evaluation of each option and the final recommendation. Presentation format was complete.

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?

CTW has mainly required additional reporting. We were already employing writing in problem solving situations in our courses. Since last year, the instructor changed the assignment used for CTW assessment and we applied to have a second course given the CTW designation to give students more options to complete their degree without delaying graduation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Religious Studies

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

Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking as applied to the field of religious studies consists of the valid and fact-based analysis, understanding and comparison of religious phenomena in their varied contemporary and historical contexts. It emphasizes the individual's ability to grasp, assess, and comment objectively and with scholarly insight on religious texts—both primary and secondary—of theories, rituals, beliefs, and actions. Since all upper-level Religious Studies courses require significant writing and since many of our majors go 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 scholarly arguments put forward by religious studies scholars.

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 clear summaries of scholarly arguments and to incorporate examples and data from primary texts in a final research paper.

G 3: Evaluation
In Rels 3750 students will demonstrate the ability to understand and to compare and contrast religious claims and scholarly arguments about religious phenomena, drawing on textual evidence to support their claims. In Rels 4750 students will be able to understand and evaluate religious claims and scholarly arguments, identifying strengths, weaknesses, and implications of scholars' arguments.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Written Communication (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Through paper assignments, students will demonstrate clear communication skills and the ability to write without grammatical errors that detract from the clarity of the argument. In Rels 3750, students will write a paper with clear organization at the paragraph and global levels 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).

Strategic Plan Associations

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

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

Instructor will use the departmental CTW rubric to assess all CTW assignments in the course and will collect and preserve these. 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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

For Rels 3750: In Spring '13 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final papers written for the Rels 3750 class using the rubric. 78% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 72% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. For Rels 4750: In spring '11 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final responses essays written for Rels 4750 using the rubric. 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 42% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

Only 65% of Rels 4750 students were assessed at reaching a target of 85% competency or better in the capstone paper. Only 65% of Rels 4750 students were assessed at reaching a target of 85% competency or better in the capstone paper. Based on this finding, it appears that students completing the initial CTW course for Religious Studies majors are somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. For Rels 3750: In Spring '13 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final papers written for the Rels 3750 class using the rubric. 78% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 72% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. For Rels 4750: In spring '11 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final responses essays written for Rels 4750 using the rubric. 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 42% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. For Rels 3750: In Spring '13 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final papers written for the Rels 3750 class using the rubric. 78% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 72% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. For Rels 4750: In spring '11 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final responses essays written for Rels 4750 using the rubric. 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 42% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. For Rels 3750: In Spring '13 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final papers written for the Rels 3750 class using the rubric. 78% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 72% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 65% 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 somewhat effective at providing an overall focus for their writing and are able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills.

Prior to submitting the final version of this document, it was proofread by Scott Smith.
**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 demonstrate the ability to organize information at the paragraph and global levels, and they are not able to incorporate supporting data 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 a revision step be incorporated in the capstone paper writing process. In addition, the Rels 4750 instructor will target these skills for special attention in the capstone seminar, as well as address correct citation and bibliographic skills.

**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. In addition, the Rels 4750 instructor will target these skills for special attention in the capstone seminar.

**Incorporation of revision step.**

In subsequent years, the instructor will incorporate a revision step in the Rels 3750 and 4750 capstone paper writing process in order to provide an opportunity to provide feedback on writing.

---

**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.

**Strategy for improving idea/content, writing mechanics achievements.**

The Rels 4750 instructor will be encouraged to maintain the focus on writing, but also revise syllabus to restore some time to content addressing these writing/mechanical issues. 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 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.

**Strategy for improving Ideas/Content and Writing/Mechanics**

The CTW ambassador will meet with Rels 3750 and 4750 instructors to discuss areas that need addressing.

---

**Incorporation of revision step.**

In subsequent years, the instructor will incorporate a revision step in the Rels 3750 and 4750 capstone paper writing process in order to provide an opportunity to provide feedback on writing.
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?
While students demonstrate adequate thinking skills, their writing skills have not improved. The program needs to address writing issues more effectively in both the 3000- and 4000-level CTW sections.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Our students have demonstrated an improved ability to understand religious thinkers' views and arguments and to understand how these views and arguments are applied to specific political and cultural phenomena.

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?
Students consistently fail to demonstrate adequate writing skills. This may be due in part to the fact that Rels 3750 has been taught by new faculty members in the department who are not familiar with the specific CTW writing goals and objectives. The Department will try to address this problem in 2013-14.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
No changes have been made to the CTW initiative. The Department has tried to use the CTW course more effectively to introduce students to the application of religious studies outside of academia, highlighting the program's commitment to prepare undergraduates to contribute to the community with the skills and knowledge they have gained as Religious Studies majors, particularly in the fields of business, nonprofit work, health care, education, the media, and politics.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
No changes in the assessment process were made in 2012-13. In 2013-14 we plan to change the assessment process so that the objectives are more concrete in the writing area. We will also conduct assessment in "real time," as the student work is submitted and graded, rather than waiting until the spring/summer.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Based on this year's assessment data, we will incorporate more revision steps in both Rels 3750 and 4750 to give students feedback on their writing. We will also adjust the measures used to assess outcomes in order to use more appropriate measures for each goal and objective.

Annual Report Section Responses

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
We are adjusting our measures for next year, but the measures for 2012-13 were the same as the measures for 2011-12.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
We changed a couple of the outcomes to be more specific, focusing on organizational skills at the paragraph and global levels.

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
We have had faculty members serve on the University Senate (Committee on Academic Programs, Admissions & Standards, ad hoc committees such as Special Talents committee). Our Director of Undergraduate Studies has served on the Undergraduate Committee and on the Undergraduate Petitions Committee.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
We work with the appropriate University offices to remove obstacles to student progression toward the degree. We have also permitted students to make adjustments to their B.A. program when appropriate to facilitate their progress toward degree. We are in the process of developing a dual B.A./M.A. degree to retain students who are interested in pursuing both degrees in an efficient manner. Finally, we have developed an internship program (with a critical reading and writing component) to retain students who anticipate moving directly into the work force after graduation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Respiratory Therapy
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department 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) by passing the national examination given by the National Board for Respiratory Care.

**G 2: Certified Respiratory Therapist**
Each student will be able to make acceptable clinical decisions to become a Certified Respiratory Therapist (CRT) by passing the national examination given by the National Board for Respiratory Care.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: NBRC-RRT (G: 1) (M: 1)**
All students will:
1. 90% of students will pass the written national registry exam on the first attempt offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care.
2. 90% of students will pass the clinical simulation national registry exam on the first attempt offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care.
3. 90% of students will graduate with a BSRT at the conclusion of the 5 semester professional program.

**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.

**Institutional Priority 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.

**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 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

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2. Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3. Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**SLO 2: NBRC-CRT (G: 2) (M: 1)**
1. 90% of students will pass the national certification exam on the first attempt offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care.

**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 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. 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. Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2. Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: CRT/RRT (O: 1, 2)**
100% of 2013 Graduates passed the CRT exam. 100% of 2013 Graduates passed the RRT written exam. 100% of 2013 Graduates passed the RRT clinical simulation exam.

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 competently 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
- **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?

All students passed both national exams achieving the credential CRT and 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. Although we did not achieve 100% first time pass on the RRT exam, all students subsequently passed.

**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 assess the ongoing CTW courses. At this time we feel content with our program and outcomes.

**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 allow them the freedom to express themselves creatively. No changes this year to our courses or faculty.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 CTW Risk Management
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

Mission / Purpose

The stated mission of the Department of Risk Management and Insurance (RMI) is to be the defining program advancing knowledge and educating students in the economics of measuring, managing, and allocating risk for individuals and households, organizations, and across society. For the purposes of our courses, critical thinking is defined as the ability to construct a thoughtful and discerning analysis of a risk management problem by evaluating a set of associated facts and using the facts in conjunction with appropriate theories and analytical methods to develop defensible and well-reasoned conclusions on how to address the identified problem. 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 good candidates to solve the problem; and 4) Identify the appropriate approach and be able to explain why this approach is superior to others.

Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking in Risk Management
Students will develop an understanding of the role of risk management within an organization and demonstrate how risk management can be used to help achieve the objectives of an organization through the use of special exercises, case studies and written examinations that will require them to apply critical thinking and writing skills.
G 2: Value of Risk Management

Students will develop an understanding of and be able to describe how risk management can help an organization achieve its objectives, such as increasing the value of a firm.

G 3: Demonstration of Critical Thinking Through Writing

Students will be able describe and apply the various elements of the risk management process through well-reasoned and articulate writing that reflects critical thinking about risk management issues and problems.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Goal 1 Risk Assessment Process (G: 1) (M: 1)

Three mini cases are assigned throughout the semester. Each of these mini cases require students to explore different aspects of the risk management process by conducting a critical assessment of a hypothetical risk management problem. The cases become increasingly more challenging in terms of their scope, the theories and methods that must be employed, and the nature of the risk management problem that must be "solved." The objective is to have students progressively develop their critical thinking and writing skills as they take on more challenging assignments and acquire a better understanding of what is required of them. Class discussions and feedback provided on submitted assignments are used to help students understand what is expected of them. A final case study requires students to combine all of the skills and lessons learned from the prior assignments to identify, analyze, and manage risks using a statistical simulation of the risk exposures faced by a real firm and the risk management devices available to it in developing an integrated risk management strategy for the firm. Students are required to explain each component of the case study in writing including a thoughtful discussion of the risk management strategy they ultimately developed for the firm.

SLO 2: Goal 2 Value of Risk Management (G: 2) (M: 2)

Students should develop an understanding of and be able to thoughtfully discuss the theoretical foundation for the application of risk management within organizations and how risk management can help organizations achieve their objectives, such as increasing the value of a firm.

SLO 3: Goal 3 Demonstration of Thinking through Writing (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students should be able to conduct relatively basic analyses of different kinds of risk exposures using facts, theories and appropriate methods to develop well-reasoned approaches for solutions to manage these risk exposures. Students were given three writing opportunities (mini-cases) where they were required to write a three-page paper about each case. Students were assessed on organization, form (grammar and spelling), citation skills, use of appropriate risk management concepts and methods, combining quantitative and qualitative analyses and their ability to develop well-reasoned conclusions based on their overall analysis. An exemplar case was based on the decision-making culture and process involving the launch of the space shuttle Challenger. This is a classic case study in organizational decision making that reflects the competition between different views and interpretations of available facts on whether it was prudent to authorize the launch under adverse weather conditions. The specific case study used in the course was “disguised” as a situation in which a decision needs to be made on whether to race a car in NASCAR race that had experienced engine failures under cold weather conditions. The students were given some engineering data, some weather date, the perspectives of different members of the race team, the financial consequences of different potential outcomes (based on the decision to race or not) and a model with which to analyze the data provided to assist their analysis. The students were then asked questions about their decision to race (or not) and justify the basis of their decision. While the cases were designed for the critical thinking component of the class, we decided to make a push for organization and describing conclusions. Three essay examinations are given during the course of the semester. The course is essentially divided into three sections. The first two examinations each correspond to topics covered in their respective sections of the course. A final examination is also given which covers topics in the third section of the course but is also cumulative in the sense that it contains questions on topics covered in the first two sections of the course. Students are required to demonstrate critical thinking and writing in their answers to the questions on these exams.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Final Case (O: 1, 3)

The final written exercise for the course is a case study of the risk management process for a German tractor company. The case requires students to use knowledge and skills acquired previously in the course to perform a full-scale risk management analysis for the firm that encompasses all of the pertinent elements of such an analysis. This assignment is based on a case study developed by Department faculty that has been presented to insurance/risk management industry professionals so it is relatively sophisticated and highly relevant to actual risk management analyses that are performed in the industry. Students are provided with documents that consist of an overview of the company and its operations and an inspection manual that provides a detailed review of its risk exposures. Students are also given an excel-based simulation model that they use to make choices re: risk management measures, insurance arrangements, and the use of various financial derivative contracts to manage the technical and financial risk exposures of the firm. After making an initial set of choices, students then run the simulation model to see how their choices affect the firm's net income and stockholder equity and how much "value" is added to the firm by the choices they have made. The assignment has four components: 1. Students are required to develop an initial risk management plan and explain how they developed the plan and the basis for their initial choices. 2. Students then must run the simulation model based on their initial risk management plan and explain the results of the simulation run. 3. Based on the results of their initial risk management plan, students are required to modify their plan, run another simulation and explain the results of their modified plan. Students also are advised to run several simulations testing the results of different risk management choices with the objective of developing a risk management plan that achieves the best results. 4. Finally, the students are required to explain how using risk management increases the value of the firm.

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

Target for O1: Goal 1 Risk Assessment Process

The Department of Risk Management and Insurance expects that 90% of students will be able to describe and use the risk management process properly for the case study firm.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

We have continued to use the tractor company case study that was first introduced in 2011. The assignment requires students to develop a risk management plan for tractor manufacturer based in Germany. The case questions specifically require the students to go through a a step by step process in assessing the risk exposures of the company, develop an initial
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Rethink Assignments**

We received a number of complaints about the mini case study assignments. One of the problems was that the students had no context in which to conduct a risk assessment. They wanted an example case. I wanted them to use their imagination to look at the materials and then come up with a rough draft of an assessment. I really didn’t want to provide them with an example (as we developed a detailed rubric). I believe they will just copy the example and not really think about the assignment. So, instead of making the students look at a number of different companies, we will make them choose one for the semester. Each of the assignments will relate 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:** In-Progress
- **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

**Improving Student Performance on the Case Study**

While a high percentage of students scored well on the first question in the rubric and the average score on this assignment exceeded 90%, we still have a concern about a number of students who scored significantly below the average for the case study. We would also like to increase our standards for what is expected of students on this exercise. This is an observation that also
Rethink and revise our approach to this course and our entire curriculum

We have had several meetings with the faculty members who have taught this course to discuss their experience and to share their thoughts on what they think has worked well and what has not and what they would like to do differently. These discussions will continue throughout the summer and will lead to some interim changes for the Fall 2013 Semester and further changes beyond this fall. While we believe that we have made some progress over the several years we have been teaching this course, we also believe that we much farther to go in getting most of our students to perform at level that we would like to see them perform. Our planning will not only address this course but also how critical thinking and writing can be better integrated throughout our curriculum. To understand the motivation behind and the fundamentals of our action plan, it is helpful to briefly characterize the challenges we face in using a CTW approach in teaching this course. As mentioned earlier in the report, many of the students who take this course lack the critical thinking and writing skills that we would otherwise expect them to have when they start this course. Hence, we find ourselves in something of a catch-up mode in terms of structuring the written exercises and examinations for the course and bring students along as well as can be expected given the point where many start from. This has led us to consider short-term changes to the course that will be followed by more fundamental changes to the course and our overall curriculum. For the Fall 2013 Semester class, we are thinking of doing several things. It is likely that we will keep the current set of assignments but will tweak them to enable better student performance. The bulk of our efforts will focus on doing more things to encourage and help students develop their CTW skills. Specifically, we will: 1) make a more concerted effort early on to stress the importance of the CTW aspect of the course and what will be expected of them and why it is important; 2) bring in guest speakers to explain how to conduct research and write effectively; 3) make use of guides and primers that may be available on critical thinking and writing; 4) use a tutor that can help students with both quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis according to their needs; 5) spend more time in class in preparing students for the course exercises and exams and providing examples of good thinking and writing; and 6) experiment with the use of other devices that may help students develop their CTW skills. For the Spring 2014 Semester, we are considering a more fundamental restructuring of the course but our discussions on this are at a preliminary stage so we are reluctant to be more specific on what that restructuring might entail. Finally, in recognition of many students' lack of preparation for the CTW requirements of this course, we are working on a plan that will better expose students to and develop their critical thinking and writing skills throughout our curriculum. This plan too is in its very early stages with much more work and vetting to be done. The essence of our plan will be to set CTW and other objectives for every course we teach so that the instructors in these courses will be expected to implement consistent set of standards that students in those course will be expected to meet according to where these courses reside in our curriculum and the timeline students would normally follow in taking these courses. As students move from lower to higher level courses their CTW skills will be expected to progress accordingly.

Revisit test design and preparation

As discussed further below in our action plan for Goal 3, we have faced a significant challenge in terms of the level of most students' ability to think critically and express themselves in writing and this observation applies to our examinations and students' demonstration of their understanding of the value of risk management. Students typically take this course in their last or next to last semester and we have only a short window of time to achieve significant improvements in their CTW skills and the demonstration of those skills ideally, students would be coming to us with a much stronger foundation and we would be building on that rather than starting from much farther back. With respect to test taking, most of our students area accustomed to answering fairly well-defined questions that tend to have specific answers. If our tests were structured like we would prefer them to be, the results would be a disaster for most students. Hence, our plan is to keep pushing the envelope carefully each semester experimenting with different kinds of questions as well as providing them with more practice exercises to further develop their skills and giving them a better sense of what is expected. As discussed further in our action plan for Goal 3, our plans for examinations and student demonstration of their understanding of the value of risk management will be encompassed within a broader plan for the course and our overall curriculum.

Finally, in recognition of many students' lack of preparation for the CTW requirements of this course, we are working on a plan that will better expose students to and develop their critical thinking and writing skills throughout our curriculum. This plan too is in its very early stages with much more work and vetting to be done. The essence of our plan will be to set CTW and other objectives for every course we teach so that the instructors in these courses will be expected to implement consistent set of standards that students in those course will be expected to meet according to where these courses reside in our curriculum and the timeline students would normally follow in taking these courses. As students move from lower to higher level courses their CTW skills will be expected to progress accordingly.

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?

To be honest, I am not comfortable describing anything we achieved as a "major CTW accomplishment." At best, we were successful in making further refinements to the structure and teaching of this course as outlined in the action plans specified last year. From an instructor's perspective, we improved our presentation of the case study assignments and worked harder at helping students navigate through these assignments. However, the overall improvement in student outcomes last year to this year was modest. We believe that we have reached a point of significantly diminishing returns in terms of what can be achieved with this course as it is currently structured. To achieve substantially better outcomes, we need to rethink our fundamental approach to this course and our entire curriculum. This includes gradually raising our standards for what we consider "good" critical thinking an writing. It is not realistic for us to dramatically raise our standards until most of our students are capable of meeting them. Hence, raising our standards progressively over time as we restructure our courses seems the most feasible and fair approach.
Goals

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 fostering in undergraduate students a high level of ordered thinking and writing in the context of social work generalist practice. Critical thinking, in a social work context, is viewed as a process to assess, critique, and evaluate theories and knowledge, varying modes of practice, beliefs and attitudes, and research. Social work practitioners always consider alternative or opposing view points to reach well-reasoned solutions and conclusions to social problems. 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: Apply critical thinking skills relative to human behavior

According to the Council on Social Work Education (2008), social workers must be knowledgeable about the process involving logic and scientific inquiry. Critical thinking is central to serving clientele who are in need of supportive assessments, interventions and evaluations. NOTE: The course numbering was changed from 3330 to 3300 beginning Fall, 2011.

G 5: SW3600: Effectively apply critical thinking skills to inform and communicate understanding about public social policy

In social policy, logic and reasoned discernment are critical to understanding social problems and the necessity for a legislative response. Critical thinking is central to understanding how and why social problems exist, and what reasonable responses are required to address them in a fair and equitable manner.

G 4: SW3300: Recognize various forms of diversity in human behavior

Social workers work closely with diverse populations. There is the understanding that diversity can shape one's identity and human experience. Differences related to age, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, political ideology, etc. are characteristics of a diverse society that can impact one's worldview, and how social behavior is often defined by such differences. NOTE: The course numbering was changed from 3330 to 3300 beginning Fall, 2011.

G 6: SW3600: Engage in Policy Practice

Social workers understand that public policy impacts social service delivery. Active engagement in the political process is necessary to effectively advocate for the needs of vulnerable groups in society. The beginning of steps toward becoming social advocates is understanding how the political process works.

G 2: SW3300: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment
As a course goal and a core competency of the social work education program, students learn various theoretical perspectives that support social work practice with infants, children and adolescents. Social workers must be knowledgeable about human behavior across the life span, have an understanding of various social systems and the ways in which social systems promote or deter growth and development. To support intervention, assessment, and evaluation, social workers have an understanding of biological, social, cultural, psychological and spiritual development.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: SW3300: Demonstrate proficiency in writing and critical thinking relative to assessing human behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G: 2</th>
<th>M: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulate position statements in written format using multiple sources of information, including research, that define the biological, psychological and social aspects of human behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 3: SW3300: Apply theoretical perspectives of human behavior to support social practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G: 2</th>
<th>M: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are directed to use conceptual frameworks to guide the process of assessment, intervention and evaluation of infants, children, and adolescents as part of social work practice. Theories of psychological development, cognitive development, sociocultural cognitive development, and emotional development are a few of the conceptual frameworks that defined and critiqued to understand social behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 4: SW3300: Recognize and communicate the importance of difference in shaping life experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G: 2</th>
<th>M: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In recognizing the importance and relevance of diversity in society, social work students must develop the skill to communicate how those differences are manifested in defining life experiences, which sometimes may not align with mainstream society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 5: SW3600: Effectively analyze social policies that advance social well-being**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G: 2</th>
<th>M: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To become policy advocates, social work students must learn how to analyze, formulate and advocate for the development or remission of existing social policies that advance the well-being of vulnerable population groups. Being able to critically consider how certain social problems develop and evolve, the consequences resulting from the policy, and the most feasible legislative alternatives to address the problems in an effective and efficient manner is central to the critical thinking process in this context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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: SW3300: Biopsychosocial and Developmental Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G: 3</th>
<th>M: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed CTW assignment is in partial fulfillment of a full term paper focusing on the novel The Other Wes Moore: One Name, Two Fates (2010). To complete the CTW requirement, students complete a biopsychosocial assessment of the main character in response to a fictitious letter of inquiry from a public child welfare agency. For the first level of measurement, students construct an ecomap that visually depicts and describes how multiple systems influenced Mr. Moore's biopsychosocial well being. This measure is valued at 4 points. The section of the letter also described the biological, psychological, and social influences on Mr. Moore's development. In addition, identification of individual, family, group, organization, and community strengths and evidence of resiliency are acknowledged. The total points for this section are 20 points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O3: SW3300: Apply theoretical perspectives of human behavior to support social practice

Based on enrolled students in the course, a majority of the students will achieve a minimum of 14/20 points on the final paper submission related to the application of bio-psychosocial and developmental assessments of Wes Moore.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The total points for the biopsychosocial and developmental sections of the assignment totaled 20 points. A total of 94 students were enrolled in the course; a total of 86 (91%) students in the course received a score of 14/20, or higher on the bio-psychosocial and development assessment portion of the assignment. Upon submission of the first draft of the paper section, only 39% of the students had scored 70% or higher on that section of the assignment.

**M 2: SW3300: Acknowledgment of Audience**

Based on enrolled students in the course, a majority of the students will achieve a minimum of 14/20 points on the final paper submission related to the application of bio-psychosocial and developmental assessments of Wes Moore.
In forming the letter to the parole officer, students are evaluated on the appropriateness of the tone and voice of the letter, as well as the consistency in tone to the reader (parole officer).

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

### Target for O1: SW3300: Demonstrate proficiency in writing and critical thinking relative to assessing human behavior

Based on enrolled students in the course, a majority (70%) of the students will achieve a minimum of 12/16 points on the final paper submission related to the writing mechanics of the letter to the parole officer regarding Wes Moore. This represents a scoring of 75% on the assignment section.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The total points for the writing mechanics of the assignment totaled 16 points. Of the 94 students enrolled in the course; a total of 73 (78%) students in the course received a minimum score of 12, or higher on writing mechanics. Based on the first draft submitted, only 18% of the students had received a score of 12 or higher for writing mechanics.

### M 3: SW3300: Mechanics of Style and Organization (O: 1)

Students letter submissions are evaluated on letter organization and style, including clear introduction and conclusion, well formed paragraphs, and logical transitions, unbiased statements, use of appropriate grammar, error free spelling, punctuation, APA formatting, as necessary. This section also included a value attributed to the student meeting with the CTW consultant for a total value of 16 points.

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

### Target for O1: SW3300: Demonstrate proficiency in writing and critical thinking relative to assessing human behavior

Based on enrolled students in the course, a majority (70%) of the students will achieve a minimum of 12/16 points on the final paper submission related to the writing mechanics of the letter to the parole officer regarding Wes Moore. This represents a scoring of 75% on the assignment section.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The total points for the writing mechanics of the assignment totaled 16 points. Of the 94 students enrolled in the course; a total of 73 (78%) students in the course received a minimum score of 12, or higher on writing mechanics. Based on the first draft submitted, only 18% of the students had received a score of 12 or higher for writing mechanics.

### M 4: SW3600: Legislative Brief- Problem Definition (O: 5)

Students submitted two drafts of the written sections on the Problem Description and the Legislative Analysis before the final submission. You must give background information with some indicators (social, economic and/or political) about the severity of the problem and the effects of the problem on the state, communities, or specific population groups. Describe which groups are most affected by the problem. How does the problem impact them socially or economically? Scholarly sources should be used to help define the problem. Use U.S. census data sources, state data sources, community survey results to support your problem description. Is the problem present in every community in Georgia, or certain localities? If not, where in the state is it located? Which population groups are most affected by the problem? Are all groups impacted similarly or are there differences? Again, provide national, state or local data to support your problem description. For example, compare counties or states with national data on the issue, if appropriate. A rubric was used to assess performance measures on a scale ranging from 0 (low/no competence) to 20 (very high competence). See Legislative Photo Essay Rubric for complete details.

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

### Target for O5: SW3600: Effectively analyze social policies that advance social well-being

There were 98 students enrolled in SW3600 Social Welfare Policy course, consisting of 3 sections, taught by 3 different instructors. A target of 70% of the students will achieve a level of competency of 14 or higher, which is equivalent to 70% of the total measure.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Based on the final submissions, A total of 69 students (70.4%) of the students enrolled in SW3600 made a final score of 14 or higher on the Problem Definition section of the paper, meeting the target for the course. Due to inconsistencies in the assessments for the drafts, the data on draft scores are not available.

### M 5: SW3600: Legislative Brief - Legislative Analysis (O: 6)

Students submitted two drafts of the legislative analysis section of the paper. This section included the following information: What solution(s) are proposed to resolve the problem? What are the goals of the legislative bill? What does it hope to achieve? What methods or service strategies (e.g., new/amended programs, extended access to services for marginalized groups, new monetary benefits, including tax credits) are proposed to address the defined problem? What specific services or benefits will come from the proposed solution? Are there any eligibility criteria for receiving benefits/services? What groups will receive services/benefits from the proposed solution, and what groups will be excluded from receiving services/benefits, and why? Is there consensus or conflict among various interested parties on what the bill proposes as a solution? What is the ultimate outcome (intended consequences) to result from the proposed solution to the problem? Are there any possible unintended consequences, and what provisions are made to address them? If the proposed solution does not eradicate the problem, then how is the bill a viable solution? A rubric was used to assess performance measures on a scale ranging from 0 (low/no competence) to 20 (very high competence). See Legislative Photo Essay Rubric for complete details.

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

### Target for O6: SW3600: Critically analyze and articulate legislative practices that advance social and economic justice

There were 98 students enrolled in SW3600 Social Welfare Policy course, consisting of 3 sections, taught by 3 different instructors. A target of 70% of the students will achieve a level of competency of 14 or higher, which is equivalent to 70% of the total measure.
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?

As faculty continue to develop their assignments that capture CTW goals and objectives, they have become more creative in their assignment development. Students in both CTW courses are using photo essays as part of their assignment. Rather than the traditional term paper, students develop photo essays to capture their experiences in the course material, along with written text to expand on an issue. Students are able to be creative in their work while also capturing the essence of course content. For example, the legislative analysis assignment required students to describe a social problem that required legislative action. But in addition, they supplemented their work with photos, videos, audio that illustrated the problem in certain communities. Adjusting the assignment to include these formats helped some students to be more engaged with the course material. It also helped them to think about the problem in "real time", which allowed students to write about the social issues with greater understanding than in the past. Continued use of this assignment format will occur to determine impact on writing skills.

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

Critical thinking is an ongoing feature of social work education. As noted in previous reports, it is a core competency of the accrediting body for social work education, the Council on Social Work Education. As such, every course in the program addresses critical thinking in some way. Students are now so used to the concept of critical thinking that it is becoming second nature to them. It is presented in all their course syllabi, and at least one assignment in each course has a critical thinking focus to it. An area that illustrates students improvement in their critical thinking skills is the responses on discussion posts. Students in the past have generally made brief comments to discussion post questions, almost as if they are on a social network link. More recently, their is clear substance and relevance to their discussion posts; students use cited works to support their positions, or to raising interesting points. This has been a consistent observance with many of the social work faculty, even those who are not assigned CTW designated courses. While discussion posts are not used as CTW assignments, they do illustrate growth and maturity in their critical thinking students are taking when responding to the posts.

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?

As noted in this year's findings, there is still the need to work with faculty on how to use a rubric for teaching, and not just grading an assignment. Faculty must also supervise the CTW consultants on how to use the rubric to assess drafts once the CTW coordinator has provided direction. Ongoing training of how to use the rubric and help the student develop their work is an area for continued training. Although the goals were met, the ongoing training will ensure that goal attainment is based on accurate and consistent analyses.

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 have been no major changes to the structure of the academic program over the past year. There is the anticipated leadership change in CTW coordinators for the 2013-2014 year, Dr. Karen Watkins will assume leadership for CTW beginning Fall, 2013.
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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)**
Students should demonstrate an understanding of sociological work in their writing assignments over the course of the semester. They will be evaluated using this scale: Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor (1).

**SLO 2: writing (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students should demonstrate their ability to critique, analyze, and interpret sociological work in their written assignments over the course of the semester, evidenced by a four-point scale: Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor.

**SLO 3: expansion (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Students should demonstrate 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, as evidenced by 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
70% of students in 4 CTW classes (3212, 4801, 4802, and 4803) scored a 3 or 4 on metrics. This suggests an increase from the previous year, but still not at the high level of 78% reported by my predecessor.

**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"; 26% 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
72% of students scored a 3 or 4 on this measure, surpassing last year’s measure of 57%. This represents a significant increase of nearly 25%. The target has been met and we are exceeding previous reports.
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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

70% of students scored 3 or 4, reflecting another sizable increase from the previous year's measure of 52%. Target has been met, with nearly 3/4 of students in these courses meeting goals.

**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 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.

**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.

**development and promotion of offerings**

One goal of our CTW plan is to offer a diversity of offerings from our three specialty areas, "Gender and Sexuality," "Family, Health, and the Life Course," and "Race and Urban Studies," and general courses (in addition to our "Sociological Methods" course, which is now always a CTW course). In addition to our Methods course, this past year, we offered CTW courses in "Social Psychology," "Gender and Sexuality," and "Families and Society," broadening our offerings from the previous year, and thus achieving our goal of expanding a diversity of offerings. Our CTW courses must have different course numbers, and hence, different names, than our "regular" courses on the same subjects without the CTW component. This apparently confused students in past years. We have striven to inform them via a variety of social networking strategies, about the CTW courses, feel like we have been successful in this regard this year also.

**Implementation Description:** In concert with our Undergraduate Advisor and the Programming Committee, I will strive to diversify future offerings, and to monitor student satisfaction with the diversity of courses offered. We will also be attentive to any further confusion generated by the complexity of naming and numbering CTW courses to distinguish them from non-CTW courses.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador, Undergraduate Advisor, Programming Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Improvements in all three areas from last year. However, I am not sure to what those improvements should be attributed. It may be that the action plans my predecessor instituted are working, but I don't think we can say for sure until/unless we see continued
improvement over time.

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?

Most significant improvement appears in writing & expansion. Students thus seem better able to do the type of critical thinking through writing and to expand on existing questions through coursework.

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?

"Understanding" is the category which, while it has shown improvement, appears to show less improvement relative to the other two categories and has not yet retained its high marks it reached a few years back. I am not sure how to address this, as this is my first year in this role.

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 seems to be helping aid students in writing and expansion. Not sure the impact on faculty as this does not appear to be measured in the paperwork I have. As this is my first year in this role, I believe that the previous CTW ambassador has been working with faculty to ensure improvement, which seems to have paid off (especially if continued reports show the same or increased levels of success).

---

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

**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 (both consumption and production) and spoken (both consumption and production) 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 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. Rationally and objectively follows where evidence and reasons lead. Makes ethical judgments. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Errors are minimal. Score of 4 – Does most of the following: Describes events, people, and places with some supporting details from the source. Makes connections to sources, either personal or analytic. Demonstrates a basic ability to analyze, interpret, and formulate inferences. States or briefly includes more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences, and points of view of others. Takes some risks by occasionally questioning sources, or stating interpretations and predictions. Demonstrates little evidence of rethinking or refinement of one’s own perspective. Style is appropriate to genre of work. Score of 3 – Does most or many of the following: Responds by retelling or graphically showing events or facts. Makes personal connections or identifies connections within or between sources in a limited way. Is beginning to use appropriate evidence to back ideas. Discusses literature, experiences, and points of view of others in terms of own experience. Responds to sources at factual or literal level. Includes little or no evidence of refinement of initial response or shift in dualistic thinking. Demonstrates difficulty with organization and thinking is uneven. In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors in grammar and syntax are not frequent; there may be some problems of style. Score of 2 – Does most or many of the following: Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest and/or preconceptions. In many places language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax or other errors are distracting with little evidence of proofreading. Score of 1 – Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Does not justify results or procedures, nor explains reasons. Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason. In most places language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax or other errors are repeated with no evidence of proofreading. Goal is 4

Target for O1: Active reading skills

75% of students will score at least 4/6 on this writing assignment based on the assessment rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

SPAN 3307: 76% of students scored at least 4/6 on this assignment: 16% scored 6/6, 31% scored 5/6, 29% scored 4/6 = 76%. 14% scored 3/6, 9% scored 2/6, 1% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6. SPAN 3310: 81% of students scored at least 4/6 on this assignment: 11% scored 6/6, 39% scored 5/6, 41% scored 4/6 = 81%. 10% scored 3/6, 7% scored 2/6, 4% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6.

Target for O2: Historical analysis

75% of students will score a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment based on the assessment rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

SPAN 3704 74% of students scored a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment: 9% scored 6/6, 26% scored 5/6, 39% scored 4/6 = 74%. attainment. 21% scored 3/6, 5% scored 2/6, 0% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6. SPAN 3310: 77% of students scored a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment: 13% scored 6/6, 28% scored 5/6, 46% scored 4/6 = 77% attainment. 17% scored 3/6, 4% scored 2/6, 2% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6.

M 2: 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 and #6 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, 4 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I understand the university's CTW initiative" with #1 indicating strong agreement and #6 indicating strong disagreement at the other extreme, 4 students replied #1, 7 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I understand the university's CTW initiative" with #1 indicating strong agreement and #6 indicating strong disagreement at the other extreme, 4 students replied #1, 7 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 9 students replied #1, 6 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 3 students replied #4, 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 9 students replied #1, 6 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 3 students replied #4, 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 9 students replied #1, 6 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 3 students replied #4, 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 stress and didn’t change the way I thought." "CTW help [sic] students to developed their [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, 2 students replied #4, and 2 students replied #5. 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, 2 students replied #4, and 2 students replied #5. 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, 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 "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. Additional student comments: "Writing the required papers did not improve my writing or critical thinking skills, it simply made the class more stress and didn’t change the way I thought.""
details of action plans for this cycle (by established cycle, then alpha)

75% of students attain 4/6 on assessment rubric

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. 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" "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 this aspect of the course. It helped me learn to write a concise short 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 philosophical'" "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 enthusiasm toward it. SPAN 3310 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, 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 the university's CTW initiative", 6 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 4 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4 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, 2 students replied #2, 1 students replied #3, 1 student replied #4, and 3 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 3 students 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 #4, and 1 students replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 7 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 3 student replied #4, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "This course improved my critical thinking skills" 5 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 5 students replied #3, 3 students replied #4, and 1 student 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 eportfolios 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" Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O1: Active reading skills

The student survey administered at the end of the Fall 2012 semester will add a question about student perceptions on their active reading skills. The targeted goal is for at least 75% of students to report in the 1-2 range.

Target for O2: Historical analysis

The student survey administered at the end of the Fall 2012 semester will add a question about student perceptions on their historical analysis skills. The targeted goal is for at least 75% of students to report in the 1-2 range.

M 3: Reading comprehension (O: 3)

75% of students will score 75% or better on brief diagnostics given at regular intervals that determine successful reading comprehension.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

SPAN 3307 72% of students scored a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment: 11% scored 6/6, 19% scored 5/6, 42% scored 4/6 = 72% attainment. 20% scored 3/6, 4% scored 2/6, 4% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6 = 28% no attainment. SPAN 3310: 78% of students scored a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment: 12% scored 6/6, 33% scored 5/6, 33% scored 4/6 = 78% attainment. 14% scored 3/6, 6% scored 2/6, 2% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>CTW ambassador / Spanish section (currently Rudyard Alcocer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continued efforts toward attainment of 75% goal
As the Spanish section continues its implementation of the CTW initiative, it will make greater and more concerted efforts toward student achievement of the 75% (score 4/6 or higher) goal. To this end, the ambassador for the Spanish section will notify participating faculty during the semester midpoints to clarify and underscore the presence of the 75% goal so as to encourage better student performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>The ambassador for the Spanish section will notify participating faculty during the semester midpoints to clarify and underscore the presence of the 75% goal so as to encourage better student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Rudyard Alcocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increased clarity and visibility of CTW assignments
The action plan for this particular measure is similar to the one on close reading skills (see below). The Spanish section has, I believe, sound CTW assignments, rubrics, and measures; at this point, the task becomes one of continuing our progress toward the desired 75% attainment goal. A central task for the 2011-12 academic year will be to increase the clarity and visibility of CTW assignments. While the Spanish section is making steady progress in its implementation of the CTW initiative, occasionally participating faculty and students are not constantly aware throughout the semester that they are part of the initiative until it becomes time to report on findings for the semester in question. Consequently, while we are making improvements toward the 75% attainment goal (72% this year vs. 70% last year), my task in the year ahead is to more regularly emphasize our work toward the desired goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>The Spanish ambassador will notify CTW faculty during the semester midpoint in an effort to remind both faculty and students to continue hard work and progress toward the attainment of the 75% goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Rudyard Alcocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increased clarity and visibility of CTW assignments
A central task for the 2011-12 academic year will be to increase the clarity and visibility of CTW assignments. While the Spanish section is making steady progress in its implementation of the CTW initiative, occasionally participating faculty and students are not constantly aware throughout the semester that they are part of the initiative until it becomes time to report on findings for the semester in question. Consequently, while we are making improvements toward the 75% attainment goal (72% this year vs. 70% last year), my task in the year ahead is to more regularly emphasize our work toward the desired goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Rudyard Alcocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reporting for SPAN 3310
Now that SPAN 3310 has become the CTW capstone course, the section will begin gathering data for this course.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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**Mission / Purpose**
In Speech “critical thinking” is the art of actively producing and analyzing arguments for particular audiences in specific cultural and historical contexts. Critical thinkers are able to construct and assess arguments in their cultural situatedness; evaluate stated or unstated claims and their supporting forms; recognize the creation of knowledge through symbol systems; and converse and pose question about the production of knowledge through the communicative process.

**Goals**

**G 1: Understand Cultural Context**
Since the cultural context of any communicative act is critical to the understanding of that act, students should be able to recognize the cultural context, construct arguments clearly, and adapt those arguments to that cultural context.

**G 2: Evaluation**
Students should be able to evaluate supporting materials and conclusions effectively in their own analyses.

**G 3: Actual Audience Adaptation**
Students should be able to produce a multi-level message (verbal and nonverbal elements) that fits a particular audience at a particular time and place. To do so requires students to understand their target audience’s communication preferences and what would be persuasive to them.

**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, hand outs, 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 Explanation (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 created an actual video, a Public Service Announcement (see next objective). Students were expected to explain the format of this video (use of text, sound, and visuals) 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.

**SLO 5: Targeted Health Message - Actual Public Service Announcement (G: 3) (M: 3)**

Students studied a particular group all semester, and new this year, students created a video. The video was a Public Service Announcement targeting their group. This video required them to incorporate knowledge of the group’s particular health problems/vulnerabilities with knowledge of their communication preferences in order to create a persuasive message. The video required students to think critically about their use of text, visuals, and sound.

**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.

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)
4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)
5. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This rubric/assignment was not assessed this year; it has been replaced by the new assignment which requires students to create an actual Public Service Announcement. Rather than simply evaluate how students write about audience adaptation, evaluating the new assignment enables us to examine a produced message to determine their ability to use what they know and adapt the message to the target audience.

**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 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. The rubric assessed their ability to do this using a 5-point 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 Explanation**

The majority of students will achieve an average of 4/5, or a score of 80%, as an average across all 6 rubric items.
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. Written in 2013: First, the faculty agreed that a smaller sample should be used for assessment purposes so this limited the number of rubrics needing revision. Second, the creation of the new PSA assignment required two rubric adjustments; a new rubric had to be created for the actual PSA and the rubric for the written explanation of the PSA had to be modified. Both of these were completed and implemented in this cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Rubric 1 Revised</td>
<td>Analytical Reaction Essays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All speech faculty, led by Jaye Atkinson, CTW Ambassador for Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Rubric 1 Revised</td>
<td>Analytical Reaction Essays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entire speech faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Rubric 2</td>
<td>Targeted Health Message Explanation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Targeted Health Message - Actual Public Service Announcement**

There are two types of targets to be achieved: 1) every student will earn 4 or 5 on one of the three dimensions; 2) the majority of students will earn 12/15 points total across all three dimensions. The first target indicates that students have an superior audience adaptation score on one dimension (text, sound, or visuals) and the second target indicates that students have an excellent audience adaptation score overall. That is, in order to achieve 12 points, students must earn an average score of 4 across the dimensions.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Thirteen videos were assessed from the Spring 2013 section of this course. The first target was not met; two students did not earn a 4 or 5 on any of the dimensions. Those videos did not clearly adapt to the audience with text, visuals, or sound. 11/13 students did though. For the second target, 7 of 13 students did earn 12 points or more; this is barely a majority so this target was met.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of 21 students, 16 achieved an average score of 4/5 or higher, thus meeting this target.

**Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)**
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:** CTW Ambassador Jaye Atkinson

### 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" the 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 Explanation

**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 assignment assessed). This suggests that further instruction explaining how to connect a particular course concept to a specific situation could benefit the students earlier in the course. The experience of writing these papers does seem to improve their ability to perform, but additional instruction could enhance their performance even more. As such, the speech faculty will discuss shorter writing assignments that require students to articulate the connections between course material (e.g., theory or theoretical concept or research finding) and a particular situation (e.g., presidential campaign slogan, public service announcement, etc.). Brainstorming on these types of assignments will add to our "assignment bank" and will enable instructors to offer students further experience articulating the relationship between concepts and situations. 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:** See "Implementation Notes" for further details on 2011-2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** Speech faculty to brainstorm and discuss, then instructors for SPCH 3250 will need to implement these new assignments in their courses

### 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

### Assignment Clarity

The PSA assignment was new this year, and the assignment description for the students may not have been clear. Specifically, students may not have understood that their semester's worth of research on their group was to inform their text, visual, and sound decisions in the creation of their videos. This may explain why some students did not perform particularly well in the creation of these videos; the importance of connecting their creations to their groups was not emphasized enough. Although target expectations for the written explanations were met, further clarity about what to include in these written descriptions could improve other students' learning, too.
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 first accomplishment was to decrease the sample size for assessment purposefully. Much time has been wasted in previous years trying to get assessment information from every section of both CTW courses, and the speech faculty decided that collecting assessment data from all CTW sections was unnecessary. This was one of the action plans from last year. Revising rubrics, a second accomplishment based on a previous action plan, was also completed this past year. Since one of the major assignments was altered, an entirely new rubric needed to be created for evaluating student-created Public Service Announcements. In addition, the written explanation accompanying these PSAs required a revised assignment sheet and a revised rubric. Perhaps most importantly, students finally CREATED their actual Public Service Announcement. The speech faculty have always desired to have students do this, and yet, until this year, it has not been required. iPads were awarded to one of the speech capstone sections, and this award enabled the students to complete the PSA assignment without hardship.

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 speech faculty agreed to change the assessment measures, and the current assessment measures do not clearly allow for such an analysis. Instead, the current procedures enable us to understand a difference in students’ understanding of a message and their creation of a message. That is, students were very successful in writing about what should be done in their Public Service Announcements; they could identify and explain appropriate health information for their group and use text, visuals, and sounds that would appeal to their target audiences. The creation of these PSAs, however, was a different story; most of the students were NOT able to create a PSA that truly fit their target audiences. In many communication situations, people know what to do and fail to act accordingly; this will be the new emphasis for the next 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?

We used to assess early and late assignments in order to determine student progress; we may need to consider doing that again. For our 3000-level CTW course, Persuasion, we were creating a bank of assignments for various instructors to use, but new instructors are simply creating new assignments. As new instructors get scheduled for the capstone course, they are also creating new assignments, and in two cases this past year, instructors did not use the required assignment. As a result, assignment variety is becoming problematic and must be addressed with a speech-faculty-wide conversation in the fall 2013. The assignment issue may also be the result of more casual, one-on-one training sessions for new faculty teaching the CTW courses. The training needs to become more formal in 2013-2014, ensuring that requirements for the courses are being met by ALL sections of the courses. If other departments have a simple training agenda, it may be helpful to examine those.

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 on our academic program has been a revision of the speech major and its learning objectives; this resulted from CTW and the assessment of the speech major. Students are definitely getting more writing experience in the CTW courses, as well as non-CTW courses. The faculty, on the other hand, seem more frustrated by the students’ inability to write clearly and effectively. As a result, the department is creating a writing lab in order to provide further, discipline-specific support to students in these courses (though at first, the focus will be on journalism students, then expanding to the other majors in the department). The department has sought to increase the number of instructors in these courses since last year’s assessment report; this will require advanced training for these instructors to be sure that this does not decrease the quality of the CTW experience.
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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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Identify main points and arguments (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 3010, Students will identify and analyze main points and theoretical arguments in their readings for class, as shown in their written work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 3010, students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate feminist and womanist theoretical perspectives, as demonstrated by writing assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: writing skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 3010, students will demonstrate writing skills through their ability to organize material, provide sufficient evidence, and articulate a coherent thesis in their final papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrate writing skills through the creation of new and focused research questions (G: 1) (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For 4920/4950, students will demonstrate writing skills through their ability to formulate new research questions.</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: Theoretical Perspectives (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 4920/4950, students will demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use appropriate feminist/womanist perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Apply skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 4920/4950, students will show that they can apply interdisciplinary women’s studies knowledge and skills to a particular project, such as the final paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Connect to lived experiences (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate that they can connect what they have learned to lived experiences; in other words, they can demonstrate the implications of their project beyond the university, as shown by their papers and journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrate additional writing skills. (G: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this objective, we focus more clearly on the mechanics of paper writing, including organization, development, and sentence structure.</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,
Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: In 3010, Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students will prepare their own question for this assignment. Rather than answering the questions the teacher has posed, students will formulate a question that calls for an engagement with multiple authors. Learning to construct a meaningful question and then answering it will provide students with the basic skills needed to write longer research papers and reflective essays; in particular, formulating research topics and questions about which to build a strong paper. For assessment, the rubric for measuring these issues involves a ranking of 1-5 along these issues: 1) Formulating a strong question 2) Identifying the main points of the cited texts 3) Demonstrating knowledge of feminist theoretical approaches 4) Demonstrating basic writing skills, on both organizational and sentence structure levels For a more thorough explanation, I am including the CTW departmental rubric: CTW Departmental Rubric – Women's Studies 5 – Excellent: n Demonstrates an incisive understanding of the main point(s) and supporting arguments for the text n Skillfully utilizes appropriate feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives in the analysis n Applies interdisciplinarity approaches to a specific project n Fully explores the implications of their project n Fully explains all assumptions and reasoning in their argument n Provides an excellent thesis that formulates innovative ways of analyzing the topic n Thoroughly supports their claims n Logically organizes their writing n Writes clearly and concisely, with superior and elegant style 4 – Very Good n Generally grasps the main idea and supporting points of the text n Uses sufficient feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives n Utilizes some interdisciplinarity in the project n Explores many ramifications of the project n Fully explains most assumptions and reasoning n Provides a clear, well-formed thesis that provides a new approach to the topic n Supports most claims sufficiently n Logically organizes the writing n Writes clearly and concisely, with few grammatical or punctuation errors 3 – Good n Demonstrates some understanding of the main idea, although may show some confusion between main and supporting ideas n Demonstrates a basic understanding of feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives n Shows some idea of what interdisciplinarity consists of n Explores at least one major implication of the project n Shows some understanding of their own assumptions and reasons n Provides a clear thesis, even if it is not particularly new n Provides adequate support for claims n Has few logical weaknesses in their text n Has some grammar/punctuation errors, but still clearly written 2 – Needs Improvement n Has difficulty distinguishing between main and supporting ideas n Shows some confusion about theoretical perspectives n Does not really grasp the notion of interdisciplinarity n Does not think past the project enough to articulate implications n Utilizes unquestioned assumptions n Thesis simply states topic, rather than argument n Does not include sufficient support for subpoints n Includes major logical and organizational weaknesses n Includes far too many grammar/punctuation errors 1 – Unsatisfactory n Cannot find a main idea and supporting ideas in a text n Does not really understand what theoretical perspectives consist of n No concept of interdisciplinarity n Little understanding of implications n Utilizes unquestioned and unstated assumptions n No discernible thesis n Very little evidence or support for claims n Deeply problematic syntax n No discernible organizational structure n So many grammar problems that the paper is difficult to read

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

This year, we found that 100% of students received at least a 3, and 83% received at least a 4, suggesting that this target was more achievable with the revised assignment.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

This year, we found that 100% of students achieved at least a 4 on this aspect of the rubric, again showing both the students' acquisition of knowledge as well as perhaps a strengthened assignment.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

This year, we found that 83% of students achieved at least a 4 on this aspect of the rubric, reflecting a need for further improvement.
On each item of the rubric, we found that all students did receive a 3, but only 67% received a 4 or 5, suggesting that we need to continue to work to improve basic writing skills. In general, the issues that we continually face involve development; we need to help students understand how to explore topics thoroughly and provide sufficient evidence for all of their claims. Also, the same students who have trouble with these sorts of issues are also having some challenges with basic sentence structure, which suggests that the writing skills are all connected.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

This year, we found that students improved substantially over the course of the semester. In the collection of earlier papers, we found that 67% received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5, whereas in the latter papers, we found that 83% received at least a 3, and 67% received a 4 or 5, so that even though we did not reach our target, we are coming close, and it does suggest students are improving throughout the course of the semester.

**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.

**M 3: In 4920 Final Paper (O: 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Senior Research in Women's Studies gives students an opportunity to do advanced work on a chosen topic. Both student and instructor will decide upon a project that the student will complete during the semester. The instructor is responsible for meeting with the student at agreed-upon times during the semester, for guiding and evaluating the student’s work, and for assigning a grade. The student is responsible for completing the requirements agreed upon with the instructor. The main requirement for this course is the major paper, which should be approximately 20-25 pages long, and follow appropriate academic conventions for a research paper, including a substantial, properly cited bibliography. This paper must go through a revision process to qualify it for CTW. I am including the CTW departmental rubric for clarity here: CTW Departmental Rubric – Women's Studies 5 – Excellent: n Demonstrates an incisive understanding of the main point(s) and supporting arguments for the text n Skillfully utilizes appropriate feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives in the analysis n Applies interdisciplinary approaches to a specific project n Fully explores the implications of their project n Fully explains all assumptions and reasoning in their argument n Provides an excellent thesis that formulates innovative ways of analyzing the topic n Thoroughly supports their claims n Logically organizes their writing n Writes clearly and concisely, with superior and elegant style 2 – Needs Improvement n Uses sufficient feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives n Utilizes some interdisciplinary approaches in the project n Explores many ramifications of the project n Fully explains most assumptions and reasoning n Provides a clear, well-formed thesis that provides a new approach to the topic n Supports most claims sufficiently n Logically organizes the writing n Writes clearly and concisely, with few grammatical or punctuation errors 3 – Good n Demonstrates some understanding of the main idea, although may show some confusion between main and supporting ideas n Demonstrates a basic understanding of feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives n Shows some idea of what interdisciplinary consistency consists of n Explores at least one major implication of the project n Shows some understanding of their own assumptions and reasons n Provides a clear thesis, even if it is not particularly new n Provides adequate support for claims n Has few logical weaknesses in their text n Has some grammar/punctuation errors, but still clearly written 2 – Needs Improvement n Has difficulty distinguishing between main and supporting ideas n Shows some confusion about theoretical perspectives n Does not really grasp the notion of interdisciplinarity n Does not think past the project enough to articulate implications n Utilizes ungrounded assumptions n Thesis simply states topic, rather than argument n Does not include sufficient support for subpoints n Includes major logical and organizational weaknesses n Includes far too many grammar/punctuation errors 1 – Unsatisfactory n Cannot find a main idea and supporting ideas in a text n Does not really understand what theoretical perspectives consist of n No concept of interdisciplinarity n Little understanding of implications n Utilizes unquestioned and unstated assumptions n No discernable thesis n Very little evidence or support for claims n Deeply problematic syntax n No discernable organizational structure n So many grammar problems that the paper is difficult to read

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

**Target for O4: Demonstrate writing skills through the creation of new and focused research questions**

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-13 academic year, all students received at least a 4 on their revised paper (with an excellent average of 4.75), although the average was only 3.5 for the rough draft (which speaks to the students’ skill level when they began this work).

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

On the revised paper, we once again found that 100% of students received at least a 4, though on the draft, students’ average was once again closer to 3, showing that the revision process allowed for much more clarity in the student demonstration of appropriate theoretical perspectives.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For this finding, students (as is becoming increasingly obvious is usual) scored the same as they did on the demonstrating knowledge of theoretical perspectives outcome, suggesting that this particular outcome works better for 4950 (Internship) than it does for 4920 (Senior Research).

Target for **O7: Connect to lived experiences**

We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

On this measure, we found that 100% of students received a 4, demonstrating that they are doing a good job in terms of exploring the ramifications of their research question and analysis.

### M4: 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%). In order to measure the development of these skills, the assessor utilizes a rubric which examines such issues as formulation of new research questions, organization and development, sentence structure, theoretical perspectives, application of skills, and connection to lived experience on a 5 point scale, where 1 is poor and 5 is outstanding.

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

**Target for O4: Demonstrate writing skills through the creation of new and focused research questions**

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Our findings for 2012-13: Draft: 75% of students received at least a 3, and 25% of students received at least a 4. Final: 88% received at least a 3, and 75% received at least a 4. While these numbers do not quite meet our target, they definitely show that revision is helping, especially in terms of moving students from basic competence to strong writing skills, which is one of the reasons that we chose to highlight revision in our CTW initiative.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Our findings for 2013: Draft: We found that 87% of students received at least a 3, and 50% of students received at least a 4. Final: We found that 100% of students received at least a 3, and 87% received at least a 4. On this outcome, we found that revision enabled our students to all meet the target of basic competence, and it also enabled most of the students to excel in terms of demonstrating theoretical knowledge in their final papers, suggesting, again, the significance of the revision process.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of the outcome of application of skills, we found that for the academic year of 2012-13, Draft: 100% of students received at least a 3, and 50% received at least a 4. Revision: 100% received at least a 3, and 75% received at least a 4. On this outcome, we just barely met our target, suggesting that while the revision process is useful, we should probably direct some attention to this particular aspect when we advise the students about what to focus on in their revisions.

**Target for O7: Connect to lived experiences**

We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For 2012-13, our findings are as follows: Draft: 100% of students received at least a 3 on this objective, and 75% received at least a 4. Revision: 100% received at least a 3 on this objective, and 87% received a 4. Again, we met our target on this objective, suggesting that the outcome that students should be able to connect what they learn in their internship to an analysis of lived experience makes particular sense in the context of the internship course. Although the improvement from draft to revision is not substantial, it does suggest that the revision is important in all contexts.
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. We found, for example, that students were more resistant to leaving sufficient time for revision, and so we need to move up the dates even earlier than we had thought to allow time for them to get behind.

We need to strengthen our emphasis on revision and on finishing tasks more quickly in order to improve students' writing in general.

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 courses. 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: Terminated
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: In 3010, Short Papers | Outcome/Objective: writing skills

Implementation Description: We terminated this one as it closely resembles another action plan.
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. Here is the updated report from 2013: Students had to write a final paper, which was peer reviewed in small groups of three to four students. Students were given twelve days to read the papers and then assemble in their group to discuss the reviews during a class session. The assignment read as follows: Peer Review 10%: Students will meet in groups of three to four to peer review final papers. The papers must be submitted on the day assigned or no credit will be given for the assignment. Partial papers will be given partial credit. Students must prepare a hardcopy of their paper for each member of their group and one copy for me, all due on the day assigned. Students will follow a guideline for peer review and submit one copy to the student and one copy to me on the day assigned. Late reviews will be downgraded one letter grade per day late. Students will be evaluated on the thoroughness of their evaluation as well as the quality of the paper submitted for review (half-done papers will receive half credit). Some students provided their group members incomplete papers to review. Other students complained that their group members did not provide adequate feedback on their papers. Students need more training on how to provide useful feedback.

This is a difficult task since they are still learning what a good term paper looks like; they don't have adequate understanding about what the final product should achieve. Nonetheless, I find it to be a useful activity since it introduces the students to the concept of peer review even if they cannot yet fully achieve the goals of the assignment.

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 demonstration of writing skills in the internship final paper. Also, this year, in the single example of senior research, the student did not allow sufficient time for revision. We need to strengthen our emphasis on revision and on finishing tasks more quickly in order to have students write a strong research paper within a single semester. We still need to work on this; we are finding that students are strongly resistant to leaving sufficient time for revision, and so we need to move up the dates even earlier than we had thought to allow time for them to get behind. As we have noticed previously, the revision process is more effective for Senior Research than for the Internship, which probably has much to do with the nature of the two different classes; it makes sense that in Senior Research, students would put all their effort into the final paper, whereas in the Internship, students put much of their effort into the actual internship.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: In 4920 Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate writing skills through the creation of new and focused research
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 general, we have met more of our targets this year than we have in the past, so that progress seems promising, in that our action plans do seem to, in fact, be working. For example, in 3010, increased attention to the shorter papers earlier in the semester does seem to have strengthened student performance in the later papers. While we still have not reached our target, in terms of writing skills on these papers, we are getting closer, which suggests that there is improvement, and that more feedback and even grading does help. While we like the idea of low-stakes papers, it does seem that including grades helps increase student motivation to work harder on their papers. Furthermore, students ability to identify main points and arguments of their readings does also seem to be improving. In terms of their final paper for 3010, students met the targets in terms of demonstrating their knowledge of appropriate theoreitcal perspectives. I would say, though, that this improvement may be attributed in part to the revisioning of the assignment, which we have not included in an action plan. Last year, the assignment was for students to construct a research question that they did much better. In one calendar year, though, it is difficult to tell how much of this improvement is sheer chance and how much is due to our paying closer attention to these aspects in the drafts of their papers. In terms of the final paper for the internship, we did stress the significance of the final paper and of the revision of that paper more intensively throughout the semester, including firm deadlines for a draft, which seems to have paid off in terms of their scores in this class. Interestingly, although the students in 4920, Senior Research, did not turn in substantial drafts and so did not have as much material to work with in their revision, they did quite well in terms of their scores on their final papers. I do think, though, that this may in fact be as much because they are strong writers already, although I am sure the revision process helped somewhat.

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 been able to discern improvements in both a given class and from the entry level to exit level class, which suggests, yet again, that the CTW initiative is working. In terms of the 3010 class, student performance on the shorter papers in terms of both identifying main points/arguments and writing skills is improving from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. In terms of the capstone classes, when we compare the scores from the draft to the revised paper, it is quite clear that revision is allowing for at least some degree of improvement in almost all cases. These sorts of direct comparisons do show most students improving in terms of their ability to construct main point, develop arguments, organize their ideas, and express them clearly. In terms of the relationships between the entry/exit classes, that is harder to show. I do think that, from the perspective of the capstone classes, the emphasis on the process of writing, perhaps the revision process especially, in all our upper level classes, has contributed to the general writing strengths that students are displaying. While we have never had much trouble with the aspects of our outcomes that emphasize demonstrating theoretical knowledge, there is still some improvement noted. In general, while we have in the past noted that many students are achieving basic competence, but we have had trouble with students excelling, we are now noticing improvements on both levels. I do think that the focus on writing in the 3000 level course is contributing to the success of the students as they get into the upper level capstone 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?

There are three significant areas that we need to continue to work on. The first involves integrating the revision process more thoroughly in all our upper level classes, so that it becomes normalized in the CTW classes. While we have done some testing on it, by integrating graded drafts in some upper-level classes, the amount of time and grading pressure on individual teachers makes this a somewhat unworkable solution. We are continuing to think through these issues, by instituting more formal proposals and shorter drafts, in order to navigate between the benefits of revision and the real challenges to time and energy the process constitutes.

Secondly, one of our action plans involves increasing the time of revision, especially for the capstone classes. We (or rather I) have not been as successful as I would like in terms of this action plan, because it is at times hard to get students to turn their work in on time, and given pressures around RPG, I'm not willing to fail them. Therefore, I need to stress the deadlines more frequently throughout the semester, to help students stay on track. While I was more successful getting students in the internship to do a revision, they still have more trouble developing focused research questions. In the Senior Research class, students must turn in their research question fairly early on in the semester; perhaps we can learn from this that internship students should also know what their final paper will analyze by a certain date maybe midway through the semester. As it stands, I think students tend to spend most of their semester working at their internship, and then they remember their final paper when I e-mail them after midterms, instead of before. Thirdly, we have noticed that in terms of writing skills, we still need to emphasize development. Students seem to still have trouble providing sufficient evidence for their claims. We still need to think through how we can help students acquire these skills.

In terms of the ongoing reflection on the peer review process in 3010, Megan Sinnott provides the following feedback: Students had to write a final paper, which was peer reviewed in small groups of three to four students. Students were given twelve days to read the papers and then assemble in their group to discuss the reviews during a class session. The assignment read as follows: Peer Review 10%: Students will meet in groups of three to four to peer review final papers. The papers must be submitted on the day assigned or no credit will be given for the assignment. Partial papers will be given partial credit. Students must prepare a hardcopy of their paper for each member of their group and one copy for me, all due on the day assigned. Students will follow a guideline for peer review and submit one copy to the student and one copy to me on the day assigned. Late reviews will be downgraded one letter grade per day late. Students will be evaluated on the thoroughness of their evaluation as well as the quality of the paper submitted for review (half-done papers will receive half credit). Some students provided their group members incomplete papers to review. Other students complained that their group members did not provide adequate feedback on their papers. Students need more training on how to provide useful feedback. This is a difficult task since they are still learning what a good term paper looks like; they don’t have adequate understanding about what the final product should achieve. Nonetheless, I find it to be a useful activity since it introduces the students to the concept of peer review even if they cannot yet fully achieve the goals of the assignment.

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 I answered much of this question in the earlier questions. I would like to respond in part here to the topic of the program I received on last year’s CTW. One recommendation the reviewer made was that I should eliminate the repetition in outcomes, and I would point out that I have it twice because there are two levels of classes. In other words, one “demonstrating knowledge and use of theoretical perspectives” applies to the entry level course, and the other applies to the exit course. That is the only way I can figure out to organize my report, given the limitations of WEAVE. The primary impact of CTW has been for us to continue to think about why we think writing is so important to the critical thinking project. The changes that we have made since last year primarily involve some changes in our action plans. Mainly we streamlined some of our plans to avoid repetition and tried to think through how we would more effectively implement the ones we have, such as peer review and revision in higher level courses. In order to think through these issues carefully, we are also having a retreat in August to think through a number of issues about the undergraduate program.
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.

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.

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: Accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources.

M 4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems (O: 4)

Students will identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.

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

Target for O4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the student work in HA 8670 Health Information Systems. Learning Objective: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: 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. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.
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**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.

**Mission in Action**-

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 effectively plan for and teach learners in grades PK-5.

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

Candidates will demonstrate the application and critical use of pedagogical and content knowledge in the context of classroom evidenced to university coaches observing in their PK-5th grade classrooms.

**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 Childhood Education I and II exam taken at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit.

**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.
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).
4.3 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.

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 cultural, 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**

**M1: 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates completing our program in Spring 2013 took and passed the GACE I and II before beginning our program, as is required for provisional certification. Verification of these scores are collected by the College of Education Office of Academic Assistance upon request for certification and reports are sent annually to each department indicating the pass rate of all candidates. This report will be sent to the GSU COE this fall and documentation will be added for these candidates at that time.

**M2: 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 through knowledge of students, content, curriculum, learning environments, assessment, and self reflectev 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. 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/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?

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for Q2: 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 the basis of 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 high achieving student. 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 high achieving 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 literary 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 planning through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. Description of how it is used in the classroom. Additional data indicated that the scale of Recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners had 55% of candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. While all candidates met or exceeded expectations on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment one to two students (out of 34) did not meet expectation on one or more of the following subscales: (a) Valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum. (b) Enacting broader curriculum to develop reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors. (c) Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment. (d) Informing planning and instruction through self-reflexive practice. (e) Facilitating productive learning tasks.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Planning and Instruction - Spring 2013 Responsive Planning and Instruction Composite Scores Standard Exceeded (4)- 26 (76%) Standard Met (3)- 8 (23%) Standard Not Met - 0 Target was met for this standard with 100% of candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. While all candidates met or exceeded expectations on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment one to two students (out of 34) did not meet expectation on one or more of the following subscales: (a) Valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum. (b) Enacting broader curriculum to develop reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors. (c) Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment. (d) Informing planning and instruction through self-reflexive practice. (e) Facilitating productive learning tasks.

**M 3: M3: Impact on Student Learning Project (Q: 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 high achieving 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 planning through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. Description of how it is used in the classroom. Additional data indicated that the scale of Recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners had 55% of candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. While all candidates met or exceeded expectations on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment one to two students (out of 34) did not meet expectation on one or more of the following subscales: (a) Valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum. (b) Enacting broader curriculum to develop reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors. (c) Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment. (d) Informing planning and instruction through self-reflexive practice. (e) Facilitating productive learning tasks.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Planning and Instruction - Spring 2013 Responsive Planning and Instruction Composite Scores Standard Exceeded (4)- 26 (76%) Standard Met (3)- 8 (23%) Standard Not Met - 0 Target was met for this standard with 100% of completing candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. While all candidates met or exceeded expectations on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment one to two students (out of 34) did not meet expectation on one or more of the following subscales: (a) Valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum. (b) Enacting broader curriculum to develop reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors. (c) Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment. (d) Informing planning and instruction through self-reflexive practice. (e) Facilitating productive learning tasks.

**Target for Q3: 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 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 high achieving 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). 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. Reflection demonstrating the development and improvement of instructional planning through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. Description of how it is used in the classroom. Additional data indicated that the scale of Recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners had 55% of candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. While all candidates met or exceeded expectations on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment one to two students (out of 34) did not meet expectation on one or more of the following subscales: (a) Valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum. (b) Enacting broader curriculum to develop reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors. (c) Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment. (d) Informing planning and instruction through self-reflexive practice. (e) Facilitating productive learning tasks.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Spring 2013: Effects on Student Learning Composite Scores Standard Exceeded (4)- 24 candidates (70%); Standard Met (3)- 10 candidates (29%); Standard Not Met (2-0)- 0 candidates This standard was met. 100% of all completing candidates from the MAT Met Standard (29%) or Exceeded Standard (70%) on the composite scores of the Impact on Student Learning Key Assessment, data indicated that 41% of candidates completing in 2013 could have presented data which demonstrated that impact on student learning in the area of mathematics, while 34% could have presented the growth in their learners as
writers more effectively. Additionally, candidates are to document the longitudinal impact on individual learners across time and 49% could have indicated that more effectively (though only 8% failed to demonstrate that adequately).

**M 4: M 4: 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 across these five areas.

**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%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Spring 2013 Dispositions Endpoint Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Not Met Empathy 22 12 - Positive View of Others 28 (82%) 6 (17%) - Positive View of Self 23 (67%) 11 (32%) - Authenticity 26 8 - Meaningful Purpose and Vision 27 7 - Target met- 100% of candidates completing our program have scored Exceptional (4 points) or Acceptable (3 points) on the Dispositions Rubric. While program completers seem to have well developed purpose and vision along with positive views of others and a sense of authenticity, fewer have developed a positive view of themselves or a strong sense of empathy. As second year candidate year of teaching and generally have a clear sense of their pedagogical and personal strengths and limitations. Data trends are mirrored by our midpoint candidates, who also seem to grapple more with Positive View of Self and Empathy. Spring 2013 Dispositions Midpoint Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Marginal (2 pts) Unacceptable (1 pt) Empathy Positive View of Others Positive View of Self Authenticity Meaningful Purpose and Vision

**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 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 courses 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 clinical 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:

- Levels 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Spring 2013 Clinical Practice Assessment Endpoint- Target met in each of the six domains of Clinical Practice. Domain 1: Content and Curriculum- Proficient (4)- 21 (61%); Achieving (3)- 13 (38%); Not meeting (2-0)- NONE Domain 2: Knowledge of Students- Proficient (4)- 23 (67%); Achieving (3)- 11 (32%); Not meeting (2-0)- NONE Domain 3: Learning Environments- Proficient (4)- 28 (82%); Achieving (3)- 6 (17%); Not meeting (2-0)- NONE Domain 4: Assessment- Proficient (4)- 23 (67%); Achieving (3)- 11 (32%); Not meeting (2-0)- NONE Domain 5: Planning and Instruction- Proficient (4)- 25 (73%); Achieving (3)- 9 (26%); Not meeting (2-0)- NONE Domain 6: Professionalism: Proficient (4)- 31 (81%); Achieving (3)- 3 (8%); Not meeting (2-0)- NONE All candidates completing the ECE MAT in 2013 met (Achieving or exceeded (Proficient) each of the key domains of the Clinical Practice Assessment at the endpoint of their program. Data from these 2013 Endpoint Assessments indicate that those who complete our program meet standards for Clinical Practice across each of the six domains. Candidates are particularly strong in Professionalism (Domain 6, 91% proficient), creating Learning Environments (Domain 3, 82% Proficient), and planning and instruction (Domain 5, 73% Proficient). Content and Curriculum (Domain 1, 38% Achieving), Knowledge of Students (Domain 2, 32% Achieving), and Assessment (Domain 4, 32% Achieving) were slightly less strong across candidates completing our program in 2013. Specific subscales in which 55% of our completing candidates were rated at Proficient (the highest rating) and 44% were rated at Achieving (the second rating) are scales in which our candidates as a whole ranked slightly less strong. These included: 1.1 Demonstrates and uses accurate content and pedagogical knowledge that is appropriate for observed learner needs. 1.2 Connects content to students’ prior knowledge, everyday lives and/or other curriculum areas. 4.3 Involves learners in self-assessment and personal goal setting to increase student achievement.
Additionally, while nearly all of our candidates were rated highly in the following three subscales, one student for each of them was rated at “Developing” and did not meet these subscales (though the composite domains were met). 3.2 Uses effective management strategies to engage and motivate students in purposeful learning activities. 3.5 Incorporates verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to support learning-based interactions in the classroom or to increase student achievement. 6.3 Demonstrates professional characteristics as indicated on state and local Code of Ethics and as described in the ECE Policy regarding professionalism. Clinical Practice Assessment Endpoint- Approaching target in each of the six domains of Clinical Practice, Spring 2013 Clinical Practice Assessment Midpoint Proficient (4 pts) Achieving (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Emerging (1 pt) Domain 1: Content and Curriculum 0.5 (62%) 2 (25%) 1 (12%) Domain 2: Knowledge of Students 0 3 (37%) 3 (37%) 2 (25%) Domain 3: Learning Environments 0 5 (62%) 1 (12%) 2 (25%) Domain 4: Assessment 0 4 (50%) 2 (25%) 2 (25%) Domain 5: Planning and Instruction 0 5 (62%) 2 (25%) 1 (12%) Domain 6: Professionalism 2 (25%) 3 (37%) 1 (12%) 2 (25%) Analysis of the midpoint data for candidates who in the spring of 2013 were two semesters in to our five semester program indicate that more than half of our candidates are already Achieving (and occasionally Proficient) in Domain 1 (Content and Curriculum), Domain 3 (Learning Environments), Domain 5 (Planning and Instruction), and Domain 6 (Professionalism). Domain 2 (Knowledge of Students) and Domain 4 (Assessment) had 62% and 50% of candidates respectively who were not yet meeting those standards at the midpoint. Specifically, subscales of the Clinical Practice Rubric in which 50% or more of our candidates scored Developing or Emerging at the midpoint where and which need additional attention during their second year of the program include: 1.2 Connects content to students’ prior knowledge; 2.2 Describes how students’ interests of the learners our candidates serve. Data from subscales 1.1, 1.2, and 4.3 of the Clinical Practice Key Assessment have confirmed this need. (b) Revision of the Responsive Planning Project which is engaged in longitudinally and across time to support connections between multiple content areas and to the everyday lives of learners and connects directly with community partners and stakeholders. This revision will support candidates in both year one and year two of our program. The candidates with these lower scores on Clinical Practice Key Assessment subscales were met with by coaches and the program coordinator, an individual action plan and program of differentiated support was created with them, and substantive additional assistance and coaching was provided throughout the course of their program. Frequent meetings between coaches, faculty, and program coordinator ensure that candidates who are struggling are provided with interventions, action plans, and specific steps for improvement, along with additional support across time as they focus on targeted areas for growth. This is a practice that has been effective during the 2012-13 year and will be continued. Each of the Domains of Clinical Teaching Practice Rubric are the focus of ECE 6576, Integrative and Iterative Curriculum Design taken during the third semester of the program after the midpoint key assessment. Candidates at the midpoint had not yet enrolled in this critical course. Particular attention to the subscales midpoint candidates most needed to develop (1.2, 2.1, 3.2, 4.3, and 5.1) were attended to in the focus, design, and implementation of this course. Additional support will be offered throughout candidates second year during Monthly Support Seminars and coaching will continue to focus on these areas for specific development. Additionally, the two midpoint candidates who most frequently struggled with their pedagogy and practice have been intentionally assigned to a coach for the upcoming year who was also the instructor of the ECE 6576 course and who will be focused on assisting them through the upcoming 2013-14 academic year, working alongside them in their classroom as they implement these ideas and focusing on providing differentiated and intentional support on the sub-scales and larger domains of need that have been indicated.

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

### Clinical Practice Support Action Plan

The summer course, taken in the third semester of our program, ECE 6576, Integrative and Iterative Curriculum, addresses each of these subscales directly. Based on qualitative program evaluation surveys and meetings with candidates in our Design Team, completing their first and second years in our program, we will be addressing these needs in a range of ways: (a) Monthly workshops revisiting of curriculum design and responsibility in the context of our candidate support seminars for our second year candidates, continuing and building upon the focus of the summer course and integrating the revision of the Responsive Planning Project. Candidates have requested that these workshop opportunities will focus on use of meaningful, authentic and performance based assessments, along with learner self-assessments in order to respond in differentiated and targeted ways to the observed needs and interests of the learners our candidates serve. Data from subscales 1.1, 1.2, and 4.3 of the Clinical Practice Key Assessment have confirmed this need. (b) Revision of the Responsive Planning Project which is engaged in longitudinally and across time to support connections between multiple content areas and to the everyday lives of learners and connects directly with community partners and stakeholders. This revision will support candidates in both year one and year two of our program. The candidates with these lower scores on Clinical Practice Key Assessment subscales were met with by coaches and the program coordinator, an individual action plan and program of differentiated support was created with them, and substantive additional assistance and coaching was provided throughout the course of their program. Frequent meetings between coaches, faculty, and program coordinator ensure that candidates who are struggling are provided with interventions, action plans, and specific steps for improvement, along with additional support across time as they focus on targeted areas for growth. This is a practice that has been effective during the 2012-13 year and will be continued. Each of the Domains of Clinical Teaching Practice Rubric are the focus of ECE 6576, Integrative and Iterative Curriculum Design taken during the third semester of the program after the midpoint key assessment. Candidates at the midpoint had not yet enrolled in this critical course. Particular attention to the subscales midpoint candidates most needed to develop (1.2, 2.1, 3.2, 4.3, and 5.1) were attended to in the focus, design, and implementation of this course. Additional support will be offered throughout candidates second year during Monthly Support Seminars and coaching will continue to focus on these areas for specific development. Additionally, the two midpoint candidates who most frequently struggled with their pedagogy and practice have been intentionally assigned to a coach for the upcoming year who was also the instructor of the ECE 6576 course and who will be focused on assisting them through the upcoming 2013-14 academic year, working alongside them in their classroom as they implement these ideas and focusing on providing differentiated and intentional support on the sub-scales and larger domains of need that have been indicated.

**Established in Cycle: 2012-2013**

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** M 5: Clinical Teaching Practice
- **Outcome/Objective:** SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

**Implementation Description:** See description above

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Field-Based Coaches

### Dispositions Action Plan- 2013-14

In order to address these aspects of disposition, all of our candidates will engage in a year-long self-study of Conscious Discipline (Bailey, 2001), engaging in this dispositions work across the academic year with coaches and colleagues and implementing these strategies with their classroom community. Additionally, individual candidates who are experiencing challenges with developing positive dispositions in their classrooms have been paired intentionally with a coach who will focus on these areas along with them during the 2013-14 year. As current students and program graduates continue to be professionalized across their induction years we are working to create systems and structures for support and continued encouragement. We are working to build structures for alumni to join with current students for the Descriptive Review of a Child or monthly gatherings, for graduates to continue to develop positive understandings and empathy for self and others.

**Established in Cycle: 2012-2013**

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** M 4: Dispositions
- **Outcome/Objective:** SLO 4: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions
Focus on Demonstration of Student Growth in Math, Writing, and Longitudinal Impact on Individual Student Growth

In response to this evidenced need from data from the Effects on Student Learning Key Assessment and from Design Team and candidate feedback, we are reframing the monthly opportunities for candidates to document focal student growth longitudinally and increasing our focus on discussion of growth over time in math and writing. Opportunities for these formative data collection points will be embedded into field based coursework (ECE 6575, 6585 across the first year of our program, and ECE 7575 and 7585 across the second year of our program). Attention to these areas of need will also be a focus during our Monthly Coaching Check in meetings to ensure that all of the faculty supporting candidate growth are taking these ideas into consideration and offering needed support.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M3: Impact on Student Learning Project | Outcome/Objective: SLO3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning

Implementation Description: See description above
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Field-Based Coaches

GACE Scores

In 2013-14 we will begin having candidates who are not provisionally certified and therefore have not taken and passed both the GACE I and GACE II before program entry. Each semester of the program, coaches and program coordinators will discuss this Key Assessment and offer support where needed.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: GACE I and II Exam scores | Outcome/Objective: SLO1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Check in for GACE for all non-provisionally certified teachers at the end of each semester
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and coaches

Responsive Planning Seminars and Project Revision Action Plan, 2013

While all completing candidates from the MAT Met Standard (23%) or Exceeded Standard (76%) on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment, data indicated that the subscale of Recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners had 55% of candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. In response to this finding and to our candidates’ evaluations of ECE 7576, Teacher Inquiry for Critical Change, we will be focusing on these partnerships earlier and throughout the second year as candidates and their students work alongside of community members and stakeholders to consider and address a shared concern. This process, along with Critical Pedagogy, was a specific emphasis of the final semester of the program and candidates completing overwhelmingly wanted this practice to be integrated with more intention throughout the final year. Faculty are collaborating during Summer 2013 to make this a significant emphasis of our field work across classes in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 for our second year candidates, but also to ensure that it is an emphasis of our field based coaching collaborations in ECE 6575 and 6585. Based on this data and confirmed by qualitative program evaluation surveys and meetings with candidates in our Design Team completing their first and second years in our program, we will be addressing these needs in a range of ways: (a) Monthly workshops revisiting of curriculum design and responsibility in the context of our candidate support seminars for our second year candidates, continuing and building upon the focus of the ECE 6576, Integrated and Iterative Curriculum and integrating the revision of the Responsive Planning Project. Candidates have requested that these workshop opportunities will focus on use of meaningful, performance-based learning tasks and authentic assessments, along with learner self-assessments in order to respond in differentiated and targeted ways to the observed needs and interests of the learners our candidates serve. These sessions will support candidates as they engage in continuous self-reflexive practice and focus on following the inquiries, questions, and passions of their learners while addressing the social, emotional, and cognitive needs of each learner. (b) Revision of the Responsive Planning Project which is engaged in longitudinally and across time to support connections between multiple content areas and to the everyday lives of learners and connect directly with community partners and stakeholders. This revision will support candidates in their focus on this critical area of development across both years of our program. Data from subscales of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment have confirmed the need for these next steps.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M2: Responsive Planning Project | Outcome/Objective: SLO2: Plans effectively for instruction

Implementation Description: See description above for detailed implementation plan
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Field-Based Coaching 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?

During the 2012-13 academic year, MAT program faculty engaged in the first full cycle of data collection and analysis based on the program design approved by the PSC. In Spring 2013, our first cohort of MAT candidates successfully completed all key assessments. Findings from these indicate that there are additional structures of support we can implement across the 5 semester program to support candidates in specific areas indicated as areas of need. (See action plans for each key assessment for specific information about implementation). All of the key assessments and rubrics used were not modified from our initial program proposal approved by the PSC.
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 analysis of candidate key assessment scores, extensive qualitative and survey based information obtained from graduates and current students, and with the guidance of a formal design team/advisory board made up of our candidates and graduates, we have made several key changes in our implementation for 2013-14. Namely, our courses have been shifted to provide more context in child development and in literacy from the first weeks of the fall semester. Seminars have been planned and scheduled to offer support that was needed early on through these novice teachers’ first months of teaching. Monthly support structures have been created to help candidates focus on the growth of their learners (individually and collectively) across all subject areas and across time, summer coursework has been tailored to expressly address aspects of candidate mid and endpoint key assessments that were indicated as needing additional support, and practices for the responsive planning project have been modified to be scaffolded developmentally across time and course engagement. Faculty instructors/coaches continue to work to develop structures for interactions and support around dispositional factors and clinical practice. MAT faculty are constantly engaged in iterative self-study and program development and are continuously shifting our practice based on the observed and stated needs of our candidates.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Early Childhood Education BSED
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science in Education Program in Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University is to prepare teacher candidates who will be qualified to direct the education of young children in diverse settings from pre-school through elementary grades, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and special education. The theme of this program is to develop teachers as facilitators of learning. Coursework, extensive field experiences, 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 is an educator who will have the content knowledge necessary to understand the curriculum he or she teaches.

G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills
The teacher candidate is an educator who will have the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be able to plan and implement effective instruction.

G 3: Student Learning
The teacher candidate is an educator who will have knowledge of varied assessment techniques and will reflect critically in order to increase student achievement.

G 4: Diversity
The teacher candidate is an educator who 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.

9.0 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 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. Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7. Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8. Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

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**

1.1 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.
5.4 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 courses ECE 4661 (Dual ECE Program with special education concentration) and ECE 4662 (Traditional ECE Program with ESOL concentration), is a comprehensive, teacher work sample documenting the teacher candidate’s use of all of these assessment tools. The teacher candidate uses content knowledge to plan and implement the integrated thematic unit, motivate and manage students, and assess student learning. Throughout the project, the teacher candidate provides written reflection on student progress as well as her/his own
professional development. The rubric used to assess the PTLM highlights competencies aligned with the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. A 100 point rubric is used to rate/score the candidate's project on four components: planning, implementing, assessing, and reflecting. Ratings include: 5 ("proficiently met"), 4 ("adequately met"), 3 ("partially met"), 2 ("minimally met"), and 1 ("not met"). The teacher candidate is expected to achieve at least a rating of 3 ("adequately met") on each of the components in order to demonstrate competency in all the assessing components. A grade 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). If the teacher candidate does not demonstrate 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Planning, Teaching, and Learning Module: Assessment Component (Impact on Student Learning) and edTPA for 2012-2013 reveals the following aggregate pass rates for combined Early Childhood Education BSED Programs: 97% or 106/109 met or exceeded expectations. See analysis of data in edTPA results to form the additional information. On the edTPA we noted that candidate's project 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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2012-2013 reveals the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 97% or 105/108 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation. Across rubric levels 86% of the teacher candidates exceeded expectations, 13% met expectations (i.e. very good or satisfactory) and 1% needed improvement. All twenty-six or 72/74 and 33/34 respectively, passed the key assessment. The mean scores based upon the Overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation Rating by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.85 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.76 on a (0-4) scale, with Traditional ESOL candidates scoring higher than Dual candidates which is the opposite outcome from the previous year. Mean scores across all learning outcomes for combined and disaggregated programs, including highest and lowest indicator scores are found in the table below. For combined programs, outcomes 1 (content knowledge) and 5 (professional dispositions) were rated the highest, while outcome 2 (planning) was rated the
lowest. Looking deeper at sub-indicators, we have noted that indicators 5 (classroom management strategies) and 8 (assessment) will continue to be monitored with current action plans (i.e., requiring the three course revised sequence in Classroom Management and revised lesson plan format targeting planning and assessment). Learning Outcomes Combined Program Scores Traditional – ESOL concentration Dual – special education concentration Highest indicators across both program concentrations (above 3.90) Lowest indicators across both program concentrations (below 3.70) Outcome 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (Standard 1) 3.85 3.84 3.86 1C: demonstrates intellectual curiosity in using multiple resources to plan for instruction Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction (Standard 7) 3.66 3.73 3.58 Outcome 3: Applies content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice (Standards 2 – 6) 3.79 3.80 3.77 2C: critical thinking through question & discussion techniques; 5A: Using a variety of classroom management strategies SE: Using effective management strategies for student self-motivation and engagement Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (Standard 8) 3.725 3.72 3.73 3.8A: Using varied formal and informal assessment strategies to monitor student progress, including self-assessment (below 3.80) 5E: Using effective management strategies – Dual – Special Education concentration 3.86 3.85 3.86 8E: Shows responsibility to punctuality and attendance 10A: Demonstrates professionalism by working cooperatively with administrators, supervisors, colleagues, parents, etc. 10B: Demonstrates exceptional poise, understanding and tact in school situations

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2012-2013 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 97% or 105/108 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation. Across rubric levels 86% of the teacher candidates exceeded expectations, 13% met expectations (i.e. very good or satisfactory) and 1% needed improvement. All twenty-six or 100% of the Alpharetta cohort candidates met or exceeded expectations on this key assessment. Disaggregated scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate 97% of the candidates from each program or 72/74 and 33/34 respectively, passed the key assessment. The mean scores based upon the Overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation Rating by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.85 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.76 on a (0-4) scale, with Traditional ESOL candidates scoring higher than Dual candidates which is the opposite outcome from the previous year. Mean scores across all learning outcomes: Most indicators fall within the range of 3.7-3.9 with the exception of outcome 5 (content knowledge) and 5 (professional dispositions) were rated the highest, while outcome 2 (planning) was rated the lowest. Looking deeper at sub-indicators, we have noted that indicators 5 (classroom management strategies) and 8 (assessment) will continue to be monitored with current action plans (i.e., requiring the three course revised sequence in Classroom Management and revised lesson plan format targeting planning and assessment). Learning Outcomes Combined Program Scores Traditional – ESOL concentration Dual – special education concentration Highest indicators across both program concentrations (above 3.90) Lowest indicators across both program concentrations (below 3.70) Outcome 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (Standard 1) 3.85 3.84 3.86 1C: demonstrates intellectual curiosity in using multiple resources to plan for instruction Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction (Standard 7) 3.66 3.73 3.58 Outcome 3: Applies content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice (Standards 2 – 6) 3.79 3.80 3.77 2C: critical thinking through question & discussion techniques; 5A: Using a variety of classroom management strategies SE: Using effective management strategies for student self-motivation and engagement Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (Standard 8) 3.725 3.72 3.73 3.8A: Using varied formal and informal assessment strategies to monitor student progress, including self-assessment Outcome 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (Standards 9 & 10) 3.86 3.88 3.83 9E: Shows responsibility to punctuality and attendance 10A: Demonstrates professionalism by working cooperatively with administrators, supervisors, colleagues, parents, etc. 10B: Demonstrates exceptional poise, understanding and tact in school situations

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2012-2013 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 97% or 105/108 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation. Across rubric levels 86% of the teacher candidates exceeded expectations, 13% met expectations (i.e. very good or satisfactory) and 1% needed improvement. All twenty-six or 100% of the Alpharetta cohort candidates met or exceeded expectations on this key assessment. Disaggregated scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate 97% of the candidates from each program or 72/74 and 33/34 respectively, passed the key assessment. The mean scores based upon the Overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation Rating by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.85 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.76 on a (0-4) scale, with Traditional ESOL candidates scoring higher than Dual candidates which is the opposite outcome from the previous year. Mean scores across all learning outcomes: Most indicators fall within the range of 3.7-3.9 with the exception of outcome 5 (content knowledge) and 5 (professional dispositions) were rated the highest, while outcome 2 (planning) was rated the lowest. Looking deeper at sub-indicators, we have noted that indicators 5 (classroom management strategies) and 8 (assessment) will continue to be monitored with current action plans (i.e., requiring the three course revised sequence in Classroom Management and revised lesson plan format targeting planning and assessment). Learning Outcomes Combined Program Scores Traditional – ESOL concentration Dual – special education concentration Highest indicators across both program concentrations (above 3.90) Lowest indicators across both program concentrations (below 3.70) Outcome 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (Standard 1) 3.85 3.84 3.86 1C: demonstrates intellectual curiosity in using multiple resources to plan for instruction Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction (Standard 7) 3.66 3.73 3.58 Outcome 3: Applies content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice (Standards 2 – 6) 3.79 3.80 3.77 2C: critical thinking through question & discussion techniques; 5A: Using a variety of classroom management strategies SE: Using effective management strategies for student self-motivation and engagement Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (Standard 8) 3.725 3.72 3.73 3.8A: Using varied formal and informal assessment strategies to monitor student progress, including self-assessment Outcome 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (Standards 9 & 10) 3.86 3.88 3.83 9E: Shows responsibility to punctuality and attendance 10A: Demonstrates professionalism by working cooperatively with administrators, supervisors, colleagues, parents, etc. 10B: Demonstrates exceptional poise, understanding and tact in school situations
content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice (Standards 2 – 6) 3.79 3.80 3.77 2C: critical thinking through question & discussion techniques; 5A: Using a variety of classroom management strategies 5E: Using effective management strategies for student self-motivation and engagement Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (Standard 8) 3.725 3.72 3.73 8A: Using varied formal and informal assessment strategies to monitor student progress, including self-assessment Outcome 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (Standards 9 & 10) 3.86 3.88 3.83 9E: Shows responsibility to punctuality and attendance 10A: Demonstrates professionalism by working cooperatively with administrators, supervisors, colleagues, parents, etc. 10B: Demonstrates exceptional poise, understanding and tact in school situations

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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2012-2013 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 97% or 105/108 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation. Across rubric levels 86% of the teacher candidates exceeded expectations, 13% met expectations (i.e. very good or satisfactory) and 1% needed improvement. All twenty-six or 100% of the Alpharetta cohort candidates met or exceeded expectations on this key assessment. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate 97% of the candidates from each program or 72/74 and 33/34 respectively, passed the key assessment. The mean scores based upon the Overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation Rating by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.85 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.76 on a (0-4) scale, with Traditional ESOL candidates scoring higher than Dual candidates which is the opposite outcome from the previous year. Mean scores across all learning outcomes for combined and disaggregated programs, including highest and lowest indicator scores are found in the table below. For combined programs, outcomes 1 (content knowledge) and 5 (professional dispositions) were rated the highest, while outcome 2 (planning) was rated the lowest. Looking deeper at sub-indicators, we have noted that indicators 5 (classroom management strategies) and 8 (assessment) will continue to be monitored with current action plans (i.e., requiring the three course revised sequence in Classroom Management and revised lesson plan format targeting planning and assessment). Learning Outcomes Combined Program Scores Traditionally – ESOL concentration Dual – special education concentration Highest indicators across both program concentrations (above 3.90); Lowest indicators across both program concentrations (below 3.70): 7A: Demonstrates content knowledge (Standard 1) 3.85 3.84 3.86 1C: demonstrates intellectual curiosity in using multiple resources to plan for instruction Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction (Standard 7) 3.66 3.73 3.58 Outcome 3: Applies content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice (Standards 2 – 6) 3.79 3.80 3.77 2C: critical thinking through question & discussion techniques; 5A: Using a variety of classroom management strategies 5E: Using effective management strategies for student self-motivation and engagement Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (Standard 8) 3.725 3.72 3.73 8A: Using varied formal and informal assessment strategies to monitor student progress, including self-assessment Outcome 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (Standards 9 & 10) 3.86 3.88 3.83 9E: Shows responsibility to punctuality and attendance 10A: Demonstrates professionalism by working cooperatively with administrators, supervisors, colleagues, parents, etc. 10B: Demonstrates exceptional poise, understanding and tact in school situations

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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2012-2013 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 97% or 105/108 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation. Across rubric levels 86% of the teacher candidates exceeded expectations, 13% met expectations (i.e. very good or satisfactory) and 1% needed improvement. All twenty-six or 100% of the Alpharetta cohort candidates met or exceeded expectations on this key assessment. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate 97% of the candidates from each program or 72/74 and 33/34 respectively, passed the key assessment. The mean scores based upon the Overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation Rating by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.85 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.76 on a (0-4) scale, with Traditional ESOL candidates scoring higher than Dual candidates which is the opposite outcome from the previous year. Mean scores across all learning outcomes for combined and disaggregated programs, including highest and lowest indicator scores are found in the table below. For combined programs, outcomes 1 (content knowledge) and 5 (professional dispositions) were rated the highest, while outcome 2 (planning) was rated the lowest. Looking deeper at sub-indicators, we have noted that indicators 5 (classroom management strategies) and 8 (assessment) will continue to be monitored with current action plans (i.e., requiring the three course revised sequence in Classroom Management and revised lesson plan format targeting planning and assessment). Learning Outcomes Combined Program Scores Traditionally – ESOL concentration Dual – special education concentration Highest indicators across both program concentrations (above 3.90); Lowest indicators across both program concentrations (below 3.70): 7A: Demonstrates content knowledge (Standard 1) 3.85 3.84 3.86 1C: demonstrates intellectual curiosity in using multiple resources to plan for instruction Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction (Standard 7) 3.66 3.73 3.58 Outcome 3: Applies content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice (Standards 2 – 6) 3.79 3.80 3.77 2C: critical thinking through question & discussion techniques; 5A: Using a variety of classroom management strategies 5E: Using effective management strategies for student self-motivation and engagement Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (Standard 8) 3.725 3.72 3.73 8A: Using varied formal and informal assessment strategies to monitor student progress, including self-assessment Outcome 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (Standards 9 & 10) 3.86 3.88 3.83 9E: Shows responsibility to punctuality and attendance 10A: Demonstrates professionalism by working cooperatively with administrators, supervisors, colleagues, parents, etc. 10B: Demonstrates exceptional poise, understanding and tact in school situations
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, 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

2012-2013 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 97% or 102/105 total program candidates (Traditional and Dual) meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Five Effective Dispositions Assessment. Disaggregate scores from 2012-2013 data show ratings for Traditional Program teacher candidates at 100% (71/71) as compared to 91% (31/34) for Dual Program candidates meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment. Of the three Dual Program candidates who received marginal ratings on one indicator of this assessment, they were monitored during Student Teaching and assessed using another measure, the Observation Field Performance Rubric (i.e., performance based assessment). All three candidates met program requirements for dispositions. All Alpharetta 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All program candidates recommended for teacher certification received passing scores on the GACE. Scores are not available for 2012-2013 data, however, scores are available for 2011-2012; however, scores are available for 2011-2012. A review of 2011-2012 GACE overall scores for test 001 (Reading, English Language Arts, Social Studies) are slightly lower at 92% or 139/151; however, all sub-indicator scores are above state averages. The area rated lowest the previous year, understanding the conventions of Standard English is up by 2%. Overall rates on test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education, and the Arts) remain constant at 96% or 145/151; however, the area rated lowest the previous year, understand concepts and principles of earth science is up 2%. Additionally, scores in the area of life science are also up 2%. As a result of the supplemental GUMS instruction and ISCI 2001 course changes, we expect to continue to see improvement in these three areas. Newly revised and more rigorous GACE Content Assessments will be offered to teacher candidates beginning 2013-2014. We will continue to monitor overall pass rates and sub-indicator scores on the GACE.

**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: 14 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 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 or 1= 5%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 2012-2013 Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration completers 108/108 or one hundred percent...
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

### 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: 3.44 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. Data from 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. We will continue to offer course inputs through 2013-2014.

**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:** 05/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** BSE faculty and/or part time instructors  
**Additional Resources:** One faculty load to cover course inputs in ESOL and special education.  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Technology for Student Learning

In an effort to increase pre-service teacher knowledge and skills in implementing technology for student learning, program faculty have embedded the NET Standards throughout course work, designating specific assignments that will target this area. Additionally, a 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 has 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 mean and 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: Finished
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 digital. Additionally, faculty have added a second day Digital Literacy Seminar.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: BSED faculty and supervisors
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. We will continue this action plan through May 2014.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: BSED Faculty
Additional Resources: None

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 professional writing skills. Finally, our scores on test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest area on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics, 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 digital. Additionally, faculty have added a second day Digital Literacy Seminar.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
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 2014. 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: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: BSED Faculty
Additional Resources: None

Assessment Used for Future Instruction

Data from 2012-2013 continue to show that developing teachers need improvement in not only documenting student learning but also in using data to inform future instruction. We will continue to monitor candidates’ ability to plan for instruction and assessment as well as implement instruction and use assessments to inform future planning for all learners. The new Observation on Field Performance rubric and the edTPA national assessment will be piloted this fall and spring 2013-2014 as new measures to target learning outcomes. These measures will be included in the next year’s report.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In an effort to streamline reporting and review meaningful data as collected for the PSC, NCATE and the university's WEAVE online system, the BSE faculty revised program learning outcomes to clearly match key assessments aligned to national standards and the Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework, loaded in courses at mid and end of program in the new LiveText Course Management System. The ECE BSED Program will continue to use the LiveText course management system to document, collect, analyze, and report program data. We will maintain the established targets, and we will continue to include disaggregated data across all levels of the key assessment rubrics in order to drill down to specific areas to identify program strength and needs for program focus. In summary, we: - Moved to an electronic assessment management system, LiveText to collect, analyze and report on learning outcome results - Revised goals and learning outcomes in order to streamline the process of reporting results for state program approval and national accreditation - Revised measures to collect meaningful data aligned to the learning outcomes

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

The ECE BSED Program has reviewed teacher candidate performance scores across all five learning outcomes and candidates have met or surpassed all identified assessment targets. Improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes made in the course management system, revisions in course design and content, identification of clear goals and learning outcomes, and development of stronger measures including clear and concise rubrics. The following three areas of teacher preparation, associated with goals and learning outcomes, are identified with key changes. Assessment data indicate improvements in student learning across some of the targeted areas: written communication, content knowledge – early/life science, classroom management, technology, planning and assessment. We will continue to monitor teacher candidates' growth in these areas and identify ways to improve the ECE BSED Program.

1. **Content knowledge:** *Improvement in student learning noted in written communication; we will continue to monitor improvements in early/life science for results in 2013-2014. Key changes: 2010-2011 GUMS - Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style Writing Program; 2011-2012 ISCI 2001 course changes; 2013-2014 will incorporate a new measure, Observation on Field Performance; and a revised three-course sequence ECE 3661, ECE 3662, ECE 3663 - Classroom Management; designed new comprehensive lesson plan format; offered multi-media digital media seminars and revised ECE 3602: Digital Composing as Literacy Learning, offered ECE 3021 as a hybrid course; 2013-2014 will incorporate a new Observation of Field Performance measure aligned to the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards - TAPS, the new standards as included in the new Teacher Keys Evaluation System (TKES) in Georgia and aligned to national standards, InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards.

2. **Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions:** *Improvement in student learning noted across some performance indicators of classroom management, but we will continue to monitor this area; improvement noted in using technology for student learning.* Key changes: revised three-course sequence ECE 3661, ECE 3662, ECE 3663 - Classroom Management; designed new comprehensive lesson plan format; offered multi-media digital media seminars and revised ECE 3602: Digital Composing as Literacy Learning, offered ECE 3021 as a hybrid course; 2013-2014 will incorporate a new Observation of Field Performance measure aligned to the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards - TAPS, the new standards as included in the new Teacher Keys Evaluation System (TKES) in Georgia and aligned to national standards, InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards.

3. **Effects on student learning:** *Some improvement in student learning noted in the area of assessment; however, we will continue to look at all performance indicators for improvement in planning, implementing and assessing student learning.* Key changes: 2010-2011 embedded the ESOL Endorsement; incorporated methods of assessment across specific content area course work and added a focus on pupil self-assessment; will incorporate new measure, the edTPA, and signature course assignments across ECE 3021: Child Development, ECE 3661, 3662, 3663 – Classroom Management, ECE 3607: Math Methods, ECE 3661: Reading Methods, ECE 3660: Assessment Additionally, improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what of the assessment process? - The ECE BSED Program embedded the ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) Endorsement in the undergraduate Early Childhood Education degree program so that all teacher candidates would be proficient in meeting the needs of all learners, including English Language Learners. The BSE program was 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 plantational instructional strategies to improve assessment. - With the addition of the assessment course to the Program of Study in Area G in 2006-2007, teacher 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 2011-2013 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. The role of instructional assessment as it relates to teaching and learning is a major focus of the 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 strategy for selecting and using assessment methods. A focus on pupil self-assessment was added to course instruction around lesson planning. 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. - We learned from program data, specifically the Observation Field Performance – media communication sub-indicator that teacher candidates are avid users of technology in their personal lives and for teacher directed instruction; however, they need improvement in using technology for student learning. In response, the program revised and renamed ECE 3602: Reading and Language Arts in Early Childhood Education II to ECE 3602: Digital Composing as Literacy Learning. One change in course content included a new focus on digital literacy for student learning. Teacher candidates are given opportunities to learn and design multimedia digital literacy compositions themselves and with K-12 students and their teachers. Additionally, in order to give teacher candidates more experience working and communicating in a learning community online, we offered ECE 3021: Child Development as a hybrid course. - The program revised the three-course sequence, ECE 3661, ECE 3662, ECE 3663: Classroom Management and Field Experiences I, II, III in Early Childhood Education, emphasizing lesson plan development and Responsive Classroom.
Management strategies in order to target classroom management, an area rated as one of the lowest on key assessments across the five years. Classroom Management is an area that is typically a struggle for new teachers. · Our scores are equal or above the state in all areas on the GACE Content Assessment with the lowest area on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics was equivalent to the state score. In response to this outcome the program continues to implement supplemental instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics, and style (GUMS) for candidates who have been identified as needing further instruction in this area. We expect to see improvement in teacher candidates’ GACE scores in this area in 2013-2014. · Our scores on the GACE Content Assessment test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. The program continues to implement course changes in ISCI 2001 with an increased emphasis on content development in earth and life sciences, a collaborative effort by the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Education faculty who implement co-teaching models of delivery. We expect to see improvement in teacher candidates’ GACE scores in earth science in 2013-2014.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Early Childhood Education BSED (B-5)
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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 1: Content Knowledge
The teacher candidate will possess the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum they teach.

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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
The teacher candidate understands child development and learning and the central concepts of the subject areas she/he teaches and creates learning experiences that are developmentally appropriate.

SLO 2: Plans effectively for development and learning (G: 2) (M: 2)
The teacher candidate plans for the educational progress of children based upon knowledge of the individual student, curriculum and behavioral goals, family goals and community.

SLO 3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 3)
The teacher candidate understands the goals and benefits of assessment and uses formal and informal strategies to evaluate the development and learning of the child.

SLO 4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 4)
The teacher candidate knows and uses the ethical guidelines of the profession. She/he uses reflection to improve practice and displays interpersonal and communication skills with diverse learners, families and colleagues.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Evaluation of Field Performance (Clinical Practice) (O: 1)
This measure rates the candidate's overall professional performance in the early childhood classroom. The measure/rubric is based on the 15 professional standards of the early care and education profession (NAEYC and CEC). At the completion of student
teaching (clinical practice), teacher candidates must receive a rating from the university supervisor of "meets" or "exceeds" on each standard/element of the rubric. If a candidate does not receive a minimum rating of "meets," s/he will be required to extend or repeat student teaching with additional coaching and action plans until mastery of standards is demonstrated.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge**

85% of candidates will receive ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for all standards demonstrating content knowledge in the field.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

94% of teacher candidates (15/16) received ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for all indicators demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy in the field. The highest mean ratings for candidates (2.8/3.0) were in the areas of "promoting child development and learning," and "becoming a professional." Candidates also received strong ratings for standards focused on working with families and communities (2.75 - 2.81/3.0), which is an improvement from prior assessment cycles. Lower mean ratings were noted for "uses a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate approaches" (2.56) and "engaging in advocacy for children in the profession." (2.62). One teacher candidate received ratings of "does not meet standard" on three (3) performance standards. This student was required to extend her student teaching internship by two weeks with a focused professional development plan on these standards. The candidate did re-mediate areas of weakness and passed student teaching with a grade of "C". [Please note: the LiveText data table linked to this finding shows only 11 candidates in the overall summary; instead of the 16 actual candidates. This error is due to one of the raters completing all ratings except "overall rating." ]

**M 2: IEP/ IFSP Project (O: 2)**

This measure rates the teacher candidate's ability to plan for a young child with special needs by completing a sample IEP or an IFSP. An IEP is the formal plan that teachers, parents and specialists develop to meet the educational needs of a student age 3-21 who is eligible for special education services. An IFSP is the formal plan that describes a child's and family's needs and the services to be provided for children with disabilities from birth through age three. Candidates develop the formal plan in a methods course for exceptional children EXC 4530. A 32 point rubric aligned with professional standards (NAEYC and CEC) is used to rate the candidate's project on eight (8) indicators. Ratings include: mastery (4), accomplished (3), developing (2), and beginning (1). Candidates are expected to receive a rating of at least "developing" on each indicator at mid-point in the program since it may be their first exposure to the IEP/IFSP process and the project proceeds their full-time student teaching experience. Birth-Five candidates will receive the Preschool Special Education Endorsement upon program completion.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Plans effectively for development and learning**

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all eight indicators demonstrating their ability to plan effectively for children's development and learning.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% (9/10) candidates received a rating of at least "developing" on all eight indicators of the IEP/IFSP project. In fact, seven (7) students received the highest rating of "mastery," and two received ratings of "accomplished." Only 1 candidate received a rating of "beginning" which is below the target. Candidates with a rating below target are able to re-mediate their skills in the second methods course for working with children with disabilities. Therefore, candidates have three chances to demonstrate mastery of all indicators, in EXC 4520, EXC 4530 or BRFV 4661 (final internship).

**M 3: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) (O: 3)**

This measure rates the teacher candidate's performance against national standards through a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes artifacts and reflective narratives. Examples of artifacts are lesson plans, child case studies, research reviews, and photo documentation of children's learning. Candidates organize the portfolio based on the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC). Candidates submit assigned artifacts and rationales each semester for progress monitoring. The final portfolio evaluation is completed at the end of student teaching. One key component of the portfolio is the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project that measures the candidate's impact on student learning. This project requires the candidate to document children's learning during a 10 day thematic unit implemented during student teaching. The portfolio rubric element that rates the candidate's performance on the DOL project is titled "impact on student learning." Rubric ratings are "exceeds expectations," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory." 

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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates (16/16) 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.” Eight (8) candidates received ratings of "exceeds expectations" with scores between 93-100 points. Seven (7) candidates received ratings of "satisfactory" with scores ranging between 73 - 92. The overall project average was 82/100. Several candidates received ratings of "partially met" or "not met" on individual components of the project. These lower ratings were not due to lack of knowledge or skill, but typically omissions of the component or technology problems encountered by candidates with uploads into LiveText.

**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
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 measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: B-5 Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards
This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating 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
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.” 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).

**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.

**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.

Prior assessment data from one of our measures, the End Program Evaluation of Field Performance, revealed that candidates in their final student teaching internship received relatively lower ratings from cooperating teachers and university supervisors on standards related to working with families and communities. At our program advisory meetings, we discussed this finding and possible additions/assignments to one course, BRFV Family and Community Relations in Birth Through Five. Candidate's 2012-2013 ratings on these standards is improved over the 2011-2012 assessment. In fact, some of the highest mean ratings are in this cluster of three standards, ranging from 2.75 - 2.81/3.0. This outcome could be influenced by the course changes or a function of the candidates or school contexts for the reporting year. We will continue to monitor candidate performance on this cluster of professional standards focused on family/community relations during the final field evaluation.

---

**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 observed and reported that one of our measures, the IEP/IFSP project, was using a rubric that was ineffective in reporting expectations and unclear to students. The rubric was revised and recent data reveal fewer candidates receiving ratings below target. We will continue to use this revised rubric and monitor student performance.

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

Prior assessment data from one of our measures, the End Program Evaluation of Field Performance, revealed that candidates in their final student teaching internship received relatively lower ratings from cooperating teachers and university supervisors on standards related to working with families and communities. At our program advisory meetings, we discussed this finding and possible additions/assignments to one course, BRFV Family and Community Relations in Birth Through Five. Candidate's 2012-2013 ratings on these standards is improved over the 2011-2012 assessment. In fact, some of the highest mean ratings are in this cluster of three standards, ranging from 2.75 - 2.81/3.0. This outcome could be influenced by the course changes or a function of the candidates or school contexts for the reporting year. We will continue to monitor candidate performance on this cluster of professional standards focused on family/community relations during the final field evaluation.

---

**Georgia State University**
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Early Childhood Education MEd

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**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 their classroom 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, 4)**
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, 4)**
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 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 between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. Mid-program Analysis: Ten candidates were assessed with the Mid-program Impact of Program Rubric I Benchmark. For the six dimensions evaluated, the 10 candidates scored either in the Novice/Independent (NI) or Intermediate (I), category. As such, all candidates met target. (See Table) Based on these results the candidates are performing on target and are poised to continue their development as they participate: in a variety of activities that promote reflection, in-class discussions about democratic practice, and in designing learner-centered experiences. 1. Candidate critically analyzes program experiences to identify program impact on his/her classroom practice. N: 3 I: 7 A: 0 2. Candidate critically analyzes program experiences to identify program impact on his/her classroom practice. N: 3 I: 7 A: 0 3. Candidate uses the professional literature to support his/her view of teaching and learning. N: 5 I: 5 A: 0 4. Candidate uses knowledge of students’ cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N: 5 I: 5 A: 0 5. Candidate includes all required components in Benchmark. N: 10 A: 0 6. Candidate uses technology and other media to augment instruction. N: 7 I: 3 A: 0

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. Mid-program Analysis: Ten candidates were assessed with the Mid-program Impact of Program Rubric I Benchmark. For the six dimensions evaluated, the 10 candidates scored either in the Novice/Independent (NI) or Intermediate (I), category. As such, all candidates met target. (See Table) Based on these results the candidates are performing on target and are poised to continue their development as they participate: in a variety of activities that promote reflection, in-class discussions about democratic practice, and in designing learner-centered experiences. 1. Candidate critically analyzes program experiences to identify program impact on his/her classroom practice. N: 3 I: 7 A: 0 2. Candidate critically analyzes program experiences to identify program impact on his/her classroom practice. N: 3 I: 7 A: 0 3. Candidate uses the professional literature to support his/her view of teaching and learning. N: 5 I: 5 A: 0 4. Candidate uses knowledge of students’ cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N: 5 I: 5 A: 0 5. Candidate includes all required components in Benchmark. N: 10 A: 0 6. Candidate uses technology and other media to augment instruction. N: 7 I: 3 A: 0

Target for O3: Educators reflect on their practice.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. The Impact of Program Rubric II will be administered at the end of Fall 2013 and will be reported during the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September
Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. Capstone The Impact of Program Rubric II will be administered at the end of Fall 2013 and will be reported during the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. Capstone The Impact of Program Rubric II will be administered at the end of Fall 2013 and will be reported during the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. Capstone The Impact of Program Rubric II will be administered at the end of Fall 2013 and will be reported during the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.

**M 3: Teacher Development (O: 1, 2)**

This project enables teacher candidates to improve their classroom practice. Two program activities focus directly on the teacher's in-classroom practice: faculty classroom visits and teacher video clubs. Faculty Classroom Visits: Program faculty visit each teacher two times during the Fall semester and two times during Spring semester. The visits include an observation of the educator and a follow-up debriefing. After the visit, the educator submits a written reflection describing what was learned and how future work will be influenced by this new information. Teacher Video Clubs: Teachers meet in small groups three times Fall semester and three times Spring semester. At each meeting, one to three teachers share a 5 to 10 minute video clip of a lesson. Teachers prepare to share their clips by completing the protocol.

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 -3.0 for every item on the ten item rubric. Therefore 100% of the candidates met target. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed. Capstone The Impact of Program Rubric II will be administered at the end of Fall 2013 and will be reported during the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.
3.1 Candidates use knowledge of students' cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N 8 12 A 0 1.2 Candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology & other resources to provide active & equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates implement appropriate communication techniques to provide for learner interaction within local & global communities. N 6 I 4 A 0 The scores fell in two categories Novice or Intermediate. For four items: (1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3) the scores fell into Novice or Intermediate. For four items (1, 2, 3, 4; 5, 2) more candidates scored in the Intermediate category than the Novice. For two items (2, 3, 4; 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.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) Mid-program analysis: Ten candidates were assessed. All ten candidates scored between 2.0 -3.0 for every item on the ten item rubric. Therefore 100% of the candidates met target. 1.1 Candidates use knowledge of child development & theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners. N 6 I 4 A 0 1.2 Candidates possess & use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge & pedagogy to facilitate learning for all. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing & assessing teaching, learning, & development. N 4 16 A 0 1.4 Candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metro contexts. N 4 I 6 A 0 2.1 Candidates know & respect individual differences, establish productive & ethical relationships with students, & modify the learning environment to positively impact student learning. N 1 10 A 0 2.2 Candidates create engaging learning communities where the diverse perspectives, opinions, & beliefs of others are acknowledged & respected. N 6 I 4 A 0 2.3 Candidates commit to continuing personal & professional development. N 1 0 A 0 3.1 Candidates use knowledge of students' cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N 8 12 A 0 1.2 Candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology & other resources to provide active & equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing & assessing teaching, learning, & development. N 4 16 A 0 1.4 Candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metro contexts. N 6 I 4 A 0 The scores fell in two categories Novice or Intermediate. For four items: (1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3) the scores fell into Novice or Intermediate. For four items (1.2, 1.3, 1.4; 3.2) more candidates scored in the Intermediate category than the Novice. For two items (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.

M 4: Content Knowledge Summative Assessment (O: 2, 4)

This assessment includes the combined end of program GPA for the two content courses: ECE 7390 Curriculum in Early Childhood Education (Mathematics) and ECE 7400 Curriculum in Early Childhood Education (Literacy). Grades for these two courses derive from multiple projects as well as in-class experiences and participation.

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

Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.

The target is 3 on a 4 point scale: 4 (Advanced), 3 (Intermediate), 2 (Novice), 1 (Not evident).

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) Mid-program analysis: Ten candidates were assessed. All ten candidates scored between 2.0 -3.0 for every item on the ten item rubric. Therefore 100% of the candidates met target. 1.1 Candidates use knowledge of child development & theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners. N 6 I 4 A 0 1.2 Candidates possess & use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge & pedagogy to facilitate learning for all. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing & assessing teaching, learning, & development. N 4 16 A 0 1.4 Candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metro contexts. N 4 I 6 A 0 2.1 Candidates know & respect individual differences, establish productive & ethical relationships with students, & modify the learning environment to positively impact student learning. N 1 10 A 0 2.2 Candidates create engaging learning communities where the diverse perspectives, opinions, & beliefs of others are acknowledged & respected. N 6 I 4 A 0 2.3 Candidates commit to continuing personal & professional development. N 1 0 A 0 3.1 Candidates use knowledge of students' cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N 8 12 A 0 1.2 Candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology & other resources to provide active & equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing & assessing teaching, learning, & development. N 4 16 A 0 1.4 Candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metro contexts. N 6 I 4 A 0 The scores fell in two categories Novice or Intermediate. For four items: (1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3) the scores fell into Novice or Intermediate. For four items (1.2, 1.3, 1.4; 3.2) more candidates scored in the Intermediate category than the Novice. For two items (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.

Target for O4: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.

The target is 3 on a 4 point scale: 4 (Advanced), 3 (Intermediate), 2 (Novice), 1 (Not evident).

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) Mid-program analysis: Ten candidates were assessed. All ten candidates scored between 2.0 -3.0 for every item on the ten item rubric. Therefore 100% of the candidates met target. 1.1 Candidates use knowledge of child development & theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners. N 6 I 4 A 0 1.2 Candidates possess & use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge & pedagogy to facilitate learning for all. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing & assessing teaching, learning, & development. N 4 16 A 0 1.4 Candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metro contexts. N 4 I 6 A 0 2.1 Candidates know & respect individual differences, establish productive & ethical relationships with students, & modify the learning environment to positively impact student learning. N 1 10 A 0 2.2 Candidates create engaging learning communities where the diverse perspectives, opinions, & beliefs of others are acknowledged & respected. N 6 I 4 A 0 2.3 Candidates commit to continuing personal & professional development. N 1 0 A 0 3.1 Candidates use knowledge of students' cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N 8 12 A 0 1.2 Candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology & other resources to provide active & equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences. N 4 16 A 0 1.3 Candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing & assessing teaching, learning, & development. N 4 16 A 0 1.4 Candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metro contexts. N 6 I 4 A 0 The scores fell in two categories Novice or Intermediate. For four items: (1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3) the scores fell into Novice or Intermediate. For four items (1.2, 1.3, 1.4; 3.2) more candidates scored in the Intermediate category than the Novice. For two items (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.
knowledge of students’ cultures, experiences, & communities to create & sustain culturally responsive classrooms & schools. N 8 1 2 A 0 1.2 Candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology & other resources to provide active & equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences. N 4 1 6 A 0 1.3 Candidates implement appropriate communication techniques to provide for learner interaction within local & global communities. N 6 I 4 A 0 The scores fell in two categories: Novice or Intermediate. For four items: (1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3) the scores fell into Novice or Intermediate. For four items (1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.2) more candidates scored in the Intermediate category than the Novice. For two items (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.

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

**Examine literature on achievement gap between majority and minority students.**

During the Glue classes attention will be directed toward examining reasons behind the achievement gap between majority and minority students. Students will read a variety of texts and hold classroom discussions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Students will be given their first reading related to the achievement gap at the first glue class in August.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The two program directors will be responsible for selecting readings and for leading the discussions.

**Action Plans**

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Capstone | **Outcome/Objective:** Educator will show commitment to student learning.

**Action Plans**

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Capstone | **Outcome/Objective:** Educator will collaborate with peers and others.
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?

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed.

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.

Note: Two changes have occurred in the CMP that affect the reporting of the findings. 1. Typically the students began the CMP in the summer and then were graduated the next summer. (Note in the CMP, the students progress through the program as a cohort.) With this structure, all program requirements were completed by the next summer and all measures had been administered by the September WEAVE due date. This structure changed with the 2012-2013 CMP cohort. This cohort began the program Fall of 2012 and will graduate Fall 2013. Therefore all measures have not been administered by the September Weave due date. To accommodate this program structure change, the decision was made to report Midpoint data for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle and then report the final findings in the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. 2. The CMP will end with the 2013 cohort, so the scores reported during the 2013-2014 will be last scores reported. The CMP has been replaced with an ECE M.Ed.
### Mission / Purpose

The Ph.D. major in Early Childhood and Elementary Education prepares scholars who serve as researchers and educators in a variety of roles including basic and applied research, curriculum development, and teacher education. As most of our graduates become educational researchers and teacher educators in universities and colleges, we strive to create thoughtful scholars who have deep theoretical understanding of their fields and strong knowledge about how to conduct research in educational and learning contexts.

### Goals

**G 1: Writers and speakers**
Candidates are thoughtful writers and speakers.

**G 2: Active seekers of knowledge**
Candidates are active seekers of knowledge.

**G 3: Ethical researchers**
Candidates are ethical researchers.

**G 4: Knowledgeable teachers**
Candidates are knowledgeable teachers.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Thoughtful writers and speakers (M: 1, 3)**
Candidates write and speak clearly. They 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.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

#### 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).

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**SLO 2: Active seeker of knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

#### 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.

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).

**SLO 3: Ethical researcher (M: 1, 3)**
Candidates will conduct quality, valid, and socially responsible inquiry related to early childhood and/or elementary education.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

#### 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.

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: Knowledgeable teachers (M: 2)**
Candidates will be knowledgeable teachers who are capable of challenging their students’ thinking and constructing knowledge relative to early childhood and elementary education.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

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).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Comprehensive examination (O: 1, 2, 3)
Comprehensive Exams The comprehensive exam is used to evaluate PhD candidates progression to becoming thoughtful writers and speakers. Comprehensive exams involve three main parts: Part A: Written essays (2-3) that provide opportunity for the synthesis of theory and 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 using a rubric based on the following dimensions: (1) thoroughness of research synthesis; (2) demonstration of "fit" (i.e., validity, credibility) of research methods to the nature of the problem or research question (3) clarity of writing and speaking; (4) convergence of theoretical and methodological approaches; and (5) social responsibility and/or critique. The rubric uses four levels of achievement ranging from "surpassed" to "not met". Based upon the ratings of the comprehensive exam committee, each of the five items combine to provide a holistic evaluation of the comprehensive examinations and result in a pass/fail decision. Students must meet expectations in all areas of the rubric to pass comprehensive exams. In other words, a student who writes clearly but does not fulfill the other areas will fail the exams. The rubric is completed by the major adviser and the students PhD advisory committee at the end of her/his comprehensive exams. Table 1. PhD Candidates Comprehensive Examination Evaluation Rubric Goal 1: Candidates are thoughtful writers and speakers. Measure: Comprehensive exams Surpassed Met Partially met Not met Demonstrates thoroughness of research synthesis for the defined topic Demonstrates "fit" (e.g., validity, credibility, etc.) of research methods to the nature of the problem and/or research questions Effectively communicates developing understandings in written and spoken form. On the indicator, Demonstrates appropriate convergence/consistency/fit among theories and methodological approaches Demonstrates social responsibility/critique of existing research COMMENTS Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers
80% will pass their comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
A total of seven (N = 7) students completed comprehensive exams during the 2012-2013 academic year. According to faculty evaluations of students' performance on the rubric above (see Table 1. PhD Candidates Comprehensive Examination Evaluation Rubric), all students "met" the criteria of being thoughtful writers and speakers. On the indicator Demonstrates thoroughness of research synthesis for the defined topic, three students "surpassed" expectations while four students "met" expectations. All seven students were evaluated as having "Met" criteria for the indicators: Demonstrates "fit" (e.g., validity, credibility, etc.) of research methods to the nature of the problem and/or research questions and Effectively communicates developing understandings in written and spoken form. On the indicator, Demonstrates appropriate convergence/consistency/fit among theories and methodological approaches, one student was evaluated as having "surpassed", and 6 students were evaluated as having "met" the criteria. Finally, for the indicator Demonstrates social responsibility/critique of existing research, two students were rated as having "surpassed" the indicator, while 5 students were evaluated as having "met" the indicator. These findings indicate a 100% pass rate for this indicator.

Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge
80% of eligible students will pass comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) in first attempt; all within second attempt.

Target for O3: Ethical researcher
80% of eligible students will pass comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) in first attempt; all within second attempt.

M 2: Teaching apprenticeship (O: 2, 4)
Residency Teaching Experiences PhD students residency teaching experience is designed to assist them in becoming knowledgeable teachers. PhD residency teaching experiences generally involved the students in the following activities: 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, student surveys, and faculty evaluation) and the course, 4. Use and interpret data gathered from all course evaluations. PhD residency teaching experiences are evaluated with a rubric that assess the following 5 domains on a 4 point scale (e.g., surpassed, met, partially met, and not met). 1. 1. Demonstrates thorough knowledge of content that is relevant, up-to-date, and comprehensive. Syllabus is organized for planning and instruction. Readings and assignments are relevant to the course topics. 2. 2. Demonstrates engaging instruction through enthusiasm and by supporting caring teacher/student and peer relationships. Promotes respect for different and diverse perspectives. Promotes collaboration. 3. 3. Adapts instruction for learners by being responsive, offering timely feedback, and presenting materials in different ways, and encouraging various means for students to express what they have learned. Offers content that is relevant to students' contexts and needs. 4. 4. Uses a variety of high-quality formative and summative assessments to inform teaching. Grades fairly. 5. 5. Course evaluations demonstrate that course goals are met. Instructor is responsive to feedback from students and peers.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge
All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

Target for O4: Knowledgeable teachers
All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

A total of eight (N=7) students were evaluated on the quality of their teaching experiences during the 2012-2013 period. According to faculty evaluations of their teaching skills, four of the students "surpassed", while 3 students "met" the criteria of: Demonstrates thorough knowledge of content that is relevant, up-to-date, and comprehensive. Syllabus is organized for planning and instruction. Readings and assignments are relevant to the course topics and Demonstrates engaging instruction through enthusiasm and by supporting caring teacher/student and peer relationships. Promotes respect for different and diverse perspectives. Promotes collaboration. Faculty evaluations of student progress on the third indicator on the rubric, Adapts instruction for learners by being responsive, offering timely feedback, and presenting materials in different ways, and encouraging various means for students to express what they have learned. Offers content that is relevant to students' contexts and needs, one student "surpassed", four students "met", and one student "partially met" the criteria. A similar finding was evident in faculty evaluations of students' progress toward the Uses a variety of high-quality formative and summative assessments to inform teaching. Grades fairly. criteria. One student "surpassed", four students "met", and one student "partially met" the criteria. Finally, for the last indicator, Course evaluations demonstrate that course goals are met. Instructor is responsive to feedback from students and peers, 1 PhD candidate "surpassed", five "met", and one "partially met" the criteria. A summary of student progress on this indicator suggests that PhD candidates "met" the criteria for becoming knowledgeable teachers at a rate of 91% (averaged across all five indicators).

**M 3: Dissertation presentation (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Dissertation Presentation The dissertation presentation is used to evaluate the degree to which PhD candidates are ethical researchers. During the dissertation presentation, PhD candidates present 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 dimensions that evaluate the rigor of the research. The following indicators are evaluated on a 4 point scale ranging from "Surpassed" to "Not Met": 1. Demonstrates a thorough reading and/or synthesis of the literature in a way that frames the philosophical/theoretical paradigm or research field in which the study is situated. Is able to articulate clear alignments between the study and his/her paradigm or field. 2. Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study. 3. Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings). 4. Creates a final dissertation product that effectively communicates study results and is able to verbally defend the work. The way in which the PhD candidate conducts the research study with regards to ethical and moral responsibility is evaluated on the following dimensions from "Met" to "Not Met": 1. Demonstrates an understanding that scholarship sometimes entails conflicts of commitment, conscience, and interest that must be negotiated according to university protocols and professional standards (when applicable). 2. Demonstrates sensitivity to vulnerable populations and principle of "do no harm". 3. Complies with human subjects protocols including adherence to confidentiality and informed consent (when applicable). 4. Demonstrates academic honesty through original scholarship.

**Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers**

We want 100% of our eligible PhD students to have rigorous dissertations.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Two students completed their dissertation presentations during the 2012-2013 academic year. Evaluations of these students performance on the their dissertation presentations, as determined by their faculty advisors and dissertation committee, reveal that both students "met" expectations on all criteria as evaluated by the rubric. A closer examination of individual indicators reveals that one PhD student was rated as having "surpassed" the criteria of Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings). and that both students were rated as having "surpassed" the indicator that reads: Demonstrates a thorough reading and/or synthesis of the literature in a way that frames the philosophical/theoretical paradigm or research field in which the study is situated. Is able to articulate clear alignments between the study and his/her paradigm or field. Given these findings, 100% of PhD candidates demonstrated that they were thoughtful writers and speakers by successfully defending their dissertations.

**Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge**

One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PhD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

**Target for O3: Ethical researcher**

One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PhD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

**M 4: Residency Research and Service Requirement (O: 2)**

PhD students' residency experiences are designed to assess the degree to which they become and demonstrate that they are active seekers of knowledge. There are multiple residency experiences that are used to determine this indicator. These indicators are completed by the PhD students' comprehensive exam committee before comprehensive exams are completed. The following scholarship and professional service focused indicators are evaluated. 1. Presents scholarly work at a research conference. 2. Submits manuscript to a peer reviewed journal. 3. Provides service to the department, university, and/or profession. 4. Participates in identifying and applying for a grant, scholarship, or fellowship. A rubric is used to evaluate students' achievement on these four indicators. The student is evaluated by his/her comprehensive exam committee on the degree to which he/she "surpassed", "met", "partially met", or "not met" the criteria. Based upon the ratings of the comprehensive exam committee, each of the five items combine to provide a holistic evaluation of the comprehensive examinations and result in a pass/fail decision. In order to "meet" the residency requirement, students' scores across the four indicators must average to a "meets" level of proficiency. In other words, if a study scores "partially met" on one dimension of the rubric (such as participates in identifying and applying for a grant, scholarship, or fellowship), he or she must score a "surpassed" in another area (such as submits manuscript to a peer reviewed journal) in order to offset this score.

**Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge**

90% of PhD candidates will demonstrate that they are active seekers of knowledge through pursuit of scholarly writing, presentation and service activities.
Findings, 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

Seven PhD candidates were evaluated on this objective during the 2012-2013 academic year. According to faculty ratings of these students, students by and large met the criteria for this indicator. However, a closer examination of the individual indicators demonstrates variability in student performance. For example, on the indicator Attends and presents scholarly work at a research conference, one student was rated as having "surpassed" the indicator, while four "met", and two "partially met" the criteria (71% met rate). Regarding Students submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals, one student "surpassed" the indicator, four "met", one "partially met" the criteria, and one student "did not meet" the indicator (71% met rate). Students performed better on the indicator designed to assess their Service to Department, University or Profession. On this indicator, 4 students scored as having "surpassed" the criteria while three students were rated as having "met" the indicator (100% met rate). Finally, for the last dimension, Participates in identifying and applying for a grant, scholarship or fellowship, 3 students were rated as having "met", 3 students were rated as having "partially met" and 1 student was rated as having "not met" the indicator (43% met rate). Overall, these data suggest that students were not performing as well as one would hope on the new metrics used to determine whether students were active seekers of knowledge (overall ~ 71%). An examination of which students were meeting and not meeting criteria reveals that part-time graduate students who are working full time in schools were less likely to have met scholarly writing and service activities as measured on the "Active Seekers of Knowledge" rubric. Given this finding, we will develop an action plan that will better assist these students as they participate in research and service activities that are designed to assist them in developing their scholarship.

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

Comprehensive exams revised
While we met our goal, we have revised our comprehensive exams (based on feedback from earlier years). The first students electing to use the revised comps format will do so summer 2009. It will be required of those entering fall 09. We plan to monitor the process and products associated with the revised comprehensive exams.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers

Implementation Description: Beginning summer 2009, continuing...
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Quality of dissertations
While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers

Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Quality of dissertations
While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Ethical researcher

Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Quality of dissertations
While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge

Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

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

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program advisory committee
**Summary of research skills form**
Continue to research and develop a checklist of communication and research skills to use in evaluating the presentation of the dissertation.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: 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):**
- Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers

**Responsible Person/Group:** Coordinator of PHD program

**UTA as coursework**
Now that the university teaching apprenticeship is a required course, the success rate is higher and the outcomes are more systematic. Continue to monitor.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Teaching apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge

**Responsible Person/Group:** Coordinator of PHD Program

**UTA assessment**
Our first student did not pass her University Teaching Apprenticeship. The good news is because it is now a course, we have ways to monitor and guide students who are not yet competent in university teaching. What we need is a systematic way to give feedback to students that is supportive, useful, and accurately matches requirements of the apprenticeship.

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

**Implementation Description:** Julie will take this issue to the PHD advisory committee. As they deliberate changes in the PHD program, this can be part of the discussion. Looking at what other universities do might be helpful.

**Change WEAVE Measures and Targets to become tiered rubrics**
We need to change the WEAVE program assessment measures and targets to comply with recommendations of the assessment committee. Faculty met on October 5, 2012 to begin constructing rubrics for each goal.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
**Responsible Person/Group:** ECEE PhD program faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**
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
The biggest change made to our program during the 2012-2013 was to design and utilize rubrics to evaluate student progress toward our learning targets. These rubrics were developed by faculty and aligned with program goals and specific program activities that provided authentic, performance-based assessments of student performance. Given the considerable diversity among ECE faculty expertise and backgrounds, the development of these common assessments was a considerable achievement during the year. These rubrics were developed in response to a concern that we were not using a standard criteria for evaluating student performance toward program goals. In addition to developing the rubrics, we piloted the rubrics with our existing PhD students by scoring their progress and achievement toward our four learning targets. During the 2013-2014 academic year, we will use these data to (a) revise and tighten the rubrics that are currently being used, (b) guide program decision making this year in order to better meet the academic needs of our students, and (c) develop additional key research opportunities for our students. These changes are articulated in our answer to Academic Program Question 2.

**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 gathered from the 2012-2013 academic year indicate that students met performance criteria on the following targets: Candidates are thoughtful writers and speakers, Candidates are ethical researchers, and Candidates are knowledgeable teachers. These findings indicate that we, as PhD program faculty, are assisting our students with obtaining the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in these key areas. One area of concern was evident in our evaluation of candidates using the rubrics this past academic year. This area of concern related to the indicator “candidates are active seekers of knowledge.” A specific examination of individual dimensions of the rubric demonstrates challenges with PhD students meeting criteria. For example, candidates had difficulty meeting criteria that were established with regard to writing and submitting grants, providing service to the profession, and submitting scholarly work to peer reviewed journals. In two out of three of these areas (submitting grants and providing service to the profession), faculty review of the establish criteria yielded discussions about the rubrics were too difficult for candidates to have adequate time during their course of study to meet criteria. In response to these concerns we will revise these two indicators to more adequately represent faculty expectations about achieving proficiency on these items. The new indicators will be piloted during the 2013-2014 academic year. Discussions around the other two indicators, “presenting research at conferences” and “submitting research for publication in peer reviewed journals”, yielded concrete plans to check in with and support students in more directive ways. For example, in response to student challenges with these two criteria, we have changed our annual review policy in order to provide more guidance and support to students. Annual review of PhD students will now be undertaken in the spring of the school year and as part of this process, faculty will complete the rubrics during these meetings as a way to progress monitor student achievement and challenges. This progress monitoring will assist students in better understanding where they are meeting and not meeting program requirements and will allow us as PhD faculty to tie concrete action plans to individual student performance in order to provide better support and guidance. Finally, to help support students in these two areas, we have secured additional funding from our department to assist candidates with conference presentations at national conferences.

---
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### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education with an elementary mathematics education concentration (the Program) is to:

1. Prepare PreK-5th grade teachers as specialists in mathematics by increasing understanding of mathematics at a deeper conceptual level, 2. Empower teacher-leaders in establishing learner-centered classrooms consistent with the standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and 3. Engage teachers in current research and methods for teaching mathematics in today's diverse PreK-5 classrooms.

### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge of Content and Curriculum**

Knowledge of Elementary Mathematics Content and Curriculum: Candidates are educators who understand and apply 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 are educators who 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 are educators who understand and use multiple, appropriate assessment methods to assess student learning and improve program effectiveness.

**G 4: Knowledge of Diversity**

Knowledge of Diversity: Candidates are educators who understand and use knowledge of student diversity to affirm and support full participation and continued study of mathematics by all students.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 5)**

Learning Objectives: The following objectives summarize the requirements of the Georgia Professional Standards Commission for the K-5 Mathematics Endorsement (see PSC 505-3-68). These objectives are consistent with the GSU PEF Conceptual Framework.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

SLO 2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 4, 5)
Demonstrates research-based pedagogical content knowledge (G2): Candidates use instructional strategies based on current research and applicable standards and use appropriate technology and a variety of physical and visual materials for exploration of mathematical concepts and procedures and development of children’s thinking, understanding, and problem solving across the strands of the elementary mathematics curriculum.

SLO 3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness (G: 3) (M: 2)
Assesses student learning and program effectiveness (G3): Candidates understand and use multiple, appropriate assessment methods to assess student learning and improve program effectiveness.

SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity (G: 4) (M: 2)
Demonstrates knowledge of student diversity (G4): Candidates demonstrate knowledge of student diversity (e.g., gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, language, special needs, etc.) and use this knowledge to affirm and support the learning of mathematics by all students.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection (O: 1)
The Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection Assessment is graded at the end of each of the four mathematics content/pedagogy courses in the program (ECE 7393, ECE 7394, ECE 7395, and ECE 7396). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: “Collection of Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks and Rationales: The NCTM Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics (1991) emphasizes the posing of learning activities it calls worthwhile mathematical tasks. These tasks are to be based on— Sound and significant mathematics; Knowledge of students’ understandings, interests, and experiences; Knowledge of the range of ways that diverse students learn mathematics; And these tasks are intended to— Engage students’ intellect Develop students’ mathematical understandings and skills; stimulate students to make connections and develop a coherent framework for mathematical ideas; Call for problem formulation, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning; Promote communication about mathematics; Represent mathematics as an ongoing human activity; Display sensitivity to, and draw on, students’ diverse background experiences and dispositions; Promote the development of all students’ dispositions to do mathematics. (p. 25) “In selecting, adapting, or generating mathematical tasks, teachers must base their decisions on three areas of concern: the mathematical content, the students, and the ways in which students learn mathematics” (pp. 25-26) Stein, Smith, Henningsen, and Silver (2000) encourage the analysis of mathematics instructional tasks for “the kind and level of thinking required of students in order to successfully engage with and solve the task” (p. 11). Their analysis of cognitive demands divides mathematics tasks into two general categories, each of which are divided further into two subcategories: Lower-Level Demands (including Memorization Tasks and Procedures Without Connections Tasks) and Higher-Level Demands (including Procedures With Connections Tasks and Doing Mathematics Tasks). “Since the tasks with which students become engaged in the classroom form the basis of their opportunities for learning mathematics, it is important to be clear about one’s goals for student learning. Once learning goals for students have been clearly articulated, tasks can be selected or created to match these goals. Being aware of the cognitive demands of tasks is a central consideration in this matching” (p. 11). The NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics (2000) elaborates on the role of problem solving in learning mathematics by specifying that— Instructional programs from prekindergarten through grade 12 should enable all students to— build new mathematical knowledge through 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) NCTM found few 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 complete the task. This assessment is graded using the Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Across four uses of this measure during 2012-2013, 100% of candidates scored Meets Expectations/High Quality or better for a mean rating of 4.95 out of 5 or a percentage equivalent of 99% compared to a target of 80%.

M 2: Student Interview Assessments (O: 3, 4)
The Student Interview Assessments are graded during three of the four mathematics content courses in the program (ECE 7393, ECE 7394, and ECE 7395). These assignments provide a model for student-centered teaching. Instructions to candidates for these assessments are as follows: Student Interview Assessments The Teaching Principle from the NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics indicates teachers’ must understand children’s thinking to make effective curricular and instructional decisions. Specifically— Effective teaching requires knowing and understanding mathematics, students as learners, and pedagogical strategies. Teachers need several different kinds of mathematical knowledge—knowledge about the whole domain; deep, flexible knowledge about 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) a. Prepare a script of 11 potential problem types for a CGI interview based on 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 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 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., JRU, 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 multiplication and division, 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 from your script that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing the student’s understanding of multiplication and division. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research.

Interview #3: Base-Ten Understanding (Third Grade) a. Prepare a script of 10-12 potential word problems to pose to a child in Third Grade with the purpose of determining what the child understands about base ten concepts. Most of the problems for this interview should be grouping and partitioning problems that use groups of ten and addition problems (both the concept and the symbol) and explore the extent of children’s thinking. 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, describes the child’s response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s response on the basis of the CGI frameworks related to solution strategies and understanding of base ten concepts. 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 base ten concepts, the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, and the types of strategies they demonstrated, 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. 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, describes the children’s responses as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s understanding of equality. At the conclusion of the report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children’s understanding of equality. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student’s understanding of equality. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children’s understanding of equality. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of equality. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Prepare 10 problems including open number sentences (e.g., 37 + 56 = 39 + 54 True or False?). See Thinking Mathematically, pp. 41-43 for examples. Carefully and deliberately choose numbers and your problem sequence to elicit children’s relational thinking and explore the extent of children’s thinking. b. Interview a small group of children (or an individual child) with the purpose of coming to know each child’s relational thinking. Provide appropriate materials for the children to use in solving the problems. Record in as much detail as possible what the children do and say in trying to solve the problems. On the basis of the children’s responses, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the
children's relational thinking while continuing to encourage and support the children's success with the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problems you posed, describes the children's responses as completely as possible, and analyzes each child's relational thinking. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children's relational thinking. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's relational thinking. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's relational thinking. For this assignment, interview #6: Children's Understanding of Geometry or Measurement. a. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of key concepts of geometry or measurement through solving nonroutine problems. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be nonroutine, engaging, and challenging, yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child to assess what that child understands about geometry or measurement as well as the child's ability to use that understanding in nonroutine problem solving consistent with grade-level expectations. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use. On the basis of the child's strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the child's strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child's success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problem you posed, describes the child's response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child's response on the basis of your understanding of the concepts and skills needed to successfully solve the problem. Repeat this process (problem as posed, child's response, and 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 geometry or measurement and how the child used this understanding to solve problems. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing this student's understanding of geometry or measurement. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's learning of geometry or measurement. These assessments are graded using the Student Interview Assessment 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Across six uses of this measure during 2012 – 2013, 100% of candidates scores Meets Expectations/High Quality or better, with a mean rating of 4.87 out of 5 or 97% compared to the target of 80%.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity**

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Across six uses of this measure during 2012 – 2013, 100% of candidates scores Meets Expectations/High Quality or better, with a mean rating of 4.87 out of 5 or 97% compared to the target of 80%.

**M 3: Data Project and Presentation Assessment (O: 1)**

The Data Project and Presentation Assessment is graded during the data analysis and probability content/pedagogy course in the program (ECE 7396). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: Data Project and Presentation 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 intended? Were the measurements accurate enough to be reliable? Does the way the data are represented in a graph or table give a view of the data that helps answer the original question? (Russell, Schifter, & Bastable, 2002, p. 122) Assignment Instructions: 1. Prepare a written Data Project Report that documents the following activities: a. Form a worthwhile, interesting, researchable question that involves a familiar context, involves numerical data that can be consistently interpreted, anticipates the range of possible responses, compares data from at least two groups, and is likely to get the information required to accomplish the purpose of the study. b. Gather applicable data, differentiating between the real-world event and the abstracted data documenting some aspects of that event. c. Create and interpret data displays that support the purpose of the study and communicate a useful picture of the range and distribution of the data to the intended audience. Appropriately treat values of zero and zero frequencies in these displays. Use available technology (e.g., Excel) in preparing these data displays. d. Analyze, summarize, and interpret the data, recognizing emergent features of the aggregated data (such as center, spread, and 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 midrange, majority, mode, median, and mean; and interpret the data by comparing group results using averages or other representative values. e. Relate the interpretations of the data back to the real situation by making statements and claims about the real-world situation rather than just the representations of the data. 2. Prepare and present (a) a poster presentation and (b) a PowerPoint presentation to convey your question, methods, and findings to your peers. This assessment is graded using the Data Project and Presentation Grading Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum**

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All of the 9 candidates enrolled in ECE 7396 during 2012 – 2013 scored Meets Expectations/High Quality (80%) or better on this key assessment. The mean overall rubric score was 4.89 out of 5, which is an equivalent percentage of 98% compared with the target of 80%.

**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 be taught in a grade band (K-2 or 3-5) that is different from your regular classroom assignment. A minimum of 2 of the 10 lesson plans included in the portfolio must provide evidence of working with diverse students as demonstrated by submitting demographics of the classes taught with the lesson plans. The use of electronic-recording media for the purpose of lesson analysis is not considered technology incorporation into mathematics instruction. This portfolio is graded using the Professional Portfolio Project Rubric.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleven Advanced Program students (85%) enrolled in ECE 7740 during 2012 – 2013 completed the course with a portfolio rating of Satisfactory/Meets Expectations. Two candidates have not yet completed the course pending satisfactory completion of the portfolio. These candidates are required to complete all outstanding assignments in order to complete the portfolio and meet program requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The aggregate GPA for the four elementary mathematics content courses during 2012 – 2013 was 3.89 (A). All candidates who completed the courses achieved a GPA for those courses of 3.00 (target) or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Increase Pedagogical Emphasis and Tools**

The qualitative data from program key assessments has indicated a need for greater emphasis and support for implementing standards-based pedagogy. We have introduced a standards-based lesson plan format for use in each of the math content/pedagogy courses that supports teachers’ attention to important elements of standards-based pedagogy. This increased emphasis will be continued through the current cycle of four math content/pedagogy courses that concludes in May 2012. Results from key assessments for 2011-2012 will be analyzed for improvement in attention to these pedagogical details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Program Co-Coordinators (Dr. Smith and Dr. Swars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Framework and Lesson Plan Outline to Guide Planning for Focus on Student-Centered Pedagogy**

During Fall 2012, students were introduced during ECE 7395 (Minimester II) to two forms for their use during lesson planning in an effort to improve the attention to student-centered pedagogy. These two forms were (1) a lesson plan outline based on the NCTM Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics and (2) framework(s) for anticipating specific student strategies for solving the story problems included in planned lessons. In addition, students were able to view additional video examples of student-centered pedagogy and a checklist for implementing student-centered instruction. In further efforts to improve attention to student-centered pedagogy, these same additional experiences and tools will be provided at the beginning of the four-course sequence during Fall
**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 made to the assessment process for the Early Childhood Mathematics Education MED program since last year’s assessment report. Beginning Fall 2013, the M.Ed. Program in ECE will be revised to allow students to earn both a Master's degree and pursue an endorsement in a specialized content area at the elementary level. The K-5 mathematics option will continue as a content concentration choice under the revised program. Two new areas of content concentration in reading and K-5 science will be added to the program. Key assessments will be revised to align with the early childhood core courses (ECE 7400: Curriculum in Early Childhood Education, ECE 7740: Internship in ECE and ECE 7800: Capstone) to assess professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions and provide evidence of K-5 student learning.

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

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: During Fall 2012, candidates were introduced during ECE 7395 (Minimester II) to two forms for their use during lesson planning in an effort to improve the attention to student-centered pedagogy. These two forms were (1) a lesson plan outline based on the NCTM Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics and (2) framework(s) for anticipating specific student strategies for solving the story problems included in planned lessons. As evidenced by the findings from the ratings on the professional portfolios, candidates improved their attention to student-centered pedagogy through the use of the lesson plan outline. Anecdotal feedback from students indicated that the anticipatory framework(s) were also helpful in focusing pedagogy on the thinking of individual children. In further efforts to improve attention to student-centered pedagogy, these same additional experiences and tools will be provided at the beginning of the four-course sequence during Fall 2013 in the context of ECE 7393 (Minimester I). 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. During Fall 2012, additional tools were implemented where candidates were able to view video examples of K-5 student-centered pedagogy and a checklist for implementing student-centered instruction was used. Observations during ECE 7740 in Spring 2013 showed that candidates were able to implement the pedagogical elements of the implementation checklist and document evidence of student learning. Beginning Fall 2013, the M.Ed. Program in ECE will be revised to allow students to earn both a Master's degree and pursue an endorsement in a specialized content area at the elementary level. The K-5 mathematics option will continue as a content concentration choice under the revised program. Two new areas of content concentration in reading and K-5 science will be added to the program. Key assessments will be revised to align with the early childhood core courses (ECE 7400: Curriculum in Early Childhood Education, ECE 7740: Internship in ECE and ECE 7800: Capstone) to assess professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions and provide evidence of K-5 student learning.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Economics Assessment of Core**

(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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: 3)**
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: 4)**

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).

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 3: Multiple Choice Questions on Exams (O: 1)**

Five multiple choice questions which can be used to assess the 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 more recent assessment cycles, we attempted 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). Some of the questions were changed from previous cycles to this cycle. See the attached files for the actual questions used in each course.

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

**Target for O1: social science (area E) goal - econ**

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

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 4: 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: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: BOR II: global perspectives goal - econ**

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. (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 to be at least 75%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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.
unta's mission is to become one of the nation’s premier 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) (M: 1)
To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.
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 documents 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Note to review committee: See the file in the link provided for the actual questions and results. While the percentage correct of a few questions is below the target and some are above the target, the average across all questions is just below the target for SLO1.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Note to review committee: See the file in the link provided for the actual questions and results. While the percentage correct of a few questions is below the target and some are above the target, the average across all questions is just below the target for SLO2.

**Target for O3: Benefits and costs**

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Note to review committee: See the file in the link provided for the actual questions and results. While the percentage correct of a few questions is below the target and some are above the target, the average across all questions is just below the target for
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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

We are in the process of redesigning the Capstone course; this project may not continue in the future. We did not assess it this cycle.

M 3: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 (O: 1)

The individual book review will require the student to explore topics in economics that he or she is interested in and choose a book to read and thoroughly review. The review should be done in 5-6 pages (using one-inch margins, Times New Roman 12 font). The instructor must approve of the book first, two weeks before the first test is scheduled. In addition, an outline for the book review will be due one week before the first test. The individual book review will count for 15% of the course grade. See the attached rubric for the book review.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories**

The book review was broken down into different skills and students were assessed separately on each one. See the attached rubric (in the measures section) for more details. We hope to see the majority of students earn a rating of 2 or more, and many of them should earn an even higher rating on the "economics concepts" measure.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided. The book report is also a CTW assignment (in the ECON 4999 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 3 or higher on the first draft, and a score of 3 or higher on the second draft and final paper. In fact, 90% 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 changed the tracking exam questions for the first 2 learning outcomes in the 2012-2013 cycle. We selected some questions from the tracking exams to assess learning outcome #3 in the 2012-2013 cycle (we did not assess learning outcome #3 in previous cycles). We are still thinking about the best way to assess that learning outcome. We also did not use the tracking exam to assess learning outcome #4; we used the group project in ECON 4999 for that instead.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Benefits and costs

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** undergraduate programs committee in consultation with ECON 4999 instructors

**change questions for the tracking exam**

Upon inspection of the findings from last year, the Department of Economics’ Undergraduate Program Committee decided to change the tracking exam questions to better reflect the learning outcomes we are seeking to measure. We are still considering changes to the assessment questions.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields  
| Benefits and costs | 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:** 05/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** economics undergraduate programs committee in consultation with ECON 4999 instructors
Mission / Purpose
The Master of Arts in Economics program is designed to train students for careers in local, state, and federal government and in the private sector. The program emphasizes basic analytical skills, micro- and macro-economic theory, and mathematical statistics, at a level necessary for contributing to and assessing policy research. Microeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8100. Macroeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8110. Statistical skills are taught in Economics 8740 and 8840. Students’ mastery of these skills is assessed with midterm and final examinations in the respective courses. The program also emphasizes advanced understanding of selected topics. Students must take seven additional economics courses, chosen in consultation with their advisors. They must demonstrate mastery of this course material through midterm exams, final exams, and research papers. A final high-quality research paper chosen by the student must demonstrate that the student has the ability to examine an economic problem at a level consistent with advanced graduate course work.

Goals
G 1: Theoretical and applied background.
To equip the MA program graduates with wide-ranging and in-depth knowledge of theoretical and applied economics. Graduates should be able to perform applied economic analysis based on sound theory and data analysis.

G 2: Professional success and continued education.
To facilitate the continued academic and professional development of the MA program graduates. Graduates should possess the necessary theoretical and analytic background to perform successfully in the job market and to be able to pursue further graduate level education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Analytical Skills. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Applying Economic Models. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 3)
To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

O/O 2: Economic Disciplines. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

O/O 4: Economic Data. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Core exams. (O: 2, 3)
All graduating Master of Arts in Economics students will be assessed on their basic learning of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics (e.g., Master of Arts in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The assessment will be based on the performances of their final examinations in macroeconomics, microeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In 2012-2013, the second cohort of our MA econ Indonesian program took the core courses. Hence, like last year the enrollment on these courses was larger than usual with 45 students taking the macro course and 28 students taking the micro course in the Fall of 2012. In microeconomics, the average across all categories was about 4.0 out of 5.0, which is similar to last year’s. In econometrics, there were improvements in the areas of Definitions, Communication and Creativity, with slight decreases in Analytics and Application. In macroeconomics, two categories that had been targeted were Math and Analytics. There was an improvement in Analytics, while Math declined slightly but was still higher than the score two years ago when
these areas had been marked for improvement. Overall, there are no major changes in performance in this category and goals are being met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Analytical Skills.</strong></th>
<th>Target not set in this cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** | In 2012-2013, the second cohort of our MA econ Indonesian program took the core courses. Hence, like last year the enrollment on these courses was larger than usual with 45 students taking the macro course and 28 students taking the micro course in the Fall of 2012. The average across all categories was about 4.0 out of 5.0, which is similar to last year’s. In econometrics, there were improvements in the areas of Definitions, Communication and Creativity, with slight decreases in Analytics and Application. In macroeconomics, two categories that had been targeted were Math and Analytics. There was an improvement in Analytics, while Math declined slightly but was still higher than the score two years ago when these areas had been marked for improvement. Overall, there are no major changes in performance in this category and goals are being met. |

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.</strong></th>
<th>Target not set in this cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** | Thirty 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 grade for these sections was 3.7, which was similar to last year’s score. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.</strong></th>
<th>Target not set in this cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** | This category was measured by Comprehension of the Literature. The average grade was 3.6 which was below the grade of the last 2 years. We will try emphasize the importance of this section this coming year. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Analytical Skills.</strong></th>
<th>Target not set in this cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** | This category was measured by the Theoretical Skills and Overall Contribution rankings. The average score in Overall Contribution was 3.6 which meets targets. The average score in Theoretical Skills was 3.4 which was somewhat below last year’s score, though similar to the score two years ago. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Economic Data.</strong></th>
<th>Target not set in this cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** | This category was evaluated by Data Collection, Measurement and Computation. The average score was 4.03, which meets targets. |

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.</strong></th>
<th>Target not set in this cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** | This year we received 4 responses to the alumni survey. The responses were generally favorable. In response to, "The program improved my ability to carry out research projects," three students agreed and one strongly agreed. Graduates have felt that the program adequately improved their research skills for a few years now. In addition, when asked if alumni would recommend our program to their peers, the average score was 4.3 out of 5. This is an indicator of an overall positive experience in the program. On the question if faculty were available and accessible to students, all respondents strongly agreed. On the other hand, alumni felt that we could improve in two particular areas. First, offer more guidance in terms of courses that would more directly prepare students for PhD studies. Second, guidance for students that want to take more quantitative courses. |


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

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

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 the 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 are planning a significant change in the design of the MA Econ-policy track program with the intention of focusing it much more to giving the students more tools and experience in applied economic policy. We will also provide more guidance on course choice for those interested in particular tracks like quantitative methods or pursuing a PhD. We also plan to continue encouraging student participation in the various activities our Career Services office put together (job fairs, resume workshops, etc).

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Economics PhD**

(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Ph.D. in Economics program seeks to develop a high level of competence in conducting basic and applied policy research. The doctoral program requires that students 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.

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' knowledge of the theory of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics is adequate for carrying independent research. Such necessary skills are taught in: Economics 9010, 9030 and 8500 for microeconomics; Economics 9020, 9040 and 8500 for macroeconomics; and Economics 8030, 9710, 9720 and 9730 for econometrics. Students' level of knowledge is assessed in midterm and final exams in these courses. Acquired skills for microeconomics and macroeconomics are also assessed in comprehensive exams, usually taken after the first year. Additional specialized knowledge is required in one field of the student's choosing. Currently, the program offers training in four fields: Environmental and Urban Economics, Experimental Economics, Labor Economics, and Public Economics; a fifth field, Health Economics, was added to the program last year. Three courses are required to be taken from the chosen field. Students' skills are assessed through midterm exams, final exams, and research papers in these courses. In addition to the three field courses, students have to pass a field comprehensive exam, usually taken after the second year. A secondary field is optional; the requirement includes taking at least two courses from the chosen secondary field.

The doctoral program in economics also requires that students demonstrate proficiency in the techniques of teaching and research. This is accomplished 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, students gain expertise in presenting and conducting their own research, individually or in collaboration with faculty. 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 competence on applications of the main models, and the latest advances in at least one field of study in economics.

**G 2: Research**
To develop a high level of proficiency in conducting independent and original research.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### SLO 1: Analytical Skills (G: 1)
To achieve a deep understanding of the use of analytical tools and expertise in applications of a variety of models of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

### SLO 2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods (G: 1) (M: 3)
To achieve a high level of knowledge in applying the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics.

### SLO 3: Field Specialization (G: 1) (M: 2, 3)
To demonstrate extensive and accurate knowledge of the issues, models, and latest advances in at least one of the field studies 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 must take a Field Examination after completing the required courses for their chosen field of specialization. Typically, a comprehensive field exam is taken after the second year in the program.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Field Specialization</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The Public Finance field exam was given to 2 students; one student failed the exam in the first attempt (but passed the exam in Spring 2013). Two students, one in summer 2012 and the other in spring 2013, took the Experimental Economics Field Exam and they both passed. The most popular field exams during 2012-2013 seem to be the Environmental/Urban and Labor Economics: The Environmental/Urban exam was given to six students in Spring 2013 with four students passing the exam; whereas the Labor Economics field exam was given to five students, with four students passing the exam in the first attempt and one student passing the exam in the second attempt (in Spring 2013).

#### M 3: Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4)

After completion of the program’s coursework, students write a Dissertation. The dissertation is written with close supervision of a faculty dissertation chair and a dissertation committee. The Dissertation is evaluated on several criteria, such as overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2012-2013. The average scores in each category are comparable to those of previous years. The overall average score is 4.4 (out of 5), which is an indicator of a high performance. The dissertation committee judged that in several cases work would deserve publication in the top journals, such as Social Choice and Welfare and Journal of Public Economics. During the last academic year (summer 2011- spring 2012) there were eight Ph.D. dissertations defended and the average score was also 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Field Specialization</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2012-2013. The average scores in each category are comparable to those of previous years. The overall average score is 4.4 (out of 5), which is an indicator of a high performance. The dissertation committee judged that in several cases work would deserve publication in the top journals, such as Social Choice and Welfare and Journal of Public Economics. During the last academic year (summer 2011- spring 2012) there were eight Ph.D. dissertations defended and the average score was also 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2012-2013. The average scores in each category are comparable to those of previous years. The overall average score is 4.4 (out of 5), which is an indicator of a high performance. The dissertation committee judged that in several cases work would deserve publication in the top journals, such as Social Choice and Welfare and Journal of Public Economics. During the last academic year (summer 2011- spring 2012) there were eight Ph.D. dissertations defended and the average score was also 4.4.

### M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 4)
Graduates of the Ph.D. program are invited to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
contributed to the performance in their current jobs. This survey includes questions about whether the dissertation (or parts of the dissertation) has been submitted for publication or has already been published. This survey is given at one year and three years after graduation.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research**

NA

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Introducing online surveys (first time this year), increased the number of alumni responding to the survey to a high thirteen. Overall the alumni gave good scores to the program. The program's evaluation of the level of analytical skills acquired by our graduates during the years in the program received the highest score of 4.15; the lowest score (3.46) was given to the program's value with respect to improving oral communication of ideas and preparation of students for an academic career. Almost half (six out of thirteen) of the alumni who responded to the survey would highly recommend the program to their peers (their scores were 5 out of 5); around 2/3 of the respondents gave a score of 4 or 5 to this question. These alumni are performing quite successfully. They have published a total of 58 papers in peer-reviewed journals and 43 book chapters; they also are frequently attending a wide-range of conferences and professional meetings; they have presented their work in 73 conferences during the last four years (2008-2012). Among the skills our alumni value more are: (i) analytical skills, (ii) econometric modeling and (iii) teaching training. This group of alumni suggest that further work should be considered in allocating more time and resources in: (i) teaching applied econometrics, (ii) project management, (iii) journal article writing and (iv) preparation of students for consulting positions. Other specific suggestions include: (i) getting students involve in research as early as the first year, (ii) having faculty more involved in working with graduate students and (iii) inviting alumni to present their work.

**M 5: Senior Ph.D. Student Survey (O: 4)**

Ph.D. students in their 4th and 5th year in the program are asked to complete a questionnaire that evaluates the program. The survey includes questions about the students' current research output (including published and submitted research papers and presentations at research conferences) as well as their feedback on the program and suggestions for improvements.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research**

NA

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Ten Ph.D. students participated in the online survey this year. Overall they say that they value the program highly; the average score was above 4.3 in all questions about the perceived performance of the program with one exception, the average score on the “ability to communicate ideas orally” is 3.89. Our students would recommend the program to their peers (4.44 out of 5). They highly value what our program offers on improving their ability in applying analytical skills (4.67), conducting independent research (4.56), and opportunities for collaborating with professionals (4.56). The perceived value of the program on expanding their job opportunities earned a score of 4.33. The total number of papers, book chapters and policy reports already published by the respondents is 18; another five papers are submitted for publication and 27 working papers are already written. These 10 senior graduate students have presented their work in 22 conferences during the last four years. Eight of them have teaching experience. The survey feedback and suggestions are similar to the ones provided by alumni. Students are asking for more applied econometrics training, more teaching opportunities and more collaborative research with faculty. Particular courses, such as metrics, causal inference, and applied microeconomics as well as mock interviews are valued as being very useful.

**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; 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 activates. The purpose is to identify determinants of what students' characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: 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
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 inferences from experimental and non-experimental (observational) data. It comprises readings, class participation, practice problems, a manuscript review and a term paper and presentation.

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

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

More active supervision of students.

We are going to pay special attention to students’ awareness of the deadlines, the graduation process and enforcements of the rules. We are in process of developing and implementing an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Improvement of the recruiting procedures.

We are planning on a more active recruiting through the utilization of gradschoolmatch.com and by coordinating with other graduate programs.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Revising requirements for dissertation proposal defense

Currently, for each dissertation proposal defense we require three readers in addition to the committee members. We are revisiting this requirement, as we feel relaxing it will not affect the quality of the decision of a dissertation committee on the readiness of the written proposal for a final defense. On the contrary, we expect that freeing up faculty from serving as readers will allow them to allocate more time on supervising graduate students for whom they serve as committee members. Last, our department is the only one in AYSPS that has this requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Revisiting the role of Comprehensive Field Exams.

We are discussing possible changes on the role of comprehensive exams as a selection criterion for student continuation in the program. We are considering adapting a hybrid model that other universities have already started implementing: Introduce a GPA threshold in each field and waive the comprehensive field exam for those students whose course grades in the field are above the threshold. We expect this to provide better incentives for studying in the first year and help advanced students with starting research work earlier.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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 is an important tool to gather information from the variety of sources and evaluate our progress with the PhD program. The improvements since last year also show that changes to the program produce changes in outcomes. 1. This summer we introduced an online implementation of alumni and current senior graduate students. One part of the survey inquires about publications, research in progress, policy reports, participated at conferences, teaching experience, and other measurable outcomes. The information is used for assessing the research and teaching outcomes of students and alumni. The second part survey is anonymous and consists of questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The objective is to have timely and comprehensive information about the program. This information is used to make adjustments to the curriculum, administration, and other aspects of the program. 2. We are still working on creating a database with students' individual characteristics, their academic performance during the years in the program, placements in the job market and their subsequent research activities. The purpose is to identify what students' characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program, which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

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.

Important changes to the Ph.D. program that the department implemented last year are: 1. We added a new field in the program: Health Economics. The health economics field was added to our program due to the high demand for this field from our previous and current students. Many of our former students would enroll in these courses at Emory University and we as a department felt we should be offering these courses for our students to improve their graduate education at Georgia State University. The field was also created to leverage the faculty resources that existed within our department as well as those recently obtained under our 2CI hiring in the health field. 2. We also added two new courses: (1) Casual Inference and (2) Data Management. Both courses have been valued highly by our students. The causal inference course was added to our course offerings to provide a rigorous policy oriented course that teaches our students the required empirical skills to conduct program evaluation research. This course was first experimental tested within the department and is in high demand among our graduate students. This course has also been added to a number of our fields as a course that can be used to satisfy field requirements. The data management course was created to teach our students the skills required to work with large data sets in conducting their research. This course serves to not only teach students data management, but to accelerate their involvement in independent and joint research with our faculty. The later being an issue that our previous graduate students cited as a weakness in our program. Hopefully, this course with help to rectify this deficiency in our graduate program. 3. We continue to mandate that all students defend their dissertation proposals within one year of successfully passing the field exam, or they lose funding. This makes students start the dissertation earlier and helps them finishing on time. 4. With respect to job market preparation we continue to: (i) offer a CV writing course for Ph.D. students; (ii) run consulting sessions during which faculty give advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications; (iii) require all graduating students to present job market papers in the brown bag seminar during the fall semester and (iv) encourage students to use the University career services for additional experience for job talks. This has helped improving job market outcomes, as above reported. 5. To maintain high standards in core classes, instructors of the core classes continue to pay special attention in their teaching towards not only providing students with advanced analytical skills and theoretical modeling but also covering applied relevance of the theory. 6. All 3rd year students now rotate through the tutoring lab. This is proved to help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which increases their value on the job market. The program is well established, and students show strong performance. Therefore, radical changes are not needed. Yet, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. From an administrative point of view, it is important to have an established plan for carrying out all the tasks involved in running the program. This allows us to add new components to enrich the experience of students and to streamline even further the logistics of the program. 1. The findings suggest that we need to maintain high requirements in terms of the quantitative component of the program. 2. We also need to maintain high standards in core microeconomics and macroeconomics classes. Acquired analytical skills and the diverse content of the program produce visible and important results for current students and alumni. Some proposed and planned changes for the coming year include: 1. Improvement of the recruiting procedures. We are planning on a more active recruiting through the utilization of gradschoolmatch.com and by coordinating with other graduate programs; 2. More active supervision of students. We are going to pay special attention to students' awareness of the deadlines, the graduation process and enforcements of the rules. We are in process of developing and implementing an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students. 3. Revising requirements for dissertation proposal defense. Currently, for each dissertation proposal defense we require three readers in addition to the committee members. We are revisiting this requirement, as we feel relaxing it will not affect the quality of the decision of a dissertation committee on the readiness of the written proposal for a final defense. On the contrary, we expect that freeing up faculty from serving as readers will allow them to allocate more time on supervising graduate students for whom they serve as committee members. Last, our department is the only one in AYPS that has this requirement. 4. Revisiting the role of Comprehensive Field Exams. We are discussing possible changes on the role of comprehensive exams as a selection criterion for student continuation in the program. We are considering adapting a hybrid model that other universities have already started implementing: Introduce a GPA threshold in each field and wave the comprehensive field exam for those students whose course grades in the field are above the threshold. We expect this to provide better incentives for studying in the first year and help advanced students with starting research work earlier.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD

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.

**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 Educational 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
In 2012-2013 we had a total of 32 doctoral students and all students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Additionally, 52 manuscripts were submitted by 16 students (with students being the senior author on 15 of these); 19 articles were published by 10 students (with students being the senior author on 7 articles); 3 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 3 students, and 2 grants were prepared with the assistance of 2 students.

**M 2: Evidence of teaching college courses (O: 2)**
Evidence of teaching college courses as teaching assistant and/or instructor, number of guest lectureres, number of students who supervised practica, as compiled from the teaching activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

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

**Target for O2: Students will teach at the university level**
By candidacy, 100% of the students will have completed their requirement of assisting or teaching a university course.
In 2012-2013, all students who had reached candidacy had assisted or taught at least one university course. For the this year, 18 students assisted in teaching 46 courses; 13 students taught 29 courses as GTAs; 13 students gave guest lectures; and 12 students supervised 107 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.

In 2012-2013, all students who had reached candidacy had made at least one conference or workshop presentation. 18 students made 38 national conference presentations; 15 students made 23 state conference presentations; 11 students made 20 workshop presentations; and 5 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.

In 2012-2013, there were a total of 32 doctoral students, including 2 who had graduated. All 32 students demonstrated expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical finding in special education. 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)

### 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 2013-2014 academic year and continue their discussions of student data and process in PMA meetings.

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

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

- **Measure:** Successful rating on annual evaluation
- **Outcome/Objective:** The student will meet course/program requirements

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**Responsible Person/Group:** PMA committee
**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: Using Literature to Guide Action
1. Graduates of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership will be educational leaders who use literature to inform their work in schools and systems.

G 2: Linking Research and Practice
1. Graduates of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership will be educational leaders who contribute significantly to the field of educational leadership through linking educational research and effective practice.

G 3: Using Values to Guide Practice
1. Graduates of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership will be educational leaders who 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: Literature Review (G: 1)
Graduates of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership will be able to critique and synthesize existing research literature and use it to support action.

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).

SLO 2: Dissertation Study (G: 2)
Graduates of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership program will be able to write and defend a dissertation study that meets the standards set by the Educational Leadership unit.

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).

SLO 3: Dispositions (G: 3)
Graduates of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership will be able to use appropriate dispositions to guide their practice.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M 1: Dispositions Assessment
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 3: The Literature Review Project
The Literature Review Project *This assignment is given in the third semester of the program as a part of EPEL 8930. For this assignment, students will write a comprehensive literature review aimed at providing foundational knowledge on the problem selected
M 5: The Dissertation

Dissertation

The dissertation and defense are the culminating activities in the students' doctoral program, demonstrating high levels of scholarly and intellectual activity. The dissertation is an original contribution to knowledge in the field of study through disciplined inquiry. Conducting, writing, and defending the dissertation are done in accordance with the highest professional standards. Enrollment for a minimum of three semester hours of credit is required during at least two out of each three-term period following successful completion of the comprehensive examination until graduation. These hours of credit must include a minimum of nine semester hours of dissertation (9990) credit but may also include other coursework. Doctoral students must be enrolled in and successfully complete three semester hours of graduate credit (typically dissertation hours) the term all degree requirements are completed. The students must be enrolled in at least three semester hours of coursework during the academic term in which they defend the dissertation. All doctoral dissertations must comply with the format, style, and procedural instructions established by the College of Education. The guide should be consulted soon after the students complete their comprehensive examination successful completion of the comprehensive examination examination requirements. Departmental and Research Committee REQUIREMENTS which is currently one of the approved formats in the Georgia State University College of Education. Use of this format results in a comprehensive literature review manuscript and a focused research manuscript. The literature review is a broadly conceived comprehensive review that is not limited by the typically more narrowly defined inquiry of the research manuscript. Some of the topics covered in the literature review manuscript will be referred to in the research manuscript to provide background for the original inquiry presented in the research manuscript. The research manuscript Table of Contents provided in Part I of the following document provides guidance regarding content of the review. http://education.gsu.edu/oaa/docs/PHD_Dissertation_Guide_2007.pdf The research manuscript is a research article written in a format appropriate for submission to a scholarly journal. This manuscript represents an original contribution by advancing 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 conducting the research may be included in appendixes (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 expectations of the field as represented by article 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 identifies the research questions. 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 and the last 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 will 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 deadlines if committee members are involved in revising the revisions. Revisions must be completed and approved 2 to 4 weeks before 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 reaching committee concensus. The dissertation will be evaluated using a rubric because the program is in its first year of existence, there are not data to report at this time.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

APA Style Assistance

For students in the next cohort, an APA overview will be given at the beginning of the program. Additionally, students will be given the newly created APA resources and contact information for the writing lab early in the program rather than once a need has been identified.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Implementation Status: Planned

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Course Scope and Sequence
Because the first year of the program took place during this reporting period, the program's scope and sequence has just begun. However, after Cohort 1 finished the first year, it became clear that the sequence of the research courses needed to be realigned in order to better meet the needs of the students. Cohort 1 took Educational Evaluation prior to taking Quant. 1 or Qual. 1. The students and the instructor overwhelmingly indicated that a stronger degree of background knowledge was needed prior to taking the course. Therefore, for Cohort 2, the sequence was rearranged in an effort to provide the needed knowledge base. The leadership unit will continue to monitor the sequence of the courses in an effort to better meet the needs of students in the program.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
One major achievement of the program was that the course sequence was rearranged for Cohort 2 based on feedback from Cohort 1 and the program instructors. By implementing this feedback, Cohort 2 is already better prepared to matriculate through the research portion of their coursework.

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 answer to this question is currently unclear as the program is still only in the first 18 months of existence.

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 area of need for the program is the need for solid examples of the two chapter dissertation format in the area of educational leadership. Because the program is new and because the only department that currently uses the format is Educational Psychology and Special Education, the models that do exist are not as helpful as we might hope. As the program continues, we will be able to build a cadre of strong examples to share with students, but at this point, we do not have them.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
The biggest area of impact has been that the Ed.D. program has caused our departmental faculty to collaborate around building committees to support our students. This has been a marked change from previous years where the formulation of committees was basically handled by individual students and their advisors. For this group, we have worked collaboratively to review student presentations and build committees in a way that is both inclusive of faculty across all three departmental disciplines and is supportive of every candidate. Because the program is new, there have not been other changes to report 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?
Because the program is new, we have not yet matriculated through the entire assessment process, and therefore, we have not made changes to it.

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 indicated previously, based on student and instructor feedback, the program's sequence was revised for Cohort 2. As far as additional changes go, we have not made any substantive changes at this point based on the assessment data. We do, however, anticipate continuing to review outcomes as students matriculate through the program.
**Goals**

**G 1: Linking Content to Practice**
Graduates of the program will be educational leaders who demonstrate an understanding of program content through site-based experiences.

**G 2: Using Data for Improvement**
Graduates of the program will be educational leaders who demonstrate an understanding of how to use data as a basis for school improvement.

**G 3: Serving as Change Leaders**
Graduates of the program will be educational leaders who serve as change agents and make appropriate decisions based on the needs of school and system stakeholders.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 2: GACE**
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 2012-2013 year. 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**

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 promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 2.2 Students will analyze the SIP procedures to 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 a framework for student learning.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**M 4: Equity audit**

Students will initiate and facilitate an equity audit using key stakeholders with their school or districts in order to determine the school's or district's status regarding diversity (i.e. whether the school or district is a monolithic, diverse, or multicultural organization). Students will help school and/or district stakeholders identify diversity issues related to school policies, curriculum, instruction, culture, management, and operations, personnel, and parent involvement and then apply those issues toward the audit (EPEL 8020). EQUITY AUDIT RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations: Student presents a thorough, holistic report of multiple diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving significant stakeholders. Student is able to help stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization. Meets Expectations: Student submits an acceptable report of multiple diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving significant stakeholders. Student achieves moderate success in helping stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization. Needs Improvement: Student submits a report that omits significant diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving a subset of significant stakeholders. Student achieves little success in helping stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization.

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

**M 5: Portfolio Assessment**

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 provide the framework for an effective instructional program and a framework for student learning.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**M 6: Dispositions Assessment**

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. 3) The Dispositions Assessment results show that the majority of students received high ratings in 2011 with 2 of 12 students rating marginal and no students with an unacceptable rating. In the 2010 results all students (100%) were highly rated. 4) The Dispositions Assessment specifically examines the five dispositions of effective educational professionals as documented in the attached rubric and is aligned with Goal 5 which addresses the integrity, fairness, and ethical behavior of administrators, staff, teachers, and students.

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

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

**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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2011-2012</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>We are currently aligning the current assignments to the standards. Next steps will be to look at all of the assignments to determine overlap and modify accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Educational Leadership Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</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?

There were three major accomplishments related to the Ed.S. program during the 2012-2013 reporting year. First, the course sequence was thoroughly examined, restructured, and rolled out. This restructuring was due to the unit wanting to better deliver content to students in a more performance-based manner with more authentic experiences throughout. The restructuring also provided the opportunity to have one coach follow students throughout their time in the program, providing more comprehensive feedback. The second major accomplishment was that the program began the process of going through a Quality Measures program review. This review, developed by the Wallace Foundation and carried out in conjunction with a K-12 partnering institution, reviews elements of the program related to course content and pedagogy, clinical practice, selection, recruitment and retention; and graduate outcomes. By participating in this review, the unit was able to determine what areas of the program were strong, what areas needed to be addressed, and what areas could serve as models for other programs. Finally, the program completed the portfolio realignment related to the new Leader Keys Assessment system. While the program still utilizes the national standards as one fundamental building block, by using the state system, the program is more closely tied to the leaders' work in the field.

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?

This is not an area that we have assessed during this reporting period.

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 area that still needs development is the assessment of the new program sequence. While the effectiveness of the sequence will become evident as students progress through the program, it is not evident at this time. The biggest area of implementation that was problematic was discerning where to begin the process and what elements to focus upon first. Once this was determined, the change process developed fairly smoothly.

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

The biggest change for faculty members in the unit was coming up to speed on the LKES leader assessment system and implementing it into the course content. Once this hurdle was passed, the remainder of the restructuring was fairly easy. Because of the Quality Measures review, our unit has begun to focus more closely on graduate outcomes. While we still have a long way to go in this regard, we feel that looking to the success of our graduates once they are in the field is a worthy expenditure of our time.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

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

The biggest change to the assessment process has been the revision of the portfolio to include the LKES assessment system and the addition of a Focus Project as a part of the three course EPEL 8970 sequence. The reason for the first change was to utilize the assessment system for Georgia leaders within the program so students would become more familiar with how they would be measured in the field and so the program content would better connect with their work. The reason for the second change was that students were increasingly meeting and exceeding all standards on the former assessments yet we were unable to see a clear articulation of how these measures bettered their practice as school leaders. By requiring a program-long focus project, we were able to embed a number of key experiences into one assessment. Further, because one of the requirements of the project is that candidates select an area tied to improving student achievement, the project is better aligned with leader standards than the former assessment were.

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 articulated previously, the main reasons for program change were to better meet the needs of leaders in the field and to integrate the new leader assessment system (LKES) into the program. However, a secondary reason for the changes was that we did not feel the former system was adequately assessing our candidates' strengths and weaknesses. Additionally, we felt that the disconnected assignments did not necessarily evaluate everything we wanted to assess with our students, but rather, provided individual snapshots of work. By adding the Focus Project to the program, we feel that the students will be able to better demonstrate mastery of concepts through application rather than through a written paper or presentation.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Educational Leadership Unit of Educational Policy Studies Department is to cultivate and develop educational researchers capable of investigating problems of the 21st century and becoming 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 2011**) and Georgia Leader Keys Standards.

**Goals**

**G 1: Conducts Scholarly Research**

PhD students who graduate from Educational Policy Studies with a concentration in educational 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 a concentration in educational leadership will 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)**

PhD students with a concentration in educational leadership 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.

**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)**

PhD students with a concentration in educational leadership 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)**

PhD students with a concentration in educational leadership 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
2.0 Student promotion and progression
3.0 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)
PhD students with a concentration in educational leadership 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
2.0 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)
PhD students with a concentration in educational leadership will complete comprehensive examinations that 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 in the PhD program with a concentration in educational leadership will successfully prepare and defend their comprehensive examinations. The Comprehensive Examination Rubric will be used to evaluate the examinations.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the PhD program with a concentration in educational leadership defended their prospectuses in the reporting cycle.

M 2: Committee evaluation of prospectus (O: 2)
In the presentation of the prospectus, the students in the PhD program with an educational leadership concentration will 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the PhD with a concentration in educational leadership defended their prospectuses during the reporting cycle.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the PhD with a concentration in educational leadership defended their prospectuses during the reporting cycle.

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.
### 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 re-admission 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Committee evaluation of comprehensive examinations  
Outcome/Objective: Successfully complete comprehensive examinations

**Implementation Description:** While there are not currently students being admitted into the program, the comprehensive exam processes have been established as outlined in the measures and findings section.  
**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:** On-Hold  
**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

---

### 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 program is not currently admitting students, and therefore, there are no new accomplishments to report.

**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 program is not currently admitting students and therefore, there are no new data available.

**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 program is not currently admitting students and therefore, there are no new data available.

**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 program is not currently admitting students and therefore, there are no new data available.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
Georgia State University
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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

SLO 1: Design a research study (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Students will design a research study to address educational questions using an appropriate methodological framework.

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).

SLO 2: Literature review (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will be able to critique existing research literature and use appropriately.

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).

SLO 3: Data collection and analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
Students will collect data needed for dissertation research work, analyze them using the appropriate methodologies and present the findings.

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).

SLO 4: Complete a dissertation study (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will be able to write and defend a dissertation study that meets the standards set by the RMS unit.
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).

SLO 5: methodological expertise (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will be able to evaluate research methodologies for their appropriateness to specific research questions

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Two students who completed the RMS PhD in 2012-2013 cycle designed studies that were suited to their research questions and were able to implement the studies. All two exceeded the expectations as outlined in the rubric used to evaluate the dissertation studies.

Target for O2: Literature review
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
The literature review sections of the two dissertations exceeded expectations as outlined in the rubric.

Target for O3: Data collection and analysis
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Two students completed their PhD dissertation in which there was a section devoted to data collection and analysis. The two students exceeded expectations on this aspect of the dissertation study.

Target for O4: Complete a dissertation study
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of the students (n=2) completed a dissertation study in 2012-2013 cycle.

Target for O5: methodological expertise
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
These two students have been employed as methodological experts in the field. One is now an assistant professor in the public health department at a university and the other is a research methodologist at a governmental agency.

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. The students' ability to gain IRB is another indicator of having met the objective of completion of the prospectus. Only after having successfully gained approval can they move on the doctoral candidacy and be able to begin data collection and move on to preparing for their dissertation defense.

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Three students in the RMS PhD program successfully completed their prospectus exam and was able to move on to doctoral candidacy after gaining approval from the Institutional Review Board to proceed with the study. Gaining this approval further exemplified that they had successfully designed a study that could be ethically implemented.

### Target for O2: Literature review
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The literature review sections of the three prospectus papers exceeded expectations.

### Target for O3: Data collection and analysis
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The section of the prospectus in which the students described their plans for data collection and analysis exceeded the expectations as described in the rubric guidelines.

### Target for O5: methodological expertise
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This is an outcome/objective that the committee will revisit as it relates to the prospectus exam.

### 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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
Five RMS students completed the comprehensive exam. One student did not meet the expectations and was required to re-write one of the questions. That means that 80% of the students met the expectations.

### Target for O5: methodological expertise
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

### 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

#### Combining the programs
This research program unit has small numbers of students and much of its work is associated with servicing all the departments in the College of Education via teaching research methods courses and serving as methodologists on dissertation committees and evaluation grants. It is in the process of discussing the feasibility of joining with Social Foundations for the purpose of reporting learning outcomes to WEAVE ONLINE.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Committee Evaluation of the Dissertation
- **Outcome/Objective:** Design a research study

### 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 is making plans to bring together the three PhD programs for the purpose of reporting. In so doing the numbers will be larger and the results more statistically significant.

Georgia State University
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As of 12-12-2016 05:59 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 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 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We had no dissertation defenses in the past three semesters.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
annual review of students
We plan revisions to the data collection procedures that will be tied into an annual review of student’s academic progress.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation Scoring Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Students will write high quality dissertations

Responsible Person/Group: unit coordinator

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?

Does not apply.

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?

Does not apply.

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?

Does not apply.

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?

Does not apply.

**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 considered using the capstone—the last required course in the doctoral program—to serve as a data collection point that requires students to draft a working prospectus, but that course was deactivated in a departmental revision to the doctoral program (a new elective was approved to take its place). We plan revisions to the data collection procedures that will be tied into an annual review of student’s academic progress.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

We have created two new international education graduate courses in our degree programs aligned with the university and college strategic plans. We dropped several curriculum-related doctoral courses due to staffing changes; and transformed three on-campus courses into online offerings.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Educational Psychology MS**

(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to master content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Masters level prepares students to pursue a variety of career paths, including research, evaluation, and the applied practice of a number of disciplines, including K-12 instruction. There were 25 students (including two concurrent students) in the MS program as of summer 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.

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

**Target for O1: Students demonstrate expertise in Ed. Psych.**  
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**  
All students passed their comprehensive exams

**M 2: Thesis or Project (O: 2)**  
Each MS student in the Educational Psychology program must complete a thesis research study or a comprehensive literature review project. For the thesis, students conduct their own research, and for the project students write an in-depth analysis of an area within the field. The written component of the comprehensive exam is followed by an oral defense of the thesis or project and is conducted by the student’s committee.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Students demonstrate independence and competence**  
All student will complete their theses/projects

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 05: Exposure to the field of EPY

All students will complete this professional development seminar.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed this professional development seminar.

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

**Review of program**
Faculty will review the program to determine if changes need to be made.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** As decided last year, all new students, in the fall of 2010 took EPY 8961, a course which orients them to GSU, EPSE, and EPY. This past fall, the COE approved our decision to make this a requirement. During this year, we discussed implementing a test option for students to choose from, in addition to selecting a project or thesis. Details need to be finalized, and this option will either become available in the spring of 2012 or the fall of 2012.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Tracking of Applicants**
Applicants' demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores) will be tracked for the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing action
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Master's Handbook**
The Master's Handbook will be updated to reflect new changes in policy and new URL addresses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing action
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and EPY faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None

**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
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The current assessment process of gathering data on student performance has been effective and will be continued.

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

Having our Master's students take EPY 8961 has been successful in getting our students more focused on their areas of research. We are pleased with the results of this course, and will continue to monitor its success. We encouraged advanced Master's students (those ready to work on their thesis/project) to take EPY 8010. This class focuses on writing literature review and proposal, and is was beneficial for these students. This year we have decided to introduce the test option to our masters students in addition to the project and thesis. This decision was made to meet the needs of students who were struggling with the project or thesis options.
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 4: College teaching</th>
<th>Develop competence in college teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 5: Scholarly activities</td>
<td>Participates in scholarly activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1: Annual Review</td>
<td>Students will undergo an annual review of their phd performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2: Professional Seminar</td>
<td>Students will attend a professional seminar in their first semester of enrollment in the EPY PhD program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3: Dissertation</td>
<td>Students will undergo the scholarly activity of writing and defending a dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
<th>Students will receive a satisfactory or better on their annual reviews, indicating their developing abilities to communicate professionally, orally and in writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Exposure to the field of EPY (G: 2) (M: 2)</td>
<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>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation (G: 3) (M: 3)</td>
<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>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 4) (M: 4)</td>
<td>Develop competence in college teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities (G: 5) (M: 5)</td>
<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>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students will receive a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better in their annual review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

All students except for 1 received a rating of "satisfactory" 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.

**M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 3)**

All EPY doctoral students are required to enroll in EPY 8961 during the first semester if their first year. As part of this seminar,
students discuss current issues and topics in Educational Psychology.

**Target for O3: Exposure to the field of EPY**

All doctoral students will complete this professional development seminar during the first semester of their first year.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All first-year doctoral students completed this seminar in their first semester and received satisfactory grades.

**M 3: Dissertation (O: 4)**

All students must defend a dissertation based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation**

All students who attempt, will successfully defend their dissertation.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All students who attempted, successfully defended their dissertation.

**M 4: Teaching Internship (O: 5)**

The teaching internship includes attending class sessions, teaching a specified unit of the class under supervision of the instructor, assessing students on the material taught during the unit, and providing feedback to the class regarding their performance.

**Target for O5: Develop competence in college teaching**

All students who attempt the teaching internship will successfully complete the requirements.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

**M 5: Presentations and Publications (O: 6)**

All students in EPY are expected to present papers at professional organizations and publish in professional journals.

**Target for O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities**

Students will present, publish and write grant proposals related to their areas of interest.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

During this reporting period, approximately 24 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
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 a 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.

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 last year we did not change our assessment process. In the upcoming year the program will meet to decide whether we should revisit and revise our goals and outcomes.

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

We have restructured our Ph.D. program to minimize the need to take excessive classes and maximize the focus on research and preparation for the field. This has included the implementation of EPY 8961 and EPY 8010. In the next cycle we will make it mandatory that all of our students gain teaching experience and teach an undergraduate course prior to graduation. Finally, we will continue to monitor our acceptances in terms of GRE scores and demographic characteristics.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 English Assessment of Core
As of 12/12/2016 05:59 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 students 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 (M: 1)**
Identification and articulation of key issue(s) (does it answer the question?).

**SLO 2: Logical Structure (M: 1)**
Identification of valid positions on the issue (presented in a logical structure).

**SLO 3: Alternative Viewpoints (M: 1)**
Student is able to formulate and effectively articulate alternative viewpoints.

**SLO 4: Thesis (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.

**SLO 5: Evidence (M: 1)**
Students will show demonstrate effective use of reasons in support of stated position.

**SLO 6: Reading Comprehension (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.

**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**
We expect 50% of our students to receive at least a 3 or 4 on the identification portion of the rubric.

**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**
We aim to have 80% of our students receive 3 or 4 on the reading comprehension exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
85% of students received a 3 or 4 on the reading comprehension exam.

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

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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Four more select text demo seminars planned for the TAs in the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 semesters.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Office of LDS (Associate Director, Angela Hall-Godsey) and LDS committee

### Revise Rubrics

Our new reading comprehension rubrics allowed us to assess the comprehension levels of our incoming 1101 students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Discuss changes with GTAs at annual conference.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** GTAs and office of lower division studies

### 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2013 and Summer 2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Angela Hall-Godsey, LDS program

### 2012-2013

In 2012-2013, we will introduce discussions of evidence and alternative points of view in the first part of the 1101 semester (TAs will amend their syllabi to reflect this goal). Evidence and alternative viewpoints are areas we usually introduce at the 1102 level. In 2013-2014 we will add a post test at the end of 1102 to measure improvement for the same students from 1101-1102.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2013 and Summer 2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Angela Hall-Godsey, LDS program

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

- **Measure:** Written assignment assessing reading comprehension  | **Outcome/Objective:** Reading Comprehension
- **Measure:** Written assignment assessing writing skills  | **Outcome/Objective:** Alternative Viewpoints
- **Measure:** Evidence

**Responsible Person/Group:** Lower-Division Studies  
**Additional Resources:** RA for LDS to collect and report data.

---

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

### 2012-2013 English Concentration in Creative Writing

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

#### 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
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 department's four concentrations: Literature, Secondary English, Rhetoric and Composition, and Creative Writing. Every portfolio is 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.

Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge Related to Creative Writing

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.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In this concentration we are reporting data for students who concentrate on fiction and poetry separately. There were 33 students assessed overall, 27 in fiction and 6 in poetry. The average evaluation for this outcome among fiction students was 4.68 and for poetry was 4.17. Both scores are higher than the previous two cycles (4.28 for fiction students, 4.15 for poetry students in 2010-2011, and 4.50/4.15 in 2011-2012). Among fiction students, the average well exceeds the target of 4.2. Among poetry students, the average exceeds the target of 4.0. Thus, the target for this measure was met. Additionally, for fiction students the % of ratings that received a 5 on a 5 point scale was 61%. For poetry students, the % of ratings that received a 5 on a 5 point scale was 33%. This is the first year that the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

Target for O2: Demonstrate Familiarity with Appropriate Examples of Literary Works

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.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In this concentration we are reporting data for students who concentrate on fiction and poetry separately. There were 33 students assessed overall, 27 in fiction and 6 in poetry. The average evaluation for this outcome among fiction students was 4.57 and for poetry was 4.17. Both scores are higher than the previous two cycles (4.56 for fiction students and 4.0 for poetry students in 2010-2011, and 4.25/4.40 in 2011-2012). Among fiction students, the average well exceeds the target of 4.2. Among poetry students, the average exceeds the target of 4.0. Thus, the target for this measure was met. Additionally, for fiction students the % of ratings that received a 5 on a 5 point scale was 54%. For poetry students, the % of ratings that received a 5 on a 5 point scale was 33%. This is the first year that the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Coordinator
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge Related to Creative Writing

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Additional Resources: Assessment Coordinator

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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 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.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

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’ final papers in the "technique" courses (3160 and 2170). 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: 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?
There were no major changes in 2012-2013. Moving forward, the Creative Writing faculty will be putting into place mission and goal statements at all levels, scaling back the number of assessed criteria from 9 to 3 for more focused targeting, and beginning to discuss how to implement an early measure, possibly in the "technique" courses (3160 and 3170), using the same criteria that are used to evaluate students in the Senior Portfolios.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
All the targets were met this year, so no action plans for changing the program are indicated.
**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).

**SLO 4: Imaginative understanding/engagement with text (G: 1, 2)**

This outcome gauges student's imaginative understanding of and engagement with the world of a literary text by determining his/her awareness of the history, biographical, and/or literary context.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 54 students assessed. The average evaluation for this outcome is 4.23, down from 4.51 and 4.30 in the previous two cycles. However, the target was met. Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 38%. This is the first year the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

There were 54 students assessed. The average evaluation for this outcome is 4.14, down from 4.43 in 2011-2012 but up from 4.10 in 2010-2011. The target of 4.2 was not met. Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 28%. This is the first year the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

Target for **O3**: Mastery of basic elements of writing

The target for this learning outcome related to the mastery of basic elements of writing is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 54 students assessed. The average evaluation for this outcome is 4.24, down from 4.35 and 4.48 in the previous two cycles. However, the target was met. Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 31%. This is the first year the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

### 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

#### Adding an initial measure

The Literature Studies concentration is discussing adding an early measure in the Engl 3040 Introduction to Literary Studies. Ideally, this measure will piggyback off of the existing CTW measures. Literature will coordinate with CTW on this.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Meeting with CTW coordinators and Director of Undergraduate Studies to implement this new measure.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Coordinator

#### Replace content knowledge criterion with contextual awareness/imaginative engagement

The Director of Undergraduate Studies and Assessment coordinator believe that the Portfolio is not well suited to gauge the depth of a student's content knowledge in any given area because it requires diversity of topic areas and points of view. By replacing the criterion of content knowledge with one that better reflects the goals of the portfolio we expect to see the scores rise in this area.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

#### Revise learning outcomes related to the senior portfolio

In next year’s assessment work, this concentration will no longer use the learning outcome related to content knowledge and will instead add a learning outcome related to imaginative understanding of and engagement with the world of a literary text by showing an awareness of the history, biographical, and/or literary context.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

#### Revising portfolio assessment form

For all four undergraduate concentrations, the portfolio assessment forms will be revised to include only three criterion (those related to the three learning outcomes we are assessing in this cycle) in order to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator is revising all of the portfolio assessment forms.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Michael Galchinsky
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?

1. The literature concentration has decided to reduce the number of learning outcomes assessed on Senior Portfolios from 9 to 3 in an effort to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty. 2. The literature concentration altered one of the criteria to be assessed as discussed in the next question.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

1. In the learning outcome of content knowledge, students in the literature concentration failed to meet the target of 4.2 in four out of the previous six cycles. The reason appears to be that the portfolio is not a good instrument for measuring depth of knowledge in any particular area of literary studies. Instead it values diversity of courses (period, theme, and genre), and perspectives. We decided to alter the learning outcome criterion to reflect our focus. We will no longer track content knowledge, but added a new criterion to gauge students' awareness of historical/biographical/literary contexts and their understanding of and engagement with a variety of cultural perspectives. 2. Students met the target in the other assessed criteria. No action plan is needed to address them. 3. There is a recognized need for an early assessment measure, and the department is beginning to consider how to put such a measure in place in Engl 3040 Introduction to Literary Studies.
**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 student 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

**Target for O1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts**

The target for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills is a 3.2 out of 4.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

This year 16 students were assessed. The average evaluation on this measure was 3.63, which substantially exceeds the target for this outcome, and is the same or better than the scores for the previous two cycles for which we have data (3.4 in 2009-2010, and 3.63 in 2010-2011). 50% of the scores were given a 4 out of 4. This is the first year we are reporting the % of high scores, so there is no comparative data.

**Target for O2: Effective written communications**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

16 students were assessed this year. The average evaluation on this outcome was 3.70, which substantially exceeds the target, and is higher than the previous two cycles for which we have data (3.4 in 2009-2010 and 3.56 in 2010-2011). 54% of scores for this outcome received a 4 out of 4. This is the first time we are reporting % of high scores, so we have no comparative data.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

16 students were assessed this year. The average evaluation on this outcome was 3.48, which exceeds the target, and substantially exceeds the previous two cycles for which we have data (3.1 in 2009-2010 and 3.0 in 2010-2011). 50% of scores on this outcome received a 4 out of 4. This is the first year we are reporting % of high scores, so there is no comparative data.

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

**Revise the mission, goals, and objectives to match the particulars of the Rhetoric/Composition concentration**

Now that the undergraduate assessment is being broken down into the four concentrations, each concentration will revise the mission, goals, and objectives so that they are more relevant to the particulars of their program. This work will be done in the fall 2010 semester.

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

**Change the portfolios to a 5-point rather than a 4-point assessment**

When the Rhetoric and Composition faculty began doing senior portfolios entirely on line, they used a 4-point ranking system rather than a 5-point ranking system. Since this differs from the other undergraduate concentrations and causes confusion, they are going to revise their on-line form to a 5-point system and put it in place for the next round of assessments.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Contact Person in Rhetoric and Composition

**Set new targets for the portfolios**

Given that the portfolios are going to be ranked on a 5-point scale, the following targets will be set: 4.0 for the ability to think critically and interpret texts; 4.1 for effective written communications; and 4.0 for knowledge of language.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Finished
Early measure
In the coming year the concentration will be instituting an early measure in Engl 3050 Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Reducing number of learning outcomes
The rhetoric and composition concentration has decided to reduce the number of learning outcomes assessed on Senior Portfolios from 9 to 3 in an effort to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty. The outcomes to be measured are as follows: knowledge of the language and history of rhetoric; ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage; and ability to think critically through writing.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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?

1. The rhetoric and composition concentration has decided to reduce the number of learning outcomes assessed on Senior Portfolios from 9 to 3 in an effort to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty. The outcomes to be measured are as follows: knowledge of the language and history of rhetoric; ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage; and ability to think critically through writing. 2. The concentration also agreed to revise its assessment forms to reflect a 5 point ranking scale rather than the current 4 point scale, to conform its documents with the other department assessment tools. 3. In the coming year the concentration will be instituting an early measure in Engl 3050 Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition.

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 concentration met all its targets. No changes are recommended at this time.
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Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the B.A. in English with a concentration in Secondary English is to provide students with a strong foundation in English studies and to make them aware of the process for transferring this content knowledge to the middle or secondary English classroom so that they are ready to enter teacher certification programs (or other opportunities related to the field of education) and eventually become highly effective teachers.

Goals

G 1: Critical thinking and effective communications
Graduates of this concentration are critical thinkers and effective communicators.

G 2: Mastery of Content Knowledge
Graduates of this concentration have a solid understanding of the various components of the field of English, including the study of literary genres and historical trends, of the history and grammar of the English language, and of critical authors and works in British, American, and World Literature.

G 3: Application of content knowledge to classroom
Graduates of this concentration are capable of transferring content knowledge from the college environment to a middle or secondary school classroom through the use of various pedagogical approaches appropriate to the subject and the setting.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Knowledge of language and linguistics (Mt: 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: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

There were 19 students assessed this year. The average evaluation for this outcome is a 4.05; therefore, the target was not met. This represents the second lowest average for this outcome in the past seven years of assessment cycles (the average for five of the years was in the 4.2 - 4.4 range). Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 12%. This is the first year the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

There were 19 students assessed this year. The average evaluation for this outcome is a 4.11; therefore, the target was not met. This represents the second lowest average for this outcome in the past seven years of assessment cycles (the average for five of the years was in the 4.3 - 4.43 range). Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 32%. This is the first year the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 19 students assessed this year. The average evaluation for this outcome is a 4.38; therefore, the target was met. However, this represents the second lowest average for this outcome in the past seven years of assessment cycles (the average for the other years was in the 4.4 - 4.6 range). Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 53%. This is the first year the % of high scores has been assessed, so there is no comparative data.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Students in the senior seminar classes did complete an exam question related to their teaching philosophy, but this assignment did not prove to be a useful measure to determine their ability to comprehend key pedagogical concepts, to reflect

**SLO 3: Effective Written Communications (M: 1)**

Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

**SLO 4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to reflect upon the profession of teaching and the effectiveness of particular classroom practices.
on pedagogical practice, to integrate pedagogical concepts and practice into their own ideas about teaching, and to
demonstrate audience awareness. This was likely because this was a timed exam question rather than a take home
assignment and therefore students did not have an adequate opportunity to demonstrate the breadth of their knowledge. If
the concentration decides to continue to use this measure, it is recommended that this be configured as a take-home
assignment instead.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of language and linguistics
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Requiring students in the senior seminar and the specialized 3040 class to write a statement about their
teaching philosophy

Last year, we asked students in the Senior Seminar to write a final exam question that required them to reflect upon the practice of
teaching. This year, we will instead ask students to write a statement which articulates their teaching philosophy, drawing upon the
various experiences they have had in this course. Starting in the fall of 2012, the instructor who teaches the specialized
introductory class (English 3040) for prospective teachers will also ask students to write a teaching philosophy statement. At first, we
will look at the scores from each class to see how much students are learning in these two individual classes. In a few years’ time, we
will be able to compare the teaching philosophy statement written at the beginning of a student’s program with the statement that
same student is able to write at the end of the program, which will give us a sense of development in this learning outcome over the
full program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Seminar Exam | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of the 4330 class and the specialized 3040 class

Set target for the teaching philosophy assignment

The expectation for the teaching philosophy assignment to be completed by students in the senior seminar is that at least 75% will
receive a 90% or above for this assignment. For all the portfolio outcomes, the department will use the same targets as were used in
the last portfolio assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

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.

Adding an initial measure
The Secondary English concentration is considering instituting an early measure to be carried out in the Introduction to Literary Studies course (Engl 3040). We will consider whether it will be possible to link the early measure to the assessment criteria used in the Senior Portfolios to enable tracking of improvement.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Concentration committee will meet to discuss.
Additional Resources: None

Continue to track student success in effective written communications
Students failed the target related to effective written communications in 2012-2013 but only by a small amount (it earned a 4.11 when the target was a 4.2). Since this is the first year since 2007-2008 that this target was missed, no particular action plan will be put in place other than to continue to observe this outcome next year.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Effective Written Communications
Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English faculty

Require students to include language paper in their portfolios
The previous plan to require a language paper in their senior portfolios was not implemented in the past year but will be done for the 2013-2014 year with the anticipation that students will be better able to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in this area if they incorporate writing that specifically addresses language.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of language and linguistics
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No changes were made in the assessment process since last year. In the next year, Secondary English faculty will determine if they want to continue to use the measure related to students' teaching philosophy statements since that measure did not provide meaningful data this year. If it is continued, it is likely that it will be made into an essay assignment rather than an exam question. Faculty will also begin discussing the possibility of creating an early assessment measure to be incorporated in the Introduction to Literary Studies class (English 3040). In an earlier cycle, this concentration made an effort to establish a specialized 3040 class for students interested in education, but that goal proved unfeasible for a number of reasons (students have schedules that make it impossible for them to take a particular class, students have not necessarily determined their concentration early on in their careers, etc.).

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Two of the three targets for the portfolio for this concentration were not met this year. The outcome related to knowledge of language and linguistics has always been a problematic criterion. The plan to require students to include a paper from a language course has not yet been implemented. It will be done immediately so that students from now on will be required to demonstrate explicit knowledge related to language in their portfolios. The other missed target involved effective communication skills, and this was only the second in seven years when this target was not met. Therefore, faculty will continue to track this outcome to see if particular action needs to be taken to address these skills.
Mission / Purpose
The English department prepares MFA students in Creative Writing with advanced knowledge of literary composition, aesthetics, vocabulary and techniques, proficiency with established literary models, ability to teach Creative Writing, familiarity with the publishing literary marketplace, and ability to produce publishable literary works.

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.

G 4: Competent writers
Graduates of the MFA are competent writers, both in terms of communication skills and imaginative expression.

G 5: Knowledgeable about history of genre
Graduates of MFA are well versed in the history of the significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, and literary vocabulary of their chosen genre.

G 6: Trained in the workshop method of teaching
Graduate of the MFA have been trained in the workshop method of teaching Creative Writing.

G 7: Able to produce publishable work
Graduates of the MFA are familiar with appropriate venues of publication and are able to produce publishable work.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

There were no MFA students in Creative Writing this year.

### 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.

### 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.

**M 2: M.F.A. Exams (O: 1, 5)**

M.F.A. students in the Creative Writing Program are required to pass two four-hour exit exams given over two days. The exam given on the first day tests the student's knowledge of literary vocabulary, major literary figures, literary history, and form and theory in the literature of the student's chosen genre before the twentieth century. The exam given on the second day tests the student's knowledge of literary vocabulary, major literary figures, literary history, and form and theory in the literature of the student's chosen genre after the beginning of the twentieth century. Each M.F.A. exam is read and graded by a committee of three faculty chosen by the student. The committee consists of the student's major professor, a second member who must be in the relevant area of creative writing, and a third member from the English department.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

### Target for O1: Content Knowledge

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target was set for the Creative Writing MFA exams that 25% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the low pass grade, retaining the target of 25% or fewer for failing grades.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Four exams were taken this year, three of which earned a grade of high pass, and one of which earned a pass. 0% earned a fail, so the target was met.

### Target for O5: Effective Communication Skills

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all M.F.A. exams stating the intention that fewer than 15% of examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the low pass grade, retaining the target of 15% or fewer for failing grades.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Four exams were taken this year, three of which earned a grade of high pass, and one of which earned a pass. 0% earned a fail, so the target was met.

### 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
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Distinguish between primary and secondary exams on MFA exams

To provide more information about the exam results for the MFA, primary exam results will be distinguished from secondary exam results.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to the Graduate Director

Set a target of 5.0 out of 6.0 for the criteria on thesis assessment sheet

A new target of 5.0 out of 6.0 will be set for all the criteria on the revised (6 point) thesis assessment form.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
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?

There were no changes in 2012-2013. The findings show that a score of 6.0 ("outstanding") has been, in the past, routinely given for MFA theses. The Creative Writing faculty will discuss ways to better distinguish between outstanding and "excellent" (5.0) evaluations so that the top score is more unusual rather than typical. This concentration will also complete mission and goal statements for the MFA and scale back the number of assessed criteria from 9 to 3 to enable more focused targeting. The concentration will also consider appropriate early measures other than the pass rate on exams, which is too broad a measure to permit actionable conclusions about the strengths/weaknesses of the program. Possibilities include using the final paper from a student's initial workshop or craft course, to be evaluated on the same criteria as the final thesis.

**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 faculty will norm their assessment of MFA theses, and reduce the number of criteria from 9 to 3. They will also begin to discuss how to institute a more focused early measure in lieu of pass rates on exams.
Mission / Purpose

The M.A.T. degree in English Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor’s degrees in English. It leads to both a master's degree and certification for teaching secondary English language arts (grades 6-12). The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in English education for students in urban settings. Our program focuses on dynamic and responsive theories, practices, and definitions of literacy, reading, writing, composing, viewing, listening, and speaking. The mission of the M.A.T. program for English 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 English 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 Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, MSIT, our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta, the nation, and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity to push the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Content knowledge for teaching English Language Arts
Candidates are informed educators who have knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

G 2: Knowledge, skills, & dispositions to teach English Language Arts
Candidates are professional educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

G 3: Impact on student learning in English Language Arts
Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learning of their students.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the content needed to teach English language arts. (Key Assessments - GACE performance and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum)

O/O 2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates demonstrate their knowledge and skills through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods and curriculum materials for teaching English language arts. (Key Assessment - Planning: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction)

O/O 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 4)
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Key Assessment - Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)

O/O 4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) (G: 2) (M: 5, 6)
Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials. (Key Assessment - Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge): Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

O/O 5: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 7)
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)
### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Content Knowledge GACE Scores (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate performance on GACE tests for English Language Arts, forms 020 and 021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O1: Content knowledge
100% of candidates will pass the required GACE II tests for English language arts education.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Note: The GACE II scores are reported a year later than the current year under review. Also, the GACE exams were transferred to a new test provider, ETS, and subsequently overhauled and re-launched in October 2013. 100% of the students passed the GACE exams for English language arts education in 2011-2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content &amp; Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O1: Content knowledge
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English language arts content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - 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 rate for this key assessment administered in Spring 2013 is 100% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Planning performance (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3). 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3). 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3). 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3). 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3). 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3). 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 rate for the Assessment Plan portion of the rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) level for all five criteria, with 90% of students scoring at least 4 on those same criteria. Contextual Factors: at least 66% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5); with the exception of one criterion, students also scored at least at the proficient level (Score 4). The one exception was the criterion: Knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, where 1 student scored at the Acceptable level (Score 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning). This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - 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 guides. The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment administered in Spring 2013 is 85% at the Acceptable Performance (Score 3) Level. One student in the group scored at the Unacceptable Performance level, comprising 14% of the student population. Furthermore, on 1 criterion, Interpretation of Data, 85% of students scored at the Exemplary level (Score 5). On the remaining 3 of the 4 criteria, 71% of students scored at the Exemplary (Score 5) level and 14% scored at the proficient (Score 4) level. The poor performance of one student in the group that was assessed brought the percentage of passing students down significantly.
M 5: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 4)
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument
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 Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument for each of the areas, which could include one or more criteria within the rubric areas. Note that the scores on this particular set of rubrics number 0 through 4. Knowledge of Students and Learning: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 58% scored at the effective level (Score 4) Learning Environments: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 33% scored at the effective level (Score 4). The 33% at the effective level (Score 4) was found on the criteria Classroom Environment. For the remaining criteria the scores were reflected as follows: Classroom Management: 41% at Effectively Demonstrated (Score 4), 58% at Adequately Demonstrated (Score 3) Communication: 100% at Effectively Demonstrated (Score 4) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments: 66% at Effectively Demonstrated (Score 4), 33% at Adequately Demonstrated (Score 3) When taking into consideration the Learning Environments score, there is a mixed picture with regard to the Score 4 level. On the one hand, students were clearly meeting the scores at the adequate, expected level, and they also exceeded expectations. However, our targets are for 40% of students to demonstrate the highest level scores for this area and while the overall picture is that they seemed to meet these goals, on the issue of classroom environment, there may be more to consider. Now, this finding, however, also has to be tempered with the fact that this is a midpoint goal for students in their practical experiences. This data needs to be considered in light of the data findings for the endpoint results. Assessment: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 50% scored at the effective level (Score 4) Planning and Instruction: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 41% scored at the effective level (Score 4) Professionalism: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 66% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)

M 6: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
The following results are for each area on the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 75% scored at the effective level (Score 4) Learning Environments: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 33% scored at the effective level (Score 4). This particular rubric, like the midpoint rubric has 4 criteria. The scores are listed below. Classroom Environment: 66% at the adequate level (Score 3) and 33% at the effective level (Score 4) Classroom Management: 66% at the adequate level (Score 3) and 33% at the effective level (Score 4) Communication: 25% at the adequate level (Score 3) and 75% at the effective level (Score 4) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments: 58% at the adequate level (Score 3) and 41% at the effective level (Score 4) Given that the scores here are right on the cusp of meeting or not meeting our target goals for 40% of students to score at the Effective Level (Score 4) just as they are in the Midpoint Evaluation, it seems that the issues learning environments detailed in this report merit further investigation. Assessment: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 66% scored at the effective level (Score 4). Planning and Instruction: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 66% scored at the effective level (Score 4). Professionalism: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 91% scored at the effective level (Score 4).

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 2012-2013 - 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 2013 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 58% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assessment Action Plan
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students’ knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicums/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. The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge
- Objective: Planning performance

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge GACE Scores
- 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

Diversity Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge via Coursework
- 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 | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge via Coursework
- 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 our 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-Progess
Priority: Medium
Classroom Environments and Management

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. Update for 2012-13: In response to the data available for the English education program as well as other programs across the Middle and Secondary Education department, we have implemented seminars for students during the practicum experiences in the fall and spring terms. These seminars provide expertise at times when students are already heavily involved with students in schools. Additionally, we also directly address classroom management and the development of classroom environments in the EDLA 6550 fall course when students plan curriculum for long and short term planning. During the spring term in EDLA 7550, we also directly address the topic of differentiation, a tactic meant to help teachers understand the individual differences that students bring to classrooms, including differences in gender, ability, culture, and other areas. This explicit work that is then tied to curriculum planning, educational theory, and classroom practice in both the methodology courses and practicum field sites provides students with multiple opportunities and different ways to think about, practice, and implement their developing ideas about how to manage and develop classroom environments that are supportive and welcoming for students.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Endpoint | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
- Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Midpoint | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
- Measure (Key Assessment): Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

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-Progess
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.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: English education faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

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

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 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 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 education needs, students who are English Language Learners, and gender differences—all of which were discussed in light of teaching, literature, and language skills and processes. Based on student feedback from exit surveys at the end of their student teaching experiences, we implemented the Teacher Work Sample as a concrete means for practicing lesson planning and analysis of student data in the process of teaching. Based on the data in Key Assessment 6 for Clinical Practice, we found that while our students were quite strong in planning, there was one or two students who needed further help, especially in the areas of Classroom Management and Classroom Environments. Thus, we focus in the methods courses on practical, concrete examples for how communities are built and sustained inside of classrooms using sound pedagogy, curriculum, and attention to the diverse needs that both students and teachers have on a daily basis. To that end, we encourage students to think and plan for long and short term learning and to articulate their choices for those plans because these have impacts on and reflect how they think about what happens in classrooms for English teaching and learning. 3. Student learning Based on data from students' teaching performances in their practicum and student teaching experiences, 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.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The English Department prepares its graduates with an MA in Literary Studies to demonstrate knowledge of the history and genres of literature, ability to recognize and employ effective critical and theoretical frameworks, and ability to produce significant critical writing, including a cumulative project that asks an original and valid research question and draws relevant conclusions based on persuasive analyses.

**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.
G 4: Well versed in content knowledge
Graduates of the MA are well versed in the content knowledge of literature studies, including the history of the significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, and vocabulary used in literary works.

G 5: Able to apply theoretical and critical frameworks
Graduates of the MA are familiar with theoretical and critical frameworks and able to apply them to the study of literature.

G 6: Able to produce persuasive literary analyses
Graduates of the MA produce persuasive literary analyses based on relevant research and critical thinking.

G 7: Communicate effectively and eloquently
Graduates of the MA communicate their ideas effectively and eloquently in writing.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2)
In addition to knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, movements, and critical approaches in American, British, and world literatures, students will be able to discuss these as a constellation of interconnected fields rather than unrelated categories of information. For example, students will be able to discuss major authors' works in the context of their historical periods and cultural movements.

SLO 2: Knowledge of Language (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history, structure, and social implications of language as a means of discourse; further, they will be able to relate their understanding of the possibilities and limitations of language to their understanding of major figures, genres, periods, movements, and critical approaches.

SLO 3: Scholarly vocabulary (M: 1, 2)
Students will bring to their analysis of literary works an appropriate scholarly vocabulary that demonstrates an understanding of concepts important to the study of literature. Examples might include critical terms such as postmodern, deconstruction, and semiotic and technical terms drawn from formal study, such as Rime Riche, ballad, and quarto.

SLO 4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical approaches to reading literature and be able to apply them in their own assessment and interpretation of texts.

SLO 5: Skills of inquiry (M: 1)
Students will be able to formulate effective questions for master's level research.

SLO 6: Effective Communications Skills (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts.

SLO 7: Researching Skills (M: 1, 2)
Students will conduct graduate-level research on topics related to English studies and will demonstrate mastery in using traditional methods of research as well as non-traditional information technology.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assessment of work in the Pro-Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Since the spring of 2008, the English department has required M.A. students in literature to take the Pro-Seminar in the second semester of their program. This course is intended to teach students about the professional elements of literary studies and to prepare them to write the thesis that will serve as the culmination of their masters program. Accordingly, students are expected to complete a draft of their prospectus by the end of the course. Beginning in the spring of 2009, instructors of the literature Pro-Seminar were requested to assess student work in this course, using an assessment form with criteria that are aligned to the graduate learning outcomes (see attached assessment form). In previous years, students were instructed to take the Pro-Seminar during their second semester. Now, they are allowed to choose between their second semester and their third semester. Because of that, only a small number (4 students) took the Pro-Seminar in the spring of 2011, and we anticipate a large group will consequently be enrolled in the fall 2011 class or classes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The instructor of the spring 2013 Pro-Seminar requested an extension on submitting his scores as some of his students took an incomplete and time in the summer to finish the prospectus. So, these findings will be entered into WEAVE by mid-August.

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
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). 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**

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 6 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 matches last year’s score. In addition, 50% of theses earned an excellent for this criterion. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information on the percentage of top scores in thesis work, we do not yet have comparative data on this.

**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.
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: Finished
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: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Target for O3: Scholarly vocabulary

Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 for all the criteria used in assessing the thesis. The data that is generated from this year's results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the M.A. thesis is intended to demonstrate.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The average score for the 6 theses assessed was a 4.50 for this learning outcome related to scholarly vocabulary. This score just meets the target, and it matches last year's score. In addition, 83% of theses earned an excellent for this criterion. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information on the percentage of top scores in thesis work, we do not yet have comparative data on this.

Target for O4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature

Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 for all the criteria used in assessing the thesis. The data that is generated from this year's results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the M.A. thesis is intended to demonstrate.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The average score for the 6 theses assessed was a 4.2 for this learning outcome related to critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and cultural contexts. This score does not meet the target, and it matches last year's score. In addition, 33% of theses earned an excellent for this criterion. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information on the percentage of top scores in thesis work, we do not yet have comparative data on this.

Target for O6: Effective Communications Skills

Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 for all the criteria used in assessing the thesis. The data that is generated from this year's results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the M.A. thesis is intended to demonstrate.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The average score for the 6 theses assessed was a 4.3 for this learning outcome related to effective communications. This score does not meet the target, and it represents the lowest score in four years of data (scores from previous years were in the 4.4 - 4.9 range). In addition, 67% of theses earned an excellent for this criterion. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information on the percentage of top scores in thesis work, we do not yet have comparative data on this.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

The average score for the 6 theses assessed was a 4.2 for this learning outcome related to research. This score does not meet the target, and it represents the lowest score in four years of assessment results. In addition, 67% of theses earned an excellent for this criterion. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information on the percentage of top scores in thesis work, we do not yet have comparative data on this.
**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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Priority:** Medium
- **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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012
- **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.

**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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Graduate Director

**Making the MA Pro-Seminar more effective**
The Graduate Committee will discuss how to make teaching the Pro-Seminar more effective, including the use of a “critical approaches” text, a style workshop, guest speakers, and other innovations. The Director of Graduate Studies will also discuss with the Pro-Seminar instructors how to norm the scoring of Prospectus assessments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Director of Graduate Studies will convene Graduate Committee.

**Strengthening the MA Pro-Seminar**
DGS and Graduate Committee will discuss how to strengthen the Pro-Seminar, by including a “critical approaches” text, a style workshop, guest speakers, and other innovations. They will also discuss how to norm assessments among the Pro-Seminar instructors.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** DGS implements

---

**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?

1. The MA in literature concentration will reduce the number of outcomes it tracks on its assessment tools from 9 to 3, to provide for more targeted and focused assessment that is less laborious for faculty. The thesis assessment tool will track the following outcomes: a) Student’s thesis demonstrates a valid and original research question; b) Student’s thesis demonstrates knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, movements in American/British/World literatures as relevant to the student’s proposed area of study; and c) Student’s thesis demonstrates knowledge of major theoretical approaches to reading literature and effectively applies them to the proposed area of study. 2. In the coming year, the concentration will institute an early measure for MA students, assessing the thesis prospectus produced in the MA Pro-Seminar course using the following outcomes: a) Student’s prospectus demonstrates a valid and original research question; b) Student’s prospectus demonstrates knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, movements in American/British/World literatures as relevant to the student’s proposed area of study; c) Student’s prospectus demonstrates knowledge of major theoretical approaches to reading literature and effectively applies them to the proposed area of study.

**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
In the area of the Thesis Pro-Seminar, we were not able to secure data this cycle. In the area of the thesis, targets were not met in three areas: research skills, effective communication skills, and theoretical knowledge. With respect to research skills, the concentration is instituting an early assessment of the research question in the MA thesis prospectus, which should help focus students and teachers on research as an area to be addressed. The DGS will continue to stress that instructors focus on effective communication skills in MA courses. Demonstrating theoretical knowledge has always been a challenging area for our students, but the new, focused criteria give instructors a better sense of what this outcome means.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measures, Targets, and Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Mastery of Rhetorical Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>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 4.7, meaning that it met the target. This did represent a decrease from the previous cycle (average of 5.0). Additionally, 67% of students earned an excellent in this area. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information of the percentage of top scores, we do not yet have comparative data on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Three M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to the knowledge of the history of rhetoric was a 4.7, meaning that it met the target. This is an increase from average from the previous cycle (average of 4.3). Additionally, 67% of students earned an excellent in this area. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information of the percentage of top scores, we do not yet have comparative data on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Three M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to the knowledge of the theories of rhetoric was a 4.7, meaning that it met the target. This matched the average from the previous cycle. Additionally, 67% of students earned an excellent in this area. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information of the percentage of top scores, we do not yet have comparative data on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Effective Written Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Three M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to effective communications was a 4.7, meaning that it met the target. This did represent a decrease from the previous cycle (average of 5.0). Additionally, 67% of students earned an excellent in this area. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information of the percentage of top scores, we do not yet have comparative data on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Researching skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Three M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to researching skills (in particular the thesis genre) was a 4.7, meaning that it met the target. This did represent a decrease from the previous cycle (average of 5.0). Additionally, 67% of students earned an excellent in this area. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information of the percentage of top scores, we do not yet have comparative data on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

**Create an explanation sheet for the rankings on the MA Thesis**
Faculty members in Rhetoric and Composition will create an explanation sheet for the five possible rankings on the MA thesis.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rhetoric and Composition faculty

**Early Measure**
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 institute an early measure for MA students in the course.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition Faculty

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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Rhetoric and Composition faculty member in charge of assessment.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: the Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

1. The rhetoric and composition concentration has decided to reduce the number of learning outcomes assessed on MA theses from 9 to 3 in an effort to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty. The outcomes to be measured are as follows: a) The thesis demonstrates knowledge in the history, theory, and/or pedagogy of rhetoric and composition as related to chosen topic; b) The thesis demonstrates mastery of academic writing, in particular the dissertation / thesis genre; and c) The thesis effectively communicates the argument and results of the research. 2. The concentration also agreed to revise its assessment forms to reflect a 5 point ranking scale rather than the current 4 point scale, to conform its documents with the other department assessment tools.

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 concentration met its targets in all areas. Therefore no changes are recommended at this time.
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Mission / Purpose
The English department prepares PhD students in Creative Writing with comprehensive knowledge of literary composition, aesthetics, vocabulary and techniques, expertise with established literary models, ability to teach Creative Writing at the college level, familiarity with the publishing literary marketplace, and ability to produce publishable literary works.

Goals
G 1: Assure Mastery in Content Knowledge
The department strives to graduate PhD students in Creative Writing who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of literary studies (including major figures, periods and movements, and vocabulary) as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

G 2: Scholarly Engagement in Theoretical Frameworks
The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who are able to successfully apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the study of literary texts.

G 3: Foster Effective Written Communications
The department strives to graduate students who have effective written communication skills that they can use successfully for any specific purpose and any particular audience.

G 4: Exemplary writers
Graduates of the PhD are exemplary writers, both in terms of communication skills and imaginative expression.

G 5: Knowledgeable about history of genre
Graduates of PhD are experts in the history of the significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, and literary vocabulary of their chosen genre.
G 6: Experienced teachers of the workshop method of Creative Writing
Graduates of the PhD are experienced teachers in the use of the workshop method of teaching the craft of Creative Writing.

G 7: Able to produce publishable work of high quality
Graduates of the PhD have a working understanding of the writing profession and are able to produce publishable work of high quality.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2)**
Ph.D. students will demonstrate a familiarity with representative examples of writing by major figures, English and American literary history, and form and theory in both fiction and poetry.

**SLO 2: Applying Literary Studies to Creative Writing (M: 1)**
Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works that are deemed worthy of being published in national literary journals. Students will also be able to develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry and fiction.

**SLO 3: Craftsmanship (M: 1)**
Ph.D. students will be able to produce writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**SLO 4: Revising Skills**
Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. Students will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor and to revise their creative writing to create work of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**SLO 5: Researching Skills**
Using and building upon the knowledge and skills acquired during master's level study, doctoral graduates will be able to isolate a fruitful question for extended, in-depth investigation and to carry out focused, productive, and thorough research, using both traditional and non-traditional research methods.

**SLO 6: Effective Communications (M: 2)**
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in English studies.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Graduating Ph.D. students in Creative Writing are assessed on the work of their dissertation. This assessment is facilitated by the Graduate Director at the student’s dissertation defense, and the form is completed by faculty members on the student’s committee. The dissertation assessment form, which uses a 6-point scale, rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes. (See the attached assessment form for the Creative Writing dissertation.) In the summer, the Graduate Director meets with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. Those suggestions are brought to the Graduate Studies Committee in early fall for review, and an action plan is formulated and presented to the entire faculty at an early fall department meeting.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The five Creative Writing dissertations defended this year scored a mean average of a 5.93 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 (which earned a score of 6.0); the knowledge of literary history of English or American poetry or fiction, depending upon the student's choice of genre (which earned a score of 5.8); and the knowledge of form and theory of fiction or poetry, depending upon the students' choice of genre (which earned a score of 6.0). This score surpassed the target and exceeded the average of 5.3 of the previous assessment cycle and moved closer to the 6.0 average of the two years previous. In addition, an average of 94% of dissertations earned an outstanding score for content knowledge while 6% earned an excellent. Since this is the first year we are calculating the percentages for top scores, we do not yet have comparative data.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The five Creative Writing dissertations each scored a 6.0 for this learning outcome (as listed in the criterion that rates the dissertation's ability to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics in English studies to create meaningful literary works, deemed worthy of publication). This exceeds the target as well as the 5.0 average of the previous year. It also matches the 6.0 averages of the two previous years. In addition, 100% of the dissertations earned an outstanding score in this area. Since this is the first year we are calculating the percentages for top scores, we do not have comparative data.
**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All five of the Creative Writing dissertations scored a 6.0 on the three criteria related to the learning outcome that addresses issues of craftsmanship: the ability to produce work that is authentic and engaging; the ability to produce work that is grammatically sound and syntactically correct; and the use of a variety of literary techniques. This score exceeds the target and represents an increase from the 5.4 average of the previous year. It also matches the perfect scores from the two years previous. In addition, 100% of the dissertations earned an outstanding score in this area. Since this is the first year we are calculating the percentages for top scores, we do not have comparative data.

**M 2: PhD Exams (O: 1, 6)**

The Creative Writing Ph.D. examinations are conducted in the fall and 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 three possible grades: high pass, pass, fail. The readers provide written commentary that explains the assigned grades to the Director of Graduate Studies.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**

In the 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. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the use of the low pass grade, retaining the 20% or fewer target for failing grades.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In 2012-2013, one student took the exams in the Creative Writing PhD program, and scored a pass on each of the two exams. Thus the fail rate was 0% and the target was met. The 100% pass rate is a large improvement over previous years, but the small sample size makes it impossible to gauge any trends from this data.

**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 or a fail on their exams. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the use of the low pass grade, retaining the 20% or fewer target for failing grades.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In 2012-2013, one student took the exams in the Creative Writing PhD program, and scored a pass on each of the two exams. Thus the fail rate was 0% and the target was met. The 100% pass rate is a large improvement over previous years, but the small sample size makes it impossible to gauge any trends from this data.

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of the Creative Writing program in collaboration with the Creative Writing faculty.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Distinguish between scores on primary exams and secondary exams**

To get a better understanding of the Creative Writing PhD exam results, the department will distinguish between scores earned for primary and secondary exams.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** PhD Exams
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

  **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Assistant to the Graduate Director

**Poetry faculty who write secondary exams will hold regular meetings with examinees**

Since fiction students often have difficulty with the poetry secondary exam, poetry faculty who writes these exams will be asked to schedule regular meetings with examinees to better prepare them for the exams.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** PhD Exams
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge
**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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

There were no changes in 2012-2013. The findings show that a score of 6.0 ("outstanding") has been, in the past, routinely given for PhD dissertations in Creative Writing. The Creative Writing faculty will discuss ways to better distinguish between outstanding and "excellent" (5.0) evaluations so that the top score is more unusual rather than typical. This concentration will also complete mission and goal statements for the PhD and scale back the number of assessed criteria from 9 to 3 to enable more focused targeting. The concentration will also consider appropriate early measures other than the pass rate on exams, which is too broad a measure to permit actionable conclusions about the strengths/weaknesses of the program. Possibilities include using the final paper from a student's initial workshop or craft course, to be evaluated on the same criteria as the completed dissertation.

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

There are no planned changes to the academic program at this time.
specific purpose and any particular audience.

G 4: Knowledgeable about the content of literary studies
Graduates of the PhD are experts in the content knowledge of literary studies, including the history of the significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, and vocabulary used in literary works.

G 5: Able to incorporate and elaborate on theoretical and critical frameworks
Graduates of the PhD have acquired mastery in theoretical and critical frameworks and are able to incorporate and elaborate on them in the study of literature.

G 6: Able to produce persuasive literary analyses
Graduates of the PhD produce original, significant, and persuasive literary analyses based on extensive research and critical synthesis.

G 7: Effective and eloquent communicators
Graduates of the PhD communicate their ideas effectively and eloquently in writing.

G 8: Experienced in teaching writing and literary studies
Graduates of the PhD are experienced teachers of composition and literary studies.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Effective Communication Skills (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in literary studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Effective Researching Skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using and building upon the knowledge and skills acquired during master's level study, doctoral graduates 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target of 4.7 was set for this learning outcome related to content knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eight literature dissertations were completed in 2012-2013, 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 5.25), 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 5.25), 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 5.0). These averages for the three areas of content knowledge average out to a 5.17, and therefore the target was very successfully met. These scores also represent an increase from 2011-2012 (where the average was 5.07) as well as over the average in 2009-2010 (where the average was a 4.70). In addition, an average of 25% of dissertations earned an outstanding score for this outcome, and an average of 67% earned an excellent. Because this is the first year that the department is gathering this data, we have no comparative data.

| 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eight literature dissertations were defended in 2012-2013, 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 4.94 average) and "the oral defense demonstrates mastery of the topics researched and sound defense of the project" (which received a 5.25 average). The combined average of these two criteria related to effective communications was a 5.1, which again was considerably higher than the 4.7 target. The combined average matches the average from 2010-2011 average. In addition, an average of 19% of dissertations scored outstanding in these criteria and an average of 56% scored an excellent. This is the first year the department is gathering such data, so we have no comparative data.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eight literature dissertations were defended in 2012-2013, 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 4.94 average) and "the oral defense demonstrates mastery of the topics researched and sound defense of the project" (which received a 5.25 average). The combined average of these two criteria related to effective communications was a 5.1, which again was considerably higher than the 4.7 target. The combined average matches the average from 2010-2011 average. In addition, an average of 19% of dissertations scored outstanding in these criteria and an average of 56% scored an excellent. This is the first year the department is gathering such data, so we have no comparative data.

**Target for O4: Effective Researching Skills**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome related to effective research skills.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eight dissertations were defended in this concentration and the average for this outcome was a 5.25. This score clearly met the target; it also represented a slight decrease from the average earned in the previous year of 5.3. In addition, 25% of dissertations earned an outstanding in this area while 75% earned an excellent. This is the first year the department is gathering such data, so we have no comparative data.

**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 three possible grades: high pass, pass, and fail. The grade of low pass was discontinued this year.

Each exam is read by three faculty members and is assessed on a scale of three possible grades: high pass, pass, and fail. The exams serve to demonstrate detailed and thorough knowledge of all facets related to the candidate’s study and dissertation area. 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.

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 three possible grades: high pass, pass, and fail. The grade of low pass was discontinued this year.

Exam results in 2012-2013 show that only 11.1% of the 18 exams earned a failure rating. Because the department has discontinued the low pass grade, this score is not comparable to scores from previous years, but given that it is below the 15% target rate, the target is met. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year 89%, slightly down from the 92% rate in 2011-2012, but still very high.

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the department decided to continue with a target for all Ph.D. exams which would allow for only 15% or fewer of the examinees to earn a low pass or a failure on their exams. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the use of the low pass grade. The target for failing exams remains 15% or lower.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Exam results in 2012-2013 show that only 11.1% of the 18 exams earned a failure rating. Because the department has discontinued the low pass grade, this score is not comparable to scores from previous years, but given that it is below the 15% target rate, the target is met. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year 89%, slightly down from the 92% rate in 2011-2012, but still very high.

**Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the department decided to continue with a target for all Ph.D. exams which would allow for only 15% or fewer of the examinees to earn a low pass or a failure on their exams. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the use of the low pass grade. The target for failing exams remains 15% or lower.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Exam results in 2012-2013 show that only 11.1% of the 18 exams earned a failure rating. Because the department has discontinued the low pass grade, this score is not comparable to scores from previous years, but given that it is below the 15% target rate, the target is met. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year 89%, slightly down from the 92% rate in 2011-2012, but still very high.

**Target for O3: Effective Communication Skills**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the department decided to continue with a target for all Ph.D. exams which would allow for only 15% or fewer of the examinees to earn a low pass or a failure on their exams. In 2012-2013, the department discontinued the use of the low pass grade. The target for failing exams remains 15% or lower.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Exam results in 2012-2013 show that only 11.1% of the 18 exams earned a failure rating. Because the department has discontinued the low pass grade, this score is not comparable to scores from previous years, but given that it is below the
15% target rate, the target is met. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year 89%, slightly down from the 92% rate in 2011-2012, but still very high.

### 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

**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:** 05/2014
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this with the Graduate Director
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** the 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:** Finished
- **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

**New assessment measure: Advanced Teaching Fellowships**
The Director of Graduate Studies will begin to track the number of PhD students with Advanced Teaching Fellowships, which reduces the teaching load for graduate students to three courses. The goal is that eventually 100% of PhD students will have a 3-course load. The DGS will determine the % of students currently holding ATFs and appropriate targets for 3, 5, and 10 years out.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** DGS
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** DGS

**New early measure: dissertation prospectus**
The Coordinator and DGS determined that the PhD exams are not the best place for an early measure. Instead, starting in Fall, 2013, we will assess the dissertation prospectus as the early measure.

Structure of PhD Exams
The Director of Graduate Studies will discuss with the Graduate Committee whether to move the current exam structure to a take-home only structure. Currently, the exams include three components: a take-home exam, an on-site exam, and an oral exam.

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?

1. The English PhD literature concentration has decided to reduce the number of learning outcomes assessed on dissertations from 9 to 3 in an effort to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty. The outcomes to be measured are as follows: a) The dissertation demonstrates comprehensive and current knowledge of literary figures, genres, periods, and movements in the area of study; b) The dissertation poses a significant, valid, and original research agenda, and draws groundbreaking conclusions and implications that contribute to the given field; and c) The dissertation effectively employs critical approaches/theoretical frameworks/cultural contexts appropriate to the research agenda.

2. The concentration revised its mission and goals.

3. The concentration decided not to continue to assess pass rates on PhD exams, because it was found that these rates do not provide actionable information.

4. In the coming year the concentration will institute an early measure for PhD students, assessing the dissertation prospectus using these outcomes: a) The dissertation prospectus demonstrates comprehensive and current knowledge of literary figures, genres, periods, and movements in the area of study; b) The dissertation prospectus poses a significant, valid, and original research agenda, and draws groundbreaking conclusions and implications that contribute to the given field; and c) The dissertation prospectus effectively employs critical approaches/theoretical frameworks/cultural contexts appropriate to the research agenda.

**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 this year. No changes are contemplated at this time.
**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Seven Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. The average score earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the history of rhetoric was a 5.3 which met the target. This score was a 0.3 from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.0. Additionally, 29% of dissertations scored an outstanding in this area while 61% scored an excellent. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information about percentages of top scores, there is no comparative data on this.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Seven Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. The average score earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the theories of rhetoric was a 4.7 which just met the target. This score was a decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.0, and it represents the lowest average in four years. Additionally, 0% of dissertations scored an outstanding in this area while 71% scored an excellent. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information about percentages of top scores, there is no comparative data on this.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Seven Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. They averaged a score of 4.7 for the mastery of academic writing (in particular that of the dissertation genre) and 4.7 for the ability to effectively communicate an argument and results of research. The average of these two scores is a 4.7 for this learning outcome related to effective written communications. This average just meets the target. It represents an increase over the previous year where the combined average was a 4.0. Additionally, 7% of dissertations scored an outstanding in this area while 65% scored an excellent. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information about percentages of top scores, there is no comparative data on this.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Seven Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. The average score earned for this learning outcome related to researching skills was a 5.1 which met the target. This score was a slight increase from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.0, but still far below the average of the two previous years (a 5.8 and 6.0 respectively). Additionally, 29% of dissertations scored an outstanding in this area while 57% scored an excellent. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information about percentages of top scores, there is no comparative data on this.

**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 three possible grades: high pass, 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2012-2013, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last two assessment cycles. 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 previous two exam cycles.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2012-2013, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last two assessment cycles. 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 previous two exam cycles.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2012-2013, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last two assessment cycles. 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 previous two exam cycles.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2012-2013, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last two assessment cycles. 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 previous two exam cycles.

**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: Finished
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: Finished
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
Responsible Person/Group: the Rhetoric and Composition faculty

**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

**Early measure**

In the coming year the concentration will be instituting an early measure in Engl 8120 Academic Writing and Publishing.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Rhet/comp concentration will implement.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Rhet/comp 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?

1. The rhetoric and composition concentration has decided to reduce the number of learning outcomes assessed on PhD dissertations from 9 to 3 in an effort to make the assessment process more targeted and less laborious for faculty. The outcomes to be measured are as follows: a) The dissertation demonstrates knowledge in the history, theory, and/or pedagogy of rhetoric and composition as related to chosen topic; b) The dissertation demonstrates mastery of academic writing, in particular the dissertation genre; and c) The dissertation effectively communicates the argument and results of the research. 2. The concentration also agreed to revise its assessment forms to reflect a 5 point ranking scale rather than the current 4 point scale, to conform its documents with the other department assessment tools. 3. In the coming year the concentration will be instituting an early measure in Engl 8120 Academic Writing and Publishing.

**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. No changes to the program will be introduced at this time.
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
Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

SLO 4: Exercise Physiology and Related Exercise Science (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 10, 11, 12, 13)
Students will be able to identify, discuss, and apply the concepts of anatomy, physiology, exercise physiology, biomechanics as they apply to the proper conduct of physical activity and exercise programs

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

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

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

SLO 5: Pathophysiology and Risk Factors (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 14, 15, 16, 17)
1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the risk factors that underlie the major chronic diseases.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
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.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 7: ECG and Diagnostic Techniques (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 26, 27, 28)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss normal and abnormal cardiac rhythms and other ECG abnormalities that may present at rest and/or during exercise.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 8: Patient Management and Medications (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 29, 30)**

Students will be able to identify and discuss the effects major cardiovascular, pulmonary, and metabolic medications and how these are used to manage patients with these diseases.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical 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.

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 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

**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 10: Nutrition and Weight Management (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 35, 36)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss basic nutrition and weight management concepts as they apply to those who will engage in exercise programs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience,
meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

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

SLO 11: Human Behavior and Counseling (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 37, 38)
1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the application of basic human behavior and counseling strategies as they apply to physical activity and exercise programs.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

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

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: First Aid Cpr Certification (O: 1)
CPR and First Aid certification pass rates in KH 3390 Advanced First Aid and Emergency Care
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Safety, Injury Prevention, Emergency Procedures
10% passed

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

M 2: ACSM Domain Score (O: 1)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 3: Practical Exam score KH 3500 (O: 1)
Practical Exam Score in KH 3500 Athletic Training
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 4: Practical Exam KH 4630 (O: 1)
Practical Exam Score in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 5: KH 4350 Project (O: 2)
Performance on KH 4350 Fitness Center Management Project (CTW)
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 6: ACSM Domain score (O: 2)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
<p>| M 7: KH 4630 Case Study Presentation (O: 3) | Performance on KH 4630 Case Study Presentation | Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| M 8: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 3) | Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Case Study | Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| M 9: Domain Score on ACSM Exam (O: 3) | Domain score on ACSM Exam | Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| M 10: KH 3650 Lab scores (O: 4) | Lab scores in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise | Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| M 11: KH 3600 Lab scores (O: 4) | Lab scores in KH 3600 Biomechanics | Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level |
| M 12: ACSM Domain Score (O: 4) | Domain score on ACSM Exam | Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| M 13: Pre Post Test KH 3650 (O: 4) | Pre Post test KH 3650 | Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery |
| M 14: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 5) | Performance on Case Studies in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription | Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| M 15: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 5) | Performance on Case Studies in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology | Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| M 16: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 5) | Domain score on ACSM Exam | Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| M 17: KH 4360 Final Exam (O: 5) | Performance on Final Examination in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology | Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| M 18: KH 4630 Practical Exam (O: 6) | Performance on practical exam in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription | Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) |
| M 19: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6) | Domain score on ACSM Exam | Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| M 20: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 6) | Performance on Case Study in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription | Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| M 21: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 6) | Performance on Case Study in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology | Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| M 22: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6) | Domain score on ACSM Exam | Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: KH (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on lab practical in KH4630 Lab Practical 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: KH 4360 Lab practical (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on lab practical in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 25: KH 3650 Lab assignments (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on lab assignments in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 26: KH 4360 Exam (O: 7)</th>
<th>Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 27: KH 4360 Practical Exam (O: 7)</th>
<th>Performance on practical exam in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 28: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 7)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 29: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 8)</th>
<th>Performance on case study presentation in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 30: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 8)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 31: KH 4630 Case Study (O: 9)</th>
<th>Performance on KH 4630 Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 32: KH 4630 Exercise Prescription Project (O: 9)</th>
<th>Performance on exercise prescription project in KH4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 33: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 9)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 34: KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Exam (O: 9)</th>
<th>KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology exam.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 35: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 10)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 36: Exams KH 2520, KH 3000 (O: 10)</th>
<th>Performance in KH 2520 Performance and Analysis: Fitness and Aerobics , and KH 3000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 37: KH 4280 Exam (O: 11)</th>
<th>Performance on take home assignments in KH 4280 Psychology of Physical Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 38: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 11)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**ACSM Examination Procedures**

Students will begin taking the required ACSM examination during the Fall of 2009. Meetings will be held with all students registered for KH 4750 Practicum in Exercise Science to inform students of the examination requirements and to conduct a review session. Practice examinations have been posted on ULearn that allow students to check their readiness for the examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeff Rupp, Program Coordinator Other exercise science faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Implementation of new Objectives**

During the past academic year (2010-2011) faculty in the exercise science program identified and adopted all new program objectives for the B.S. in Exercise Science program. These new objectives better reflect the knowledge skills and abilities that students must exhibit in order to successfully pass the American College of Sports Medicine professional certification program. Because this was an extensive revision of the current objectives, the process was very time consuming and performance data was not collected during this time period.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** During the 2011-2012 academic year faculty will be determining achievement targets and measures as well as collecting performance data on each objective. This data will be 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.

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The M.S. degree program in Exercise Science prepares students at the graduate level to enter fields of worksite health promotion or fitness, cardiac rehabilitation, or related clinical programs; or to perform research in exercise science, including biomechanics and exercise physiology. The program includes classroom, laboratory, research, and field experience biomechanics, exercise physiology, fitness assessment, exercise program design, and program management and related interdisciplinary coursework. The concentration areas within the degree program provide advanced academic preparation for a successful career in the health and fitness field or for advancement to doctoral-level study.

**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, 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)**
  
  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)**
  
  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.
Education Programs.

O/O 4: Understands research and human subjects issues (G: 1) (M: 4)
Students should understand and interpret research in exercise science and should understand issues associated with clinical testing and research involving human subjects, including informed consent.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.6, 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.8, 2.6.0.4, and 2.6.0.5. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Target achievement was met. Students demonstrated success in this measure, with 93% of students scoring at or above 80% on exams/quizzes in the following classes: KH 6280, KH 7500, KH7510, KH 7550, KH7620, 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
98% of students demonstrated proficiency on this measure based on the following courses: KH 6280, KH 7510, KH 7550, KH 7620 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
98% of the students demonstrated success in this measure in the following courses: KH 6280, KH 7500, KH 7510, KH 7550, KH 7620 and KH7630.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
50% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam
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: Applies knowledge to practical situations

Implementation Description: 2009-2010
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science Faculty

Review and/or Revise Outcomes/Objectives
Review and/or revise outcomes/objectives to insure they best reflect outcome requirements associated with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs and/or industry best practice standards

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
- Measure: Case Studies and Labs | Outcome/Objective: Understands research and human subjects issues
- Measure: GXT practical exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing
- Measure: Practical Exams | Outcome/Objective: Applies 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

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
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 major change in the program occurred in 2009-2010 when the Exercise Science (M.S.) faculty changed KH 7710 Practicum in Exercise Science to include a national level standardized exam from the American College of Sports Medicine. Before this change, all of our assessments were based on student performance in select courses and in laboratory based practical exams. The national exam has provided us with an external marker of student learning outcomes. The discrepancy in student performance on the American College of Sports Medicine national exam (60-70% of students passing the exam [target of 80%]) and the internal learning outcomes (improved from 89-100% in 2008 to 100% in 20012) has prompted us to review possible explanations for the difference in performance. Changes being reviewed include the requirement of students to take the exam a second time if they fail to pass on their first attempt and obvious course content/curriculum changes to address deficient areas highlighted by ACSM exam results. In addition, we are in the process of creating evaluation rubrics for internship site supervisors and thesis advisors.

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 have been no major changes have been to the M.S. Exercise Science program itself in the last year. However, changes have been made to course syllabi that emphasize measurable student learning outcomes as opposed to traditional course objectives.
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: Has an introductory sense of how cinematic pleasure occurs. Has a basic understanding of the mechanisms of spectator positioning and identification. Articulates the basic theoretical underpinnings of spectatorship. Discusses complications in identification (art cinema, multiple identifications, etc.)

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

**Curriculum Revision**

It is anticipated that a significant revision of the Film/video curriculum will be approved for implementation in the Fall 2011. The new curriculum will provide an opportunity for the faculty to articulate in more precise language the desired learning outcomes of the new curriculum. Greater participation by the faculty will facilitate the adoption of the goals, learning outcomes and other details of the assessment process, especially in regard to collecting data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** meetings to discuss the revised curriculum and its assessment
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Film/video faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Fundamental Concepts**

Determine system by which students’ understanding of the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scene, editing, and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning can be measured.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty need to find ways that a conversation about media aesthetics can be linked to other program
discussions about other learning outcomes.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Film/Video faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Improve student performance
Only one of the goals/learning outcomes, production/post-production, met its assessment target. The faculty should discuss how the instruction of mise-en-scene and fundamental media aesthetics can be used to teach students about spectatorship, textual pleasure, narrative structures, and interpreting ideas and meaning from moving images. A few questions to be considered for the new curriculum: - Are class discussions preparing students for the writing assignments and are the goals of the assignments clearly detailed in class? - Do class discussions emphasize aspects of media that are not associated with curricular goals, e.g. arguments within moving image media, developing meaning through moving images, etc. - Can instructors be encouraged to foster a better class conversation about the generation of spectatorial pleasure? A challenging aspect of media culture is the ways in which it discourages introspection or reflexivity in its audience.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty meetings to discuss the new curriculum and its assessment.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Film/video faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Narrative Structure Assessment
Develop system to determine if students can identify and discuss various narrative structures media employ for story delivery.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Conduct program-wide discussion of differences between story and narrative, a challenging differentiation given current media ability to paint over such distinctions.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Film/Video faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Spectatorial Pleasure
How to create system to assess students' understanding of the generation of spectatorial pleasure. Recognize and articulate a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: A challenging aspect of media culture is the ways in which it discourages introspection or reflexivity in its audience. Film/Video faculty will examine ways to assess students' understanding.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
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)
critically. (3) Technical knowledge. Students should possess a strong technical knowledge of finance.

**Goals**

G 2: Students will become proficient in using quantitative skills for financial analysis.

G 3: Student will be equipped with a very broad knowledge base in finance.

G 4: Students will become prepared for financial practice.

G 5: Students will employ critical thinking in financial decision-making.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1:** The development and application of foundation knowledge (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)

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

The 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 modeling 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 (G: 3, 4, 5) (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 the 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 the purpose 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-Fall2012: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2012 and "Exhibit 1b-Spring2013: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2013. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013:BBA Assessment Plan and Alignment" (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). 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 level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance or higher and that their development and application of technical skills thus meets our targets.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). These
findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance or higher and that their
development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills thus meets our targets.

**M 2: National performance indicator: ETS (O: 1, 2, 3)**

All GSU BBA students take the Educational Testing Service ("ETS") Major Field Test that evaluates performance of each student across the major disciplines typically offered within BBA programs. These areas include disciplines such as finance, accounting, economics, marketing, management, legal studies, and international. Performance of our finance majors are reported and also are tracked relative to national performance of undergraduate BBA students. For current and historic results, please see "Exhibit 3-2013: 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.

**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 2-2013: 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 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

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**

The student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) should align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

The student learning outcomes pertaining to the development and application of technical skills in representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) should align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The student learning outcomes pertaining to the development and application of technical skills in representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

The student learning outcomes pertaining to the development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills in representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) should align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The student learning outcomes pertaining to the development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills in representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**M 4: Enhance student practical training (O: 2, 3)**

To enable students to engage in the practicum of finance, we partner with Atlanta area corporations to offer field study experiences to students. These field study assignments, offered in conjunction with FI 4391 "Field studies in finance", allow students to gain course credit, 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 past several years continues to indicate high levels of satisfaction of employers and high levels of applied learning on the part of student participants.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

Students should have opportunities to engage in practical training in specialized areas of finance such as investment management, corporate finance, and financial institutions.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The Department has been successful in finding corporate partners in the various specialty areas of finance.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The Department has been successful in finding corporate partners in the various specialty areas of finance.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

The Department requires senior managers at sponsoring organizations to provide mentoring and training that will enable students to enhance and use the analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills learned in their programs of study.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students participating this past year in field study courses did receive mentoring and opportunities for developing and...
applying finance skills from senior executives at our partner firms.

### 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 continue to create and update 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 (CTW)
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

  **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
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Enhance student practical training | **Outcome/Objective:** The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

  **Implementation Description:** continuous

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Milind Shrikhande and Richard Fendler

#### Action Plan re ETS Findings
Based on the initiatives taken during the past year, student performance in all testing disciplines either improved or remained at satisfactory high levels, resulting in our continuing to meet our targets. We will continue with our initiatives and monitor performance to ensure that we continue to meet targets.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** National performance indicator: ETS | **Outcome/Objective:** The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

  **Implementation Description:** Immediate

  **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2014

#### Curriculum Innovation
To add new courses and revise existing courses to keep pace with the latest advancements in finance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Implementation Description:** During the past year one new course was added to the curriculum: FI 4080 Financial Modeling. During the next year we plan to introduce two new courses FI 4210 Portfolio Practicum and FI 4260 Hedge Funds, Mutual Funds, and Trading Strategies.

#### Program Innovation
As a result of our program assessments over the past several years, we have identified a need to provide a unique opportunity for high performing students to learn finance at an advanced level. This thinking has resulted in a proposed honors program dedicated to finance majors. We anticipate College approval and a launch sometime during the next academic year.
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 new and different instructors 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 in the required FI 4000 and FI 4020 classes, and increasing incorporation of international finance issues into the curriculum has resulted in significant improvement in classes and in student exit testing performance. 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. Also, given the presence of Bloomberg data terminals in the Department, an increasing number of students are obtaining professional certification on their use.
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2012-2013 Finance MS
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Description: The Master of Science degree program with a major in Finance is designed for individuals with undergraduate business or other major-based 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 become knowledgeable about the discipline of finance and related business practices.

G 2: Conceptual and technical skills development
Students will be equipped conceptually and technically for financial model building and analysis.

G 3: Problem-solving skills for real world application
Students will become proficient in problem-solving used in the analysis of commonly encountered issues in the practice of finance.

G 4: The development of critical thinking skills
Students will become critical thinkers for analyzing complex financial issues.

G 5: Professional leadership skills
Students will become adequately 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 (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The MS-Finance student 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 (G: 2, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Technical skills the MS-Finance student 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 (G: 3, 5) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The MS-Finance student will: (i) Possess knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization from corporate finance, investments, or financial institutions and markets. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)

To examine student performance in select courses from each specialization (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310), the course instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exams] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on these five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 1-2013: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2013. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013: 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

Median scores shall be at least at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (for which links indicate the specific document). These findings indicate that our MS students are continuing to learn at least at or above the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.

Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills

Median scores shall be at least at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (where the links indicate specific documents). These findings indicate that our MS students are continuing to learn at least 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 least at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (where the links indicate specific documents). These findings indicate that our MS students are continuing to learn at or above the expected level of performance and that their analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills meet our targets.

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 3-2013: MS Exit Survey". In addition, we have conducted a course satisfaction survey based on the Spring 2012, Summer 2012 and Fall 2012 Fast Track MS-Finance semesters. On 'Satisfaction about quality of program', 77.3% agree or strongly agree the program quality is satisfactory. On 'Importance in employment opportunities', 68.2% agree or strongly agree the program is important in seeking employment opportunities. The weak link is 'Pleased with career services' where only 18.1% agree or strongly agree indicating they need far better career services support. The findings overall 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 2-2013: MS Assessment Plan and Alignment" for details showing how student 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

Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge
The representative questions testing student learning outcomes pertaining to development and application of foundation knowledge should be completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
This alignment indicates that the representative questions testing student learning outcomes are completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

The alignment of representative questions testing student learning outcomes pertaining to development and application of technical skills should be completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
This alignment indicates that the representative questions testing student learning outcomes are completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

The alignment of representative questions testing student learning outcomes pertaining to the development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills should be completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
This alignment indicates that the representative questions testing student learning outcomes are completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

**M 4: Enhance student practical training (O: 2, 3)**

To enable MS-Finance students to engage in the practicum of finance, we partner with Atlanta area corporations to offer field study experiences to students. These field study assignments, offered in conjunction with FI 8391 "Field Studies in Finance", allow students to gain course credit as well as the opportunity to work with senior managers on real world projects that are of implementable interest to these organizations. Feedback over the last several years indicates high levels of satisfaction of employers and high levels of applied learning on the part of student participants.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

Students should have opportunities to engage in practical training in specialized areas of finance such as investment management, corporate finance, and financial institutions.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
The Department has been successful in finding corporate partners in the various speciality areas of finance.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

The Department requires senior managers at sponsoring organizations to provide mentoring and training that will enable students to enhance and use the analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills learned in their programs of study.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students participating this past year in field study courses did receive mentoring and opportunities for developing and applying finance skills from senior executives at our partner firms.

**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 2012-13 at approximately 625, based on a sample-study of students admitted to the program. To maintain and improve upon these gains in student quality, there is need to refine certain aspects of the program based on formal and informal student feedback. The technical background courses in Management Science can overlap with a student's prior coursework. These courses could be replaced with higher level courses tailored to each student's career goals and prior preparation. These substitutions have now been permitted during the past few years. The Department continues to review its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace. In response, we have most recently added two courses: FI 8350 "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and FI 8260 "Hedge funds and their trading strategies." These two courses have been successfully taught now for 2 cycles and are among our most popular courses. Looking forward to the 2013-2014 academic year, we will continue to review the curriculum and identify potential new courses that will provide students with important skill sets relevant to their professional development.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** MS-Finance Exit Survey Responses
- **Outcome/Objective:** The development and application of technical skills

Implementation Description: continuous

Responsible Person/Group: Professors Milind Shrikhande and Gerry Gay

**Practical training**

Our experience in developing and offering the field-study in finance course FI 8391 continues to prove highly useful for providing MS-Finance students with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial
global business organizations). We will continue to identify additional corporate partners for purposes of expanding opportunities for students to participate in these internship / field-study opportunities every semester. 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 PMBA program to similarly complete the MS-Finance degree requirements in an efficient manner. Further improvements were planned for the summer schedule commencing in January 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 has now been exceeded during the next cycle: the January 2013 cohort has 35 students.

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

Curriculum Innovation
We have added FI 8360 "Special Topics in Finance" to the cohorted fast track version of the M.S. Finance degree program. This will allow us to bring to the classroom topics dealing with recent innovation and developments in financial markets.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

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?

During the 2012-2013 academic year, there were one significant change made in the assessment process of the MS-Finance program since last year’s assessment report whereby we selected two courses within the fast track set of classes as part of the courses assessed. Also, 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. For the 2012 cohort of students in the Fast Track MS-Finance program, course effectiveness surveys of students were conducted during the Fall 2012 semester. We hope that such surveys will be implemented with each cohort going forward during the Fall semester to include 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.

Three 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 continues to seek the proper balance of work experience so as to ensure that students are of high quality and possess appropriate work experience. Due to this change and improvement in marketing efforts of the program, 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 during the past year 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 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 positive feedback from students, we continue to seek participation from leading industry executives for guest lecturing and mentoring to enhance student learning in the classroom and student professional development.

Georgia State University
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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 (in terms both of consumption and production 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
Students will achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
The stated target of 8.0-8.4 was met. There were two sections of Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts during this reporting cycle. The average student score in one section was 8.85 (meets target). Meanwhile, in the other section the average student score was 8.25 (meets target).
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 Collectioning 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

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

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

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

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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Geography BA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST*

(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**

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Student evaluates claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**SLO 2: Contemporary Issues - Diverse Disciplines (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students effectively analyzes contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.

**SLO 3: Methods (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students will learn concepts and methods of geographical research.

**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

**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

**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

**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
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 In order to improve scores on Outcome 10 (Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation) in Geography 4764 (Urban Geography), the instructor will provide students with solid examples of appropriate evaluations of claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: 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
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

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

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Geology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

We collected data related to earth systems from 4 courses (GEOL 1121, GEOL 1122, GEOG 1112, GEOG 1113) and tested a total of 1117 students. Of the students tested, we found the following: In GEOL 1121: 79% answered Question #1 correctly. 95% answered Question #2 correctly. 80% answered Question #3 correctly. 52% answered Question #4 correctly. 95% answered Question #5 correctly. In GEOL 1122: 84% answered Question #1 correctly. 61% answered Question #2 correctly. 39% answered Question #3 correctly. 59% answered Question #4 correctly. 52% answered Question #5 correctly. In GEOG 1112: 49% answered Question #1 correctly. 35% answered Question #2 correctly. 69% answered Question #3 correctly. 38% answered Question #4 correctly. 59% answered Question #5 correctly. In GEOG 1113: 83% answered Question #1 correctly. 81% answered Question #2 correctly. 81% answered Question #3 correctly. 91% answered Question #4 correctly. 79% answered Question #5 correctly. Note: Data for GEOG 1112 is reported here for the first time. No data were collected previously for this course.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

We collected data related to global society from 1 course (GEOG 1101) and tested a total of 88 students. Of the students tested, we found the following: In GEOG 1101: 34% answered Question #1 correctly. 69% answered Question #2 correctly. 89% answered Question #3 correctly. 73% answered Question #4 correctly. 22% 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: In-Progress
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 they were new to the faculty teaching the courses. When we next teach these courses, the faculty should be aware of the questions and prepared 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Exam Questions for Natural Processes | Outcome/Objective: Earth System

Evaluation of Questions & Conceptual Understanding

We did not meet our goals for several of the questions on the examinations based on data from both fall 2012 and spring 2013. Questions with low success that should be investigated include Question #1 and Question #5 (GEOG 1101). A re-evaluation of these questions is recommended (e.g., level of difficulty/detail, appropriate content, etc.). Following a review of these questions, an examination regarding how conceptual understanding can be strengthened is needed.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Exam Questions for Society and Environment | Outcome/Objective: Global Society
Evaluation of Questions & Conceptual Understanding
We did not meet our goals for several of the questions on the examinations. Questions that indicate low success based on data from both fall 2012 and spring 2013 in the GEOL sequence are Question #4 (GEOL 1121) and Question #3, Question #4, and Question #5 (GEOL 1122). A re-evaluation of these questions is recommended (e.g., level of difficulty/detail, appropriate content, etc.).

Following a review of these questions, an examination regarding how conceptual understanding can be strengthened is needed. Questions for GEOG 1113 demonstrate high success both semesters; however, an investigation into the low scores in GEOG 1112 is needed. Data are only available for the spring in GEOG 1112; additional data may offer more insight. A re-evaluation of these questions is a first step.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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?

This is the first year we have purposefully and strategically collected assessment data for our core courses. It is a great first step in identifying issues regarding consistency in course content and student learning outcomes. Faculty discussions early on regarding which questions to ask students as part of this work were informative in that differences in material stressed by various instructors were recognized. Now that we have a year of performance data for students, it is even more apparent that a 1) revision of questions is needed requiring faculty to improve in agreeing upon key content areas in the course, 2) consideration as to how best to assess learning overall is recommended and whether or not the current format is the most useful approach, and 3) reflection regarding how we can better address gaps in student knowledge moving forward is essential. We will continue to collect data in the coming year but with modifications in how better to assess student success in these 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 CORE courses mostly serve as an overview to GEOL and GEOG for non-majors. No major changes are expected at present based on assessment data to the courses/curriculum/sequence as related to degrees offered by GEOS. However, as explained in the previous question, a discussion regarding consistency of content covered in these courses is needed.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Geology BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

Mission Purpose The Department of Geosciences at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in instruction and research in the Earth Sciences. We expect all our graduates to develop a thorough knowledge base in geology which will place them in a good position for moving on to graduate school or to employment in geology. We expect each graduate to have a strong understanding of the constitution of the earth; earth processes, both internal and external; and earth history.

**Goals**

**G 1: 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.
### 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 out of 5, or high, on foundation knowledge acquisition. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on 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.

- **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 out of 5, or high, on information evaluation. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on 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
Students will learn research and practical knowledge toward success in their respective fields of Geography and Geology.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Quality Thesis Research (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Students will demonstrate quality research design and implementation for each of the Geosciences concentrations: Geography and Geology. The outcomes include: coverage of topic, quality of data collected, quality of interpretation, discussion and conclusions.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thesis - Overall (O: 1)**

The thesis for each concentration (Geography and Geology) will be measured on a five-point scale rubric for introduction/thesis statement, quality of information and evidence, organization and development of ideas, language conventions, and documentation. The findings for this measure is the average score among all theses for each of the above variables.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.4. This outcome was met.

**M 2: Thesis - Introduction (O: 1)**

The introduction/thesis statement for each thesis will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.3. This outcome was met.

**M 3: Thesis - Information (O: 1)**

The quality of information and evidence for each thesis will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.4. This outcome was met.

**M 4: Thesis - Evidence Support (O: 1)**

The support of ideas and evidence for each thesis will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.1. This outcome was met.

**M 5: Thesis - Organization (O: 1)**

The introduction/thesis statement for each thesis will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.1. This outcome was met.

**M 6: Thesis - Language Conventions (O: 1)**
The language conventions for each thesis will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.5. This outcome was met.

**M 7: Thesis - Documentation (O: 1)**

The documentation for each thesis will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Quality Thesis Research**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 16 theses. The mean scores for outcome 2 was 3.6. This outcome was met.

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

**Thesis Action Plan**

The areas of weakness in many theses are the support of ideas and evidence and the organization and development of ideas. Therefore, the parts of the theses that are associated the most with critical thinking are where our students performed the worst. Graduate faculty members in the Department of Geosciences will place more emphasis on guiding their advisees in making connections within the thesis and in developing a well-organized thesis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** All members of a thesis committee will be asked to pay special attention to how a students supports ideas and evidence in his/her thesis and how the student organized and developed ideas in the thesis.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy E. Diem
- **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 focused only on the student theses in this report, since we feel that the various components of a thesis are the best measures of student learning. We do not plan on making any changes to the assessment process 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.

We have found that our students produce high-quality theses, with the areas of weakness in many theses being the support of ideas and evidence and the organization and development of ideas. Therefore, the parts of the theses that are associated the most with critical thinking are where our students performed the worst. Graduate faculty members in the Department of Geosciences will place more emphasis on guiding their advisees in making connections within the thesis and in developing a well-organized thesis.
G 4: Knowledge of German Literature
Student will understand the particularities of German literature in light of broad historical and cultural contexts.

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 analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

Target for O6: Knowledge of German Literature
Students will achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
One Course of German 3311 (Reading German Literature) was taught during this period (the course was taught in Fall 2012). Students majoring in German achieved a result of 8.2.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 German MA
As of 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Germany and German speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in German, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of German literature and culture, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

Goals

G 1: Goals for 2010-11
In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Effective writing, communicating and editing (M: 1)**

Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and follows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**SLO 2: Research and data collecting skills (M: 1)**

Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

**SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)**

Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

A committee of German professors will use the pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in German.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Gerontology MA**

(As of 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of Gerontology Institute is to offer students the opportunity to study gerontology to prepare for careers in the field of aging.

**Goals**

**G 1: administration track**

The M.A. curriculum in gerontology has been designed for two types of students, those desiring to pursue careers in administration and practice in the field of aging and those seeking careers in research and teaching. The goal for the aging program administration track is to prepare students for careers in the field of aging services and policy analysis with an emphasis on program design and administration. The goal for research track is to prepare students to enter doctoral programs in gerontology, sociology, psychology, poly studies, family studies or related fields. Both tracks emphasize an interdisciplinary curriculum, which utilizes courses from eight different departments across the university.

**G 2: research track**


**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Objectives - Administrative Track (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

For MA students in the Program Administration Track, the internship and Capstone seminar (Gero8850) are used by the institute to give the student an opportunity to demonstrate a master of an array of skills and knowledge appropriate to the discipline. The student's adviser will assess the student's performance on the Institute's set of five learning outcomes and the core competencies for the program administration track. These are the core track competencies: 1. Understand issues in aging administration and be able to organize, staff, and administer a program to serve older people. 2. Be able to write a proposal for establishing and funding a new aging program. 3. Understand how to use technology to support programs in aging. 4. Know about empirically validated interventions for older people and know ho to use quantitative and qualitative data to plan and evaluate services for older people. 5. Recognize the impact of public economic policies and programs on the lives of older people.

**Relevant Associations:**

**SLO 2: Objectives - Research Track**

For MA students in the Research Track, the thesis and thesis defense will be used by the Institute to give the student an opportunity to demonstrate a mastery of an array of skills and knowledge appropriate to the discipline. At the thesis defense, the thesis director will assess the student's performance on Institute's five sets of learning outcomes and the core competencies for the research track. The core track competencies are: 1. Be able to design and implement a research study investigating a specific question in gerontology or
be able to design and implement an evaluation of a program serving older people. 2. Be able to critically evaluate published research in gerontology. 3. Identify appropriate research methods, study design, and statistical analyses in gerontological research. 4. Be able to disseminate research findings in oral and written form to professional and lay audience. 5. Be able to design research in light of the dynamic nature of aging that reflect the diversity, ethnicity, and heterogeneity of aging population.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Capstone Seminar Score (O: 1)**
1. Understand issues in aging program administration and be able to organize, staff, and administer a program to serve older people. 2. Be able to write a proposal for establishing and funding a new aging program. 3. Understand how to use technology to support programs in aging. 4. Know about empirically validated interventions for older people and know how to use quantitative and qualitative data to plan and evaluate services for older people. 5. Recognize the impact of public economic policies and programs on the lives of older people.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Objectives - Administrative Track**
100% of students will score at least a 3.5 out of 4.

**M 2: Administrative Internship (O: 1)**

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Objectives - Administrative Track**
Completion of 120 hours of internship.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Health & Physical Education BSED**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 identify how individuals learn and develop and will 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 develop and implement a variety of assessments 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 identifies and 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
Measures, Targets, and Findings

O/O 2: Goal 2: Planning (M: 2)

Objective #1: Students will demonstrate ability to develop a contextual analysis and rationale for their physical education and health units as determined by the following criteria: a. Teachers will select instructional models based on in depth understanding and thoughtful reflection. b. Teachers will demonstrate a thorough understanding of the model, its strengths and limitation. 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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

Target: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Finding: Explanation of how task presentation is used in the HPE Program: Task presentation is used as a measure of competence in the ability to demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in teaching. PCK is the ability to combine content knowledge with pedagogical knowledge to effectively instruct specific groups of learners in schools. This assessment is broad covering pedagogical skills in the teaching of content that is developmentally and functionally appropriate. The rubric for scoring task presentation reflects qualitative behaviors that correspond respectively to the following: Lesson progresses use no refinement and extension activities to develop skills (1 point unsatisfactory); Lesson consists mostly of informing and application tasks (2 points needs improvement); Lesson progresses 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 outstanding). Analysis of Task Presentation: A total of 54% of candidates demonstrated very good or outstanding performance in task presentation in KH 4520, a midpoint evaluation metric. Task presentation scores improved after student teaching. A total of 80% of candidates following student teaching were very good/outstanding in their task presentation skills. These findings emphasize (1) 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 instructional plans being used. Established in Cycle: 2012-2013 Active Through: 2012-2013

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 2012-2013 - 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 of 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 teacher understanding and not student need. 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 would see 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 would see 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 result in the 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, 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 start early in 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 54% were very good/outstanding in writing a contextual analysis and rationale prior to student teaching. After the completion of student teaching 93% of HPE candidates were very good/outstanding in writing a contextual analysis and rationale prior to student teaching. After the completion of student teaching 93% of HPE candidates were very good/outstanding in writing a contextual analysis and rationale prior to student teaching. HPE candidates were very good/outstanding in writing block and lesson plans midway through their program. By the end of student teaching 100% of students were rated as very good/outstanding in writing block and lesson plans. Learning Goals and Objectives: Data from this key assessment show that 54% of candidates rate very good/outstanding in the writing of learning goals and objectives prior to student teaching with 100% being very good/outstanding in writing learning goals and objectives at the end of student teaching. · Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

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 of HPE content. KH 4520 and KH 4710 students are required to use multip types of assessments to determine P-12 student's learning of HPE content. KH 4520 was the first class students were required to conduct an analysis of student learning. HPE candidates completed an analysis of student learning in KH 4710 as part of their student teaching requirements. At this time, 80% of candidates received a score of very good/outstanding.

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 2012-2013 - 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 (KH4520) that requires them to analyze their ability to positively impact P-12 students' learning. All candidates in the program complete one/two 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 by 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 46% of candidates scored very good/outstanding on their ability to demonstrate their impact on student learning. HPE candidates completed an analysis of student learning in KH 4710 as part of their student teaching requirements. At these times, 80% of candidates received a score of very good/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 grading rubric for the models project conducted during the second half of student teaching and the models project conducted during the first half of student teaching. Some of these assignments, such as lesson reflections, are edited by full time HPE faculty, and (c) having teacher education requirements completed prior to teaching in place of the current 8 weeks of student teaching.

Suggestions are based on reflection of student assessment data. Analysis of Lesson Reflections Lesson reflections were the key assessment to evaluate candidate performance. Prior to student teaching 54% of BSEd candidates received very good or outstanding ratings for their lesson reflections. Reflection ratings of very good and outstanding rose 26% after student teaching to 80%. 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.

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 2012-2013 - 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. For these purposes, teachers are rated on their reflections during the lesson rather than just opinion. Reflections center on the impact that teacher performance had on student learning. Candidate offers suggestions for improving the delivery of lesson content to enhance student learning.

Suggestions are based on reflection of student assessment data. Analysis of Lesson Reflections Lesson reflections were the key assessment to evaluate candidate performance. Prior to student teaching 54% of BSEd candidates received very good or outstanding ratings for their lesson reflections. Reflection ratings of very good and outstanding rose 26% after student teaching to 80%. 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 work with content 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 content knowledge 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 at 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 student. On lesson reflections, 84% of candidates were very good or outstanding in their performance. 84% of candidates were very good or outstanding in their performance, which suggests 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 strengthen 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, 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 are anticipated to impact Fall 2011 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

Conversion to InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards (replacing the GA Framework for Teaching)
The Conceptual Framework, syllabi, and key assessments will be aligned to new InTASC standards.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Fall 2013 - KH 4510, 4520, 4530, and 4540 syllabi will be aligned with the new standards.

Exposure to specialized knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching in a distance learning environment
To comply with Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01 methods courses will integrate attention to effective teaching in a distance learning environment.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Spring 2014 - workshop for student teachers (KH 4710 and 4720) will focus on distance learning; syllabi will be revised to reflect addition of new learning outcome.

Prepare candidates to implement T-KES
To comply with Educator Preparation Rule 505-03.01 the HPE program will integrate an overview of the T-KES evaluation system in their syllabi. Sessions will be held focusing on T-KES during the PEF Induction Seminar each semester.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2013 - the HPE program will address T-KES in student teaching; candidates scheduled to student teach Spring 2014 will receive information on T-KES during the PEF Induction seminar Fall 2013. Spring 2014 - T-KES will be introduced to candidates in KH 3200; a workshop for student teachers will focus on T-KES; T-KES will be integrated into university observations of student teachers.
Responsible Person/Group: HPE faculty

Preparing teacher candidates to teach any state-mandated curriculum (CCGPS)
To comply with Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01 the HPE program will require evidence of GPS in course syllabi (courses with field experiences), and in candidates' lesson and unit plans.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Syllabi for KH 4510, 4520, 4530, 4540, 4710 and 4720 will be revised to reflect requirement of GPS. Lesson and unit plan templates will be revised.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: HPE faculty

Provide a tracking system to allow program to ensure quality and diversity of field placements.
To comply with Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01, the HPE program will track placements by grade levels, socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds as well as experiences in ESL and special education classrooms. Students will be required to document placement information for practica and field-based courses using Livetext. The unit will administer a tracking survey each semester to all students who are enrolled in courses with field-based assignments/placements.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Tracking information will begin Fall 2013. Evidence of tracking and documentation of quality of experiences will be available by Spring 2014.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2014
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education and HPE faculty
The teaching of the Code of Ethics and an assessment of ethics.

To comply with the Educator Preparation Rule 505-3.01, the HPE program will place attention to ethics prior to each field experience with additional attention to ethics and an assessment during practica.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Students scheduled for KH 4510 and KH 4520 (student teaching) Spring 2014 were assigned an online ethics training module and assessment to be completed prior to student teaching.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** HPE 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?

Since last year’s assessment report no changes were made in the assessment process. In the coming academic year we will continue to monitor assignment instructions and assignment quality based on the current rubric and make any changes necessary to ensure students continue to perform to meet and/or exceed target 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 from assessment findings indicate that our program is producing teacher candidates who are highly qualified in all areas of teacher effectiveness. Based on this year’s assessment data we will continue to focus on delivering quality instruction and providing field placements that allow students to apply content knowledge and skills.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**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 include the following: Determining what program or content changes will be required to implement edTPA. Our goal is to explore these changes in 2013-2014 and pilot edTPA in 2014-2015. Preparing our teacher candidates for T-KES (sate mandated teacher evaluation instrument).

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

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

### 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 P-12 students.

### 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.

### 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.

### Service to the External Community

**International Activities**

Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.


**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 P-12 students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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

**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**

- 4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching (G: 1, 2, 4, 5) (M: 2)**

Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach K-12 students, reflect on their teaching effectiveness, and make appropriate 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).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: KH 7240 Unit plan (O: 1)
Students are required to plan a unit of instruction. The plan should contain the teaching settings, the necessary content (skills to be taught and teaching progressions), assessments used to measure student learning, provisions for feedback, and a management plan for executing/delivering the unit to their students.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan**
- Target is 75% of program completers with at least 6 of the 9 indicators in the Unit Plan Project scored as Acceptable or Target.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- 80% of our program completers scored acceptable for KH 7240 unit plan.

### 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 30 (out of 40) on the instructional portion of the KH 7250 Models Project.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- In Spring 2012 the models project portion of the course was 40 points. Students needed to score at least 30 points in order to be placed within the established target of 75% on this particular item. All students enrolled in this class in Spring 2011 scored higher than 30 points on this assignment. Therefore, target was met.

### M 3: Project to demonstrate supervision competence (O: 3)
This project is a final project for the EDUC 8360 class. Following several exercises designed to teach them how to supervise others, teacher candidates are required to submit a final project where they actually do a live supervision with another teacher and then provide feedback to this teacher with the intent of improving teaching performance. Following the supervision experience, candidates are required to summarize the experience using data from the observation and a re-cap of the feedback provided to the person observed.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers**
- Target is 75% of program completers scoring at least 25 (out of 30) on both the digital and peer supervision projects.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- Of the 6 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 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, and next steps to help them grow).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models**
- Target is 75% of program completers scoring at least 30 (out of 40) points on the KH 7250 models project assignment.
### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

75% of our MED program completers scored at least 30 out of the 40 available points on the KH 7250 models project assignment.

### M 5: Research synthesis (O: 5)

The purpose of this assignment is to develop teacher candidate ability to develop a research question and then conduct a complete review of the extant literature on that topic. The candidate writes the research synthesis and then presents it to other students in KH 7820.

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

**Target for O5: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document**

Target is 75% of program completers scoring at least 37 (out of 45) on the major paper in KH 7820.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All students who completed this assessment scored at least 40 (out of 45) on this assessment, thus meeting the objective.
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teaching experience | Outcome/Objective: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching
Implementation Description: This plan will start with the next offering of this course and continue indefinitely.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

Summary of 2008-2009 Assessment data
Using the selected assessments in 2008-2009, it was determined from the Faculty end-of-program ratings that 100% of all students were meeting each of the five NBPTS Standards. The data were essentially the same for the 2007-2008 program completers, indicating consistency over time. Nonetheless, the HPE graduate faculty have begun discussions to revise the major research project in the program, away from the Collaborative Action Research (CAR) Project, to participation in ongoing faculty research efforts. Those discussions will proceed through the 2009-2010 academic year.
  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Finished
  Priority: High
  Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
  Responsible Person/Group: HPE Graduate faculty members, led by Mike Metzler, HPE graduate program coordinator.

Maintain and monitor
The assessment used to measure this outcome appears to be appropriate, and all completers met the stated objective. There is no need for change at this time.
  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: KH 7250 Instructional models project | Outcome/Objective: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models
  Implementation Description: maintain and monitor
  Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (course instructor)

Maintain and monitor
The assessment used to measure this outcome appears to be appropriate, and all three completers scored above the stated criterion, demonstrating their ability to conduct a research literature synthesis. There is no need to change at this time.
  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Research synthesis | Outcome/Objective: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document
  Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor
  Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (course instructor)
  Additional Resources: none

Maintain and monitor
These assessments appear to be appropriate for this outcome, and the program completers in this cohort all met the objective. There is no need for any changes at this time.
  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Project to demonstrate supervision competence | Outcome/Objective: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers
  Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor
  Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)

Re-calibrate the rubric used in this assessment
The rubric currently used in this assessment appears to be too stringent, as many more of the indicators should have been scored as "Target" but going by the definitions in the rubric had to be scored as "Acceptable."
  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: KH 7240 Unit plan | Outcome/Objective: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan
  Implementation Description: Revise the scoring rubric for this assessment in KH 7240
  Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund
  Additional Resources: none

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
The vision of the Institute of Health Administration (IHA) within the J. Mack Robinson College of Business at Georgia State University is to be a premier master's level educator of future healthcare/business leaders. The program is accredited by the AACSB and CAHME (The Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education) and is ranked 34th nationally (USNEWSWR, 2009). The mission is to prepare graduates to assume managerial and leadership positions in health sector organizations through 1) A leading-edge curriculum that integrates business and health care knowledge, 2) The engagement in scholarly inquiry related to the improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of health care services and the health care system, and 3) Providing and promoting professional service to the academic and health care communities.

Goals

G 1: Provide CAHME specified competency areas
Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical and medical issues affecting health care organizations.

G 3: Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment
This relates to the 1st domain of the HLA competency model

G 2: Business skills and knowledge
This relates to the 2nd domain of the HLA competency model

G 5: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
This is the 3rd domain of our hybrid HLA competency model

G 4: Develop leadership knowledge and skills
This is the 4th domain of our hybrid HLA competency model

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas (M: 1, 2, 9)
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)
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)
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)
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)
Competency in the areas of 1) self-awareness and
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
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 student evaluation of H.A. program during residency, capstone course, and on-going feedback
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas during residency
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance (O: 6)
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty (O: 6)
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Assessment of residents by HA faculty during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

M 9: Capstone questions (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students answer specified summative questions in capstone HA 8990 course
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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

Administrative residency and field study
The two semester health care management residency facilitates the transition from the classroom to the workplace by providing students with an entry point and extensive exposure to a health care management career. The full-time, off-campus residency assures that all graduates have an integrated experience that applies didactic knowledge in a real world health care setting.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills |
| Develop real world experience in the HA field |
| Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills |
| Develop real world experience in the HA field |
| Measure: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | Outcome/Objective: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills |
| Develop real world experience in the HA field |
| Measure: student evaluation of H.A. program | Outcome/Objective: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills |
| Develop real world experience in the HA field |
Goals

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.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate entry-level competence in the design, interpretation, and ethical conduct of nutrition research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will comprehend the interrelationships between macro- and micronutrient intakes as they impact human health in normal and disease states.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Understand the Essential Components of Delivering Health Services (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Research Proposal Assignment (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNHP 6000 (Research Methods for Health Professionals) – Research Proposal Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target – Of the total points available, 25% of students will receive a score of &gt;90% and 75% of students will receive a score of &gt;80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Research Presentation (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 6012 (Orientation to Practice) – Research Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Macronutrients Final Exam (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 6104 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Macronutrients) – Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the total points available on the exam, 25% of students will score &gt;90% and 75% will score &gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the total points available on the exam, 56% of students scored &gt;90% and 87% scored &gt;80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Micronutrients Quizzes (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Micronutrients) - Five quizzes are given during the semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the total points available on the quizzes, 10% of students will score &gt;90% and 50% will score &gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the total points available on the quizzes, 24% of students scored &gt;90% and 76% scored &gt;80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNHP 8000 (Trends Affecting Health Policy) – Debate on Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Of the total points available on the assignment, 100% of students scored >90%

### 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 2012-2013

- **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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Action Plan
Continue monitoring

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 History Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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)
Instructors will test and assess students based on questions asked in formal exams, quizzes, and/or in-class writing assignments. (Assignments testing these objectives are given at instructors' discretion.) 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Source Differentiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>60%</strong> to receive 2 or above; <strong>30%</strong> to receive 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Over the course of the 2012-2013 school year, students in HIST 2110 responded to questions/assignments that tested their ability to differentiate between primary and secondary sources. Each instructor of 2110 randomly selected five of those answers to submit to the History Department's Core Assessment Committee, for a total of 100 responses submitted. The instructors of these courses assessed the students' answers themselves, and then these assessments (and the assignments from which they were derived) were reviewed by the Assessment Committee. Of these 100 students, 9 received a 1, meaning that they were unable to differentiate between different kinds of historical sources. A total of 51 students received a 2, meaning that they were able to differentiate between different kinds of historical sources, but were not able to put those sources to use in historical interpretation. A total of 40 students received a 3, which means that they were able to both differentiate between types of sources and were able to use that knowledge in historical interpretation. The percentage breakdown is as follows: 1: 9% 2: 51% 3: 40% A total of 91% of our students received a two or above, which significantly exceeds our stated target of 60%. Our stated target of students receiving a 3, which was 30%, was also exceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors will test and assess students based on questions asked in formal exams, quizzes, and/or in-class writing assignments. (Assignments testing these objectives are given at instructors' discretion.) A student who receives a 1 cannot understand or explain encounters 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>60%</strong> to receive 2 or above; <strong>30%</strong> to receive 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Over the course of the 2012-2013 school year, students in HIST 2110 responded to questions/assignments that tested their understanding of historical context, in relation to political, economic, social, cross-cultural, or cross-geographic developments, encounters, or conflicts. Each instructor of 2110 randomly selected five of those answers to submit to the History Department's Core Assessment Committee, for a total of 100 responses submitted. The instructors of these courses assessed the students' answers themselves, and then these assessments (and the assignments from which they were derived) were reviewed by the Assessment Committee. Of these 100 students, 11 received a 1, meaning that they were unable to explain or indicate that they understood historical context. A total of 46 students received a 2, meaning that they were able to explain or indicate that they understood historical context at a rudimentary level. A total of 43 students received a 3, which means that they were able to explain and utilize historical context in a sophisticated way. The percentage breakdown is as follows: 1: 11% 2: 46% 3: 43% A total of 89% of our students received a two or above, which significantly exceeds our stated target of 60%. Our stated target of students receiving a 3, which was 30%, was also exceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Historical Geography (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors will test and assess students based on questions asked in formal exams, quizzes, and/or in-class writing assignments. (Assignments testing these objectives are given at instructors' discretion.) A student who receives a 1 cannot locate or identify selected locations. A student who receives a 2 can locate and identify selected locations, but cannot explain the role of chronology and change over time in geographic developments. A student who receives a 3 can locate and identify selected locations; can also explain the role of chronology and change over time in geographic developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Historical Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>60%</strong> to receive 2 or above; <strong>30%</strong> to receive 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Over the course of the 2012-2013 school year, students in HIST 2110 responded to questions/assignments that tested their ability to demonstrate knowledge of the historical geography of the United States. Each instructor of 2110 randomly selected five of those answers to submit to the History Department's Core Assessment Committee, for a total of 100 responses submitted. The instructors of these courses assessed the students' answers themselves, and then these assessments (and the assignments from which they were derived) were reviewed by the Assessment Committee. Of these 100 students, 13 received a 1, meaning that they were unable to locate or identify geographic locations. A total of 49 students received a 2, meaning that they were able to locate or identify geographic locations, but were not able to explain the role of chronology and change over time in geographic developments. A total of 38 students received a 3, which means that they were able to both locate and identify selected locations, and explain the role of chronology and change over time in geographic developments. The percentage breakdown is as follows: 1: 13% 2: 49% 3: 38% A total of 87% of our students received a two or above, which significantly exceeds our stated target of 60%. Our stated target of students receiving a 3, which was 30%, was also exceeded.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
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 teaches the US History survey (2110) to all undergraduates at Georgia State who do not place out of the course. As such, this course is an opportunity for our department to reach most of the students at Georgia State, introduce them to our discipline, and provide an overview of American history. Because so many professors and instructors are needed to teach many sections (approximately 40-45 per semester), there are a vast range of approaches to teaching this survey. But in the process of developing assessment objectives, the department concluded that three fundamental areas of student learning should be addressed in all of those sections. The department established three areas of historical understanding and student learning to assess: 1. differentiation of primary and secondary sources; 2. explaining encounters and conflicts in their historical contexts; and 3. identification and location of locations from contextual and chronological perspectives. The department set target goals that 60% of students measured would achieve a 2 or 3 with 2 meaning “developing” and 3 meaning “proficient.” (1 meant unsatisfactory.) The first year that we asked faculty and graduate student instructors to collect data, we found that we easily met and surpassed our targets. (See our “Findings” for 2012-13.) While we are pleased with having achieved our stated goals, we have also come to two conclusions. First, we needed to revise the assessment instrument to include a fourth category for “excellence.” Indeed, the 3 identifies only basic competence in skills considered fundamental to the discipline. (This revision has been completed; see our documents for the instrument/rubric for 2013-14, which we will use to assess our World History surveys this year.) Second, we need to emphasize to graduate student and Visiting Lecturers particularly that we need random selections. We suspect that some instructors were more inclined to provide better student work to reflect better teaching. (We have already done this as well; this year, instructors are to hand in the first three and last two students, alphabetically, when they gather their assignments to give to the assessment committee.) Since this was our first year of implementing our assessment program, we do not have anything with which to compare it. This will change next year, when we will have two years’ worth of data to consider. But we have been pleased to find that the process itself has required instructors to think about these three categories (source identification, historical encounters, and historical geography) in their courses explicitly. Instructors have remarked to us that it has made them more intentional about including these goals and paying attention to student mastery. For example, one tenured professor commented that she had not used a map in his U.S. History course in years, but this exercise prompted her to add one, which she found useful and worthwhile. Another positive and constructive result has been that the assessment committee has collected examples of every exam, quiz, or assignment that accompanied each assessment instrument. This means that we have already a rich library of useful exercises for faculty to consider in the future, as they teach and assess student learning in these three categories.

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.

At this point, we do not intend to change our department’s survey curriculum. This may change, though, as 1) we collect more data and have more information to work with, and 2) our department considers developing a version of the survey that incorporates technology in a “hybrid” or “flipped” fashion. 
### Mission / Purpose

Description: By majoring in history, students hone a set of practical skills while developing timeless values that will help them in numerous professions. Particular to the study of history is an awareness of changing interpretations—historiography—over time. The history student develops an appreciation for both interdisciplinary awareness and a comparative-global-transnational perspective of the past best suited for understanding the rapidly changing world of today. Therefore history students are better able to evaluate primary and secondary sources gleaned through a variety of research methods and assemble as arguments in both written and oral formats, all the while being tolerant of different approaches to and maintaining the integrity of historical knowledge. 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)

Using nineteen capstone HIST 4990 papers, five faculty members from the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee (reading four papers each from five different HIST 4990 classes taught over the 2012-2013 academic year) offered an assessment of instruction in the History BA Program. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning partially met the outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Three Department of History Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being Professional Skills, 2LO being Historiography, and 5LO being Professional Values. Two of the Department of History Standard Learning Outcomes, 3LO being Interdisciplinary Awareness and 4LO being Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective, were not assessed using the HIST 4990 papers. Over the past three years when engaged in self-assessment, it became apparent to the Undergraduate Studies Committee that the assessment tool, the use of the capstone paper from HIST 4990, failed to adequately demonstrate competency in both LO3 and LO4 because faculty who teach the class often design the research assignment around certain topics that might not engage these particular Learning Outcomes. Nevertheless these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet the requirements to graduate with a degree in history by
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 HST 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. [Preview Formatting] 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 01: Professional Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In reporting for 2013, the Department of History fell short of its benchmark of seventy percent meeting or exceeding expectations on Learning Outcome #1 on Professional Skills. Only fifty percent of graduating students, or nine out of nineteen capstone papers evaluated, demonstrated having met or exceeded department expectations, although most students nevertheless demonstrated some level of professional skills. Strategies adopted by the department to address such shortcomings have yet to substantially alter such assessments, as these numbers are fairly consistent with the reports from previous years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 02: Historiography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In reporting for 2013, the Department of History fell short of its benchmark of sixty percent meeting or exceeding expectations on Learning Outcome #2, historiography. Only forty-four percent of graduating students, or five out of nineteen capstone papers evaluated, demonstrated having met or exceeded department expectations, although most students nevertheless demonstrated some level of historiographical understanding. Strategies adopted by the department to address these shortcomings have yet to substantially alter such assessments, as these numbers are fairly consistent with the reports from previous years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 03: Interdisciplinary Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the three previous years, it became apparent to the Undergraduate Studies Committee that the assessment tool, the use of the capstone paper from Hist 4990, failed to adequately demonstrate competency in both Learning Outcome 3, Interdisciplinary Awareness, and Learning Outcome 4, Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. Faculty who teach the class often design the research assignment around certain topics that might not engage these particular Learning Outcomes. Nevertheless these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet the requirements to graduate with a degree in history by completing the CORE and taking at least one of each U. S., Europe, and World upper level courses. Consequently in consultation with the Office of Academic Assessment, this year’s Department of History self-assessment excluded Interdisciplinary Awareness from consideration when reading the capstone papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 04: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the three previous years, it became apparent to the Undergraduate Studies Committee that the assessment tool, the use of the capstone paper from Hist 4990, failed to adequately demonstrate competency in both Learning Outcome 3, Interdisciplinary Awareness, and Learning Outcome 4, Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. Faculty who teach the class often design the research assignment around certain topics that might not engage these particular Learning Outcomes. Nevertheless these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet the requirements to graduate with a degree in history by completing the CORE and taking at least one of each U. S., Europe, and World upper level courses. Consequently in consultation with the Office of Academic Assessment, this year’s Department of History self-assessment excluded Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective from consideration when reading capstone papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 05: Professional Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In reporting for 2013, the Department of History fell short of its benchmark of seventy percent meeting or exceeding expectations on Learning Outcome #1 on Professional Skills. Only fifty percent of graduating students, or nine out of nineteen capstone papers evaluated, demonstrated having met or exceeded department expectations, although most students nevertheless demonstrated some level of professional skills. Strategies adopted by the department to address such shortcomings have yet to substantially alter such assessments, as these numbers are fairly consistent with the reports from previous years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only fifty percent of graduating students, or nine out of nineteen capstone papers evaluated, demonstrated having met or exceeded department expectations, although most students nevertheless demonstrated some level of professional values. Strategies adopted by the department to address these shortcomings have yet to substantially alter such assessments, as these numbers are fairly consistent with the reports from previous years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>comparative/global/transnational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: capstone course seminar paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 03/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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-requests for 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):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values
Implementation Description: The department's undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Interdisciplinary Awareness
Implementation Description: The undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions during Fall 2010 and 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: Professional Skills
Implementation Description: The undergraduate studies committee will be working on these revisions during the fall semester and then bring them before the department as a whole early in the spring 2011 semester. They should be ready in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

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: Historiography

Implementation Description: The history 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. The new version 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 year’s 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
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the program of graduate education in History of Georgia State University is to prepare students at the MA level for professional activities in History and related fields. This involves not only the mechanics of research but abetting such personal qualities as accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, and evenhandedness. The Department demands active learning, involving the students in reading and participation in seminars, in research and analysis of primary sources, and in the presentation of the resulting finding in written and verbal formats that adhere to recognized professional standards. Graduates of GSU's graduate History program will be able to analyze conflicting information and viewpoints, write clearly and communicate ideas, find reliable evidence for judgments about human actions and motives, and place particular events in a wider context or historical pattern. Graduates are prepared not only to be competent historians and teachers but to function successfully in the larger community, both within and outside the academy. The Department thus seeks to prepare students for future careers, for the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society, and for the uncertainties that one encounters in relations to others.

Goals
G 1: Prepare student to research, write and teach history
Learning

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 (M: 1)**
A student’s writing skills will be assessed from a range of weak to exceptional.

**SLO 7: Oral Presentation & Participation (M: 1)**
The student’s oral presentation and participation will be rated from weak to exceptional.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**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: Assessment Instrument (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Professional Skills**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of at least 6 (Competent) in the Professional Skills category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
70% of the MA students received a score of 6 in the Professional Skills category.

**Target for O2: Historiography**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to score a 6 in the Historiography category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
76% of the MA students received a score of 6 in the Historiography category.

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of 6 in the Interdisciplinary Awareness category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
75% of the MA students received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of 6 in the Comparative/Global/Transnational perspectives category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
76% of the MA students received a score of 6 in this category.
**Target for O5: Professional Values**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of 6 in the Professional Values category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
83% of the MA students received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O6: Writing Skills**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of 6 in the Writing Skills category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
76% of MA students received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O7: Oral Presentation & Participation**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of 6 in the Oral Presentation & Participation category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
81% of the MA students received a score of 6 in this category.

**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 2013
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013
- **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?

We have not made any changes to the assessment instrument or to our learning outcomes. We plan to design a new instrument for the assessment of graduate comprehensive exams. The graduate committee will consider increasing the target for the MA students to 80% (up from 70%) for each learning outcome.

**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 for MA students. The instrument measures a number of student learning outcomes twice in the course of a semester: midpoint and end. At the midpoint of the semester, learning outcomes averaged 5.56, meeting the low-competent level. By the end of the semester, learning outcomes averaged 6.36, meeting the high-competent level, the baseline for our achievement outcome. The department will continue its mentoring program for first year MA students to ensure they are making progress toward meeting all outcome goals. In addition, the assessment outcome show that the department could do more to prepare MA students in basic outcomes, particularly in our required 7000-level core course offerings (where scores were in the low-competent range). We made significant changes to our curriculum in 2009, and are still in the process of evaluating the consequences of those changes.
**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 |
| G 3: Academic Honesty and Integrity |
| G 4: Global Perspective |

**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 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. |

| SLO 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. |

| SLO 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. |

| SLO 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. |

| 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. |

**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 |
| **Target for O1: Professional Skills** |
| At least 70% of PhD students will receive a score of 6 in the Professional Skills category |

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The target was met as 78% of PhD student received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O2: Historiography**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive a score of 6 in the Historiography category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
84% of the PhD student received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive a score of 6 in this category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
74% of the PhD students received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive a score of 6 in this category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
81% of the PhD students received a score of 6 in this category.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive a score of 6 in this category.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
88% of the PhD student received a score of 6 in this category.

**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.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The end of Spring semester 2010
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC 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 graduate program committee has made no changes since the 2011-2012 assessment report. We expect to design and implement a tool that will assist us with assessing student performance on our comprehensive exams. The graduate committee will consider increasing the PhD students to 80% (up from 70%) for each learning outcome.

**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 instrument measures a number of student learning outcomes twice in the course of a semester: midpoint and end. At the midpoint of the semester, learning outcomes averaged 6.0, just a few tenths of a point shy of our low-sophisticated level. PhD students seemed to perform exceptionally well in the “Comparative Perspectives”, “Professional Values”, and “Writing Skills” outcomes. Overall, the assessment outcomes show the PhD students tend to perform better than MA students, which we would expect given their level of training. In 2009-2010, we made significant changes to our PhD curriculum and we are continuing to assess the consequences of those changes which we geared mostly toward shortening the time required to complete the degree.
Mission / Purpose
What do students need to learn to prepare for careers in the hospitality field? Students are expected to understand the business processes essential to profitable, sustainable operations. Every hospitality course incorporates quality service principles including service to internal and external stakeholders and continuous improvement principles. Because this is a labor-intensive industry, there is a dedicated Hospitality Human Resources course and HR processes are covered in most hospitality courses (Hospitality Law - employment law, Cost Control and Financial Analysis - employee productivity, for example). Every hospitality course incorporates ethical decision-making and business practices. Technology is also a fundamental in the courses in terms of understanding how technology is used in any industry segment from hotels to restaurants to venues and event management. Technology applications that support the delivery of quality service are the focus. Marketing in the hospitality curriculum focuses on marketing principles for services rather than tangible goods. Industry specific courses (hotel management, restaurant management, event management, private club management, tradeshows and meetings management, for example) cover the trends and issues of that segment as well or organizational structure, functional areas, metrics used and service standards. The hospitality curriculum consists of seven required major courses and a variety of elective courses from which majors can select three (9 hours.) Hospitality majors are required to work at least 570 hours in industry-related positions. To certify that these hours have been worked, students are required to take "Hospitality Work Study" (HADM 4900) for which there is no fee and no credit hours. Students complete a work portfolio as part of this process.

The focus of the 2012-2013 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

SLO 1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4, 6, 7)
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. 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
5. Financial management
6. Ethical and socio-political influences affecting organizations
7. Strategic Management
8. Human resources
9. Exposure to critical thinking skills
10. Provision of an evaluative culminating experience

SLO 2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)
Students will be able to apply concepts and principles of financial analysis applied to the hospitality industry including cost control techniques and evaluate their effectiveness.

SLO 3: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills (M: 4, 5, 6)
A graduation requirement for hospitality majors is to work in the industry a minimum of 575 hours. The application of service skills is measured through a self-analysis of the student's work experience in a required work portfolio. The application of service knowledge and skills is also evaluated through an evaluation completed by the employer.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 4: Work Experience Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Hospitality majors are required to work a minimum of 575 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). The topic of sustainability is included in the work portfolio in order to address green operational practices and what the 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 skill 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 101 students completing the work portfolio from fall 2012 - summer 2013, 100% showed evidence of critical thinking skills in evaluating the application of service skills as well as analyzing organizational change, conflict management and working in a diverse workplace. In analyzing a sample of 25 of the 101 work portfolios, the level of evaluation and analysis was further reviewed to ascertain the level of learning of the students. Of the 25, all of the students (100%) experienced in their work places having to apply critical thinking skills in situations of providing service, handling change and/or conflict and working with diverse populations of both employees and clients/customers/guests. Through their written comments, the students evaluated the situations at hand and made decisions reflective of management-level thinking. Most telling were the comments in which each student related how they learned from the situation at hand and how they would handle similar situations differently in the future.

**Target for O2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results**

In the work portfolio, students were specifically asked to offer suggestions to maximize profitability for the business in which they worked including cost control suggestions or marketing strategies to increase revenue. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

A sample of 25 work portfolios were reviewed of the 101 students who submitted portfolios during the academic year 2012-2013. All of the students (100%) offered specific ideas including cost savings as well as revenue generation. The comments were reflective of evaluative and analytical skills displaying critical thinking abilities.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 101 students who completed the work portfolio in the 2012-2013 academic year, 100% comprehensively evaluated their ability to apply service knowledge and skills in their workplaces. These evaluations were a combination of delivering service to external customers (guests, clients) as well as internal customers (employees, owners) as well as handling service recovery (correcting service problems) situations.

**M 5: Employer Evaluation of Work Experience (O: 3)**

All hospitality majors are required to have a minimum of 575 hours of industry experience. Employers submit a written structured evaluation for each student under their supervision. These evaluations are regularly grouped and analyzed in terms of positive and negative feedback. The evaluation form (which is provided to employers) includes 12 factors: 1. Knowledge of areas involved in job position 2. Technical skills 3. Interpersonal and service skills with customers 4. Interpersonal and service skills with co-workers 5. Interaction with supervisors/managers 6. Written communication abilities 7. Oral communication abilities 8. Ability to accept feedback; Willingness to learn 9. Work habits (attendance, punctuality, accuracy) 10. Demonstration of potential leadership abilities 11. Credibility/ethical behavior 12. Work performance was reflective of what would be expected of a major in hospitality

**Source of Evidence:** Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Target for 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 101 students submitting work portfolios in the academic year of 2012-2013, 100% received a minimum of a satisfactory employer evaluation. Specifically, all students received at least a “satisfactory” rating for each of the 12 factors being evaluated. Of the 101, 25 employer evaluations were analyzed in measuring areas there were rated less than “outstanding” or “above expectations.” Six students received satisfactory ratings with the breakdown as follows: Knowledge areas involved in
job position(s): 2 Technical skills involved in job position(s): 3 Interpersonal service skills with customers: 2 Interpersonal service skills with co-workers: 1 Written communication abilities: 1 Oral communication abilities: 2 Ability to accept feedback; willingness to learn: 1 Work habits (attendance, punctuality, accuracy): 3 Demonstration of potential leadership abilities: 3 Credibility/ethical issues: 0 Work performance was reflective of what would be expected of a major in hospitality: 1

### 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 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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-2013 academic year, 125 students completed the course, "Food Production and Service Management." A requirement of this course is to take the national certification test for food safety and sanitation. Of the 125 students completing this course, 123 passed on the first attempt (98.4%).

**Target for O3: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 125 students taking the exam, 123 (98.4%) passed the certification exam on the first attempt.

### M 7: Hospitality Field Project (O: 1)

The measure selected for the 2012-2013 academic year was a field project completed by hospitality majors during spring semester 2013 through HADM 4800, "Hospitality Strategic Management." The students worked with the leaders of Stone Mountain Village, located at the foot of Stone Mountain with a population of approximately 5,000, in developing a strategic plan for enhancing tourism capacity for the small town. This was a comprehensive project incorporating analyses of the local economy, a SWOT analysis, a market feasibility study and evaluation of resources on many levels from financial to geographic and infrastructure. The delineation of goals for increasing tourism and action steps were also included.

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 90% of the hospitality majors in the senior capstone course will make a contribution to the analysis section of the project. The class was divided into teams and each team had to analyze the current business operations of the town including hotel/lodging operations, foodservice operations, special events as well as analyze entities competing with the town in drawing visitors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

There were 49 students in the senior capstone course for spring 2013. All students contributed to either the analysis of the town or the analysis of competitors of the town. The students had to document their contributions which were then verified with their group members.

### 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

The School of Hospitality will be conducting its Self Study in conjunction with reaccreditation through the Accreditation Commission for...
Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA) in 2013-2014. Curricular review is part of this process and will be ongoing as the Self Study is written between fall 2013 and spring 2014.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 12/2014
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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Dave Pavesic

Utilization of Smith Travel Research Data
Smith Travel Research data has been purchased to be incorporated into specific hospitality courses including HADM 3010, HADM 3310 and HADM 4100. Faculty will be trained in how to use these data and integration into courses will start fall 2011 and will expand in spring 2012.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Diana Barber, Paul Breslin, Soon-Ho Kim

Revised Employer Evaluation Form
The Employer Evaluation will be revised to include more in-depth areas of feedback on each student's performance.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Employer Evaluation of Work Experience | Outcome/Objective: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills

Implementation Description: There is a section for additional comments which is frequently used.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Debby Cannon

Revised Work Study Portfolio
A revised student Work Portfolio format will be developed adding more structure and asking for more details in several of the analytical areas of business operations.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Work Experience Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations

Implementation Description: A structured format does exist for the Work Portfolio. This will be a minor revision inserting more needed details.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Debby Cannon

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
The major CTW accomplishments included utilizing the work portfolio in a more comprehensive manner to evaluate student knowledge and skill areas. There continues to be emphasis of applied knowledge to industry needs and this was achieved through a comprehensive project in Hospitality Strategic Management and the food safety certification test. The feedback from employers is also receiving more attention through a regular analysis of the employer evaluation form.

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 entry level for hospitality majors is typically the course, "Perspectives of the Hospitality Industry." The course is introducing the student to most segments of the hospitality and tourism industry. The learning objectives for the course include analyzing and evaluating how the segments of the industry work together and support one another. As a student moves through the hospitality curriculum, the evaluative and analytical skills become more intense and are applied to an in-depth analysis of either a functional area (such as Human Resources, Marketing, Financial Analysis, Legal and Governmental Regulations) or a specific industry segment (evaluation of the profit and loss in a hotel or restaurant, budgeting for a special event, developing a marketing plan for locale, limiting liability for a resort). There is evidence through the results reported for the hospitality capstone course that the critical thinking skills are being applied at a level expected of an entry-level manager.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The area of financial analysis, one facet of critical thinking, is receiving more attention over the 2013-2014 academic year. In a pilot program, each hospitality course will be provided with additional content on profit and loss analysis through a series of lectures from one of our part-time instructors who is a CPA and a consultant in the industry. We will be tracking the ability to apply this information from the lower-level courses to when students take HADM 4100, "Hospitality Cost Control and Financial Analysis."

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

CTW is not limited to the one course taken as a CTW in hospitality. Based on feedback from employers and alumni, we realized the need to incorporate critical thinking skills and improved oral and written communication in all hospitality courses. We do institute over the 2012-2013 academic year, a resource that supports analytical thinking. The resource (called the SHARE Center through Smith Travel Research) is available for academic settings and provide faculty and students with industry data that are up-to-date and relevant. The SHARE Center is being used in at least four hospitality courses and linked to assignments. Three of our faculty were trained in fall 2012 at Smith Travel Research (in TN) on how to maximize learning results with their resources.

**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 field project was substituted for the case study last year because it was felt that field study was a real-life application of knowledge and skills. It was an opportunity to work with the leadership of a small town in increasing tourism capacity although it is realized that such an opportunity may not be available or realistic for each semester. We did pilot a small assessment project last fall that we hope to incorporate into our full assessment report. Seven hospitality majors completed the exam leading to a certification in hospitality industry analytics (CHIA). The School of Hospitality paid for this exam for the students. All passed and are now officially certified. We plan on making this exam (offered by the Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Lodging Association and Smith Travel Research) available to more students and encouraging all majors to take the exam beginning this academic year. With a larger number taking the exam, we will include it as a form of 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.

As discussed in the previous questions, the assessment data from previous years has impacted changes in this program. Based on this year's assessment data, we will continue with including the analytical resources particularly the resources supporting financial analysis. We will also continue with the emphasis on industry applications. The assessment data will be an important factor as we evaluate our current curriculum in preparation for reaccreditation through the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA). We are considering adding questions on the college's exit exam that will tie to programmatic learning outcomes. We will also be evaluating additional direct and indirect measures for this coming year's assessment.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.**

1. Addition of analytical resources through industry programs such as SHARE with Smith Travel Research. 2. Review of curriculum and determination that additional content is needed in each course on profit and loss analysis and the evaluation of financial statements. 3. Arranging for a part-time instructor (with a CPA and strong financial background) to provide this additional financial content to all courses. 4. Piloting of exam leading to a certification in hospitality industry analytics. 5. Including a comprehensive, applied field project in HADM 4800, Hospitality Strategic Management.

**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.**

1. The additional cost of the part-time instructor to teach supplemental financial content in each course. 2. The additional cost of the industry resources from Smith Travel Research. 3. Preparing for reaccreditation and completing the Self Study by the beginning of 2014. 4. Faculty consisting of a large percentage (50%) part-time instructors. 5. Needing dedicated computer labs for industry applications.

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

An applied field project replaced case studies as a measurement from the previous year for HADM 4800, Hospitality Strategic Management.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes--If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.**

There were no modifications of intended outcomes this past year.

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

Our PR Coordinator serves on a University-wide event committee. We have Senate representation through faculty participation.

**Publications and Presentations--Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.**

Diana Barber, J.D. (Lecturer) and Donetta Poisson, Ph.D. (Visiting Lecturer) - "Consumer Demand, Food Safety and Farmers Markets: Exploring the role of responsibility in food safety" Presented at the Southeast Council of Hotels, Restaurants and Institutional Education (CHRIE), Spring 2013, 2/22/13, Atlanta. Diana Barber, J.D. - Legal Contributor to Hospitality Electronic Newsletter published monthly by Georgia Hotel and Lodging Association, 2013 Diana Barber, "100+ Cases that have impacted us this year." Hospitality Law Conference, February 13, 2013, Houston, TX Debby Cannon - Presented at Business Management Institute I and V, sponsored by the Club Managers Association of America; October 2012, Las Vegas, NV; Topics - Generational differences in the workforce and application of whole brain thinking in leadership decision-making; March 17, 2013 and September 8, 2013, Atlanta;...
International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
Our Study Abroad over Maymester was successfully held in 2013 with 22 students traveling to five European countries. Our semester-long exchange agreement was renewed with the Université de Savoie in France. Alwyn Tai from China was part of our 40th Anniversary Distinguished Speaker Series, Spring 2013. Programs were being planned this past year by faculty member, Joe Perdue, to be delivered in fall 2013 in South Africa and Jakarta. These programs will be professional development sessions for club managers.

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 2012, we assigned students to specific faculty members for mentoring. The role of the faculty member was to provide career advice, support in career preparation (internships, industry mentoring, professional associations) through meeting with each student at least once per semester. The program was very positive with students engaged in participating. We monitor GPAs to try to identify students who may need assistance either within our department or through other GSU resources. We consistently remind students to meet with their Academic Advisors at least once per semester.

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).
Our faculty are very involved in supporting the hospitality community by participating in a number of professional associations. The School of Hospitality has representation through faculty involvement with the Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau, Georgia Hotel and Lodging Association, Georgia Restaurant Association, Georgia Business Travel Association, International Association of Exhibitions and Events, Club Managers Association of America and the Council of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education. The faculty and staff volunteered in spring 2013 with the Atlanta Food Bank.
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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.

G 5: Quantify contributions and costs of HR
To graduate students from the MS/HRM program who are able to quantify the contributions and costs of HR functions in organizations.

G 6: Manage compensation budgets
To graduate students from the MS/HRM program with the ability to manage compensation budgets and understand the linkages with...
organizational profitability.

**G 7: Perform training and development**
To graduate students from the MS/HRM program with the ability to perform training and development needs analysis, program design, program delivery, and evaluation.

**G 8: Forecast future HR needs**
To graduate students from the MS/HRM program with the ability to use current turnover and planned growth to forecast future HR needs.

**G 9: Case to support use of contingent workers**
To graduate students from the MS/HRM program with the ability to develop a business case to support the use of contingent workers, including costs and benefits.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Compensation System Design (M: 1, 2, 12)**
- 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.

**SLO 5: Quantify contributions and costs of HR (G: 5) (M: 9, 10)**
The MS/HRM graduate will be able to use all relevant costs and benefits of HR activities to compute the ROI of HR functions in organizations.

### 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.

### Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

### Standard Associations

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

**SLO 6: Understand and manage compensation budgets (G: 6) (M: 11, 12)**
Manage the setting, monitoring, and final reporting of compensation budgets

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/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

**SLO 7: Perform training and development (G: 7) (M: 13, 14)**
The MS/HRM student will be able to perform training and development needs analysis, develop a training and development program, design the delivery of the training, and evaluate the effectiveness of the 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.

### Standard Associations

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

**SLO 8: Use all data to complete forecast of future HR needs (G: 8) (M: 15, 16)**
The MS/HRM graduate will be able to identify all relevant data needed to forecast future HR needs, including turnover data and projected growth. Relevant Associations: Student will be able to find and use all relevant data to use in developing an HR forecast.

**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 9: Develop case to support contingent workers (G: 9) (M: 17, 18)**

Develop a business case to support contingent workers, including costs and benefits

**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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Inclusion of and appropriateness in MGS 8390 project of strategic alternatives and rationale for various recommended strategies.

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

**Target for O1: Compensation System Design**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 1: Accurate description and usage guides for job analysis, descriptions, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage in detail of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 1.83/3.0. 83% of HR/MS students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 2: Integration of All Compensation Components (O: 1)**

Inclusion, integration, and proper usage in MGS 8390 project of all components of compensation systems, including job evaluation, market wage analysis, pay structures, and compensation budgets.

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

**Target for O1: Compensation System Design**

At least 80% of the students scoring higher than 2.0 on the criteria in the Measure 2 Rubric. To be scored from randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately and in detail describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Faculty rating of 1.83/3.0. 83% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 3: Job Analysis and Description (O: 2)**

In the final project in MGS 8360 students will include a clear explanation of job analysis procedure and resulting job description and job specification.

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

**Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment**

Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Below Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 3: Inclusion and proper usage of job analysis, job descriptions, and job specifications Student uses 2 of 3 bases for selection system (job analysis, description, and specification) in inadequate detail: Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system (job analysis, job description, and specification) in good detail: Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system in extensive detail

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.17/3.0. 83% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE

Inclusion of detailed behavioral interview questions, and related scoring system and administrative guidelines, and work sample and other tests for an employee recruitment and selection system.

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

**Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 4 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Does not meet Standard (1) Meets the Standard (2) Exceeds the Standard (3) Measures 4: Inclusion and proper usage of behavioral interviews, work sample, and other selection tests Student designs behavioral interviews or work samples, but not more than 2 selection tests with no validation. Student designs behavioral interviews and work samples, and validation for both. Student designs behavioral interviews, work samples, and additional selection tests with validation for all methods.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.33/3.0. 100% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 5: Law Issue Identification (O: 3)**

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Identification of relevant case issues and laws and expression of reasonable conclusions.

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

**Target for O3: Employment Law**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 3: Understand and effectively apply employment law Standard Not Met (1) Standard Met (2) Standard Exceeded (3) Measure 5: Identification of relevant issues, laws, and reasonable conclusions Incomplete or incorrect identification of issues, laws, or conclusions Complete and correct identification of most issues, laws, and conclusions Complete and correct identification of all issues, laws, and conclusions

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Average faculty rating of 1.67/3.0. 67% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 6: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements (O: 3)**

Students will be able to produce appropriate and clearly-written HR policies in response to situations and laws.

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

**Target for O3: Employment Law**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 6 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Rubric for Measuring Learning Outcomes – MS in HRM Criterion 3: Understand and effectively apply employment law Falls to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 6. Appropriate and clearly-written HR policies A few ambiguous or inappropriate HR policies Most appropriate and clearly-written HR policies All appropriate and clearly-written HR policies

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Average faculty rating of 1.50/3.0. 50% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 7: Performance Management Concepts (O: 4)**

Student will be able to discuss appropriate use of performance management tools and the advantages and disadvantages of each as exhibited in answers to exam questions in MGS 8300.

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

**Target for O4: Employee Relations**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 7 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 4: Understand and effectively apply performance management and employee relations techniques Does not meet standard (1) Meets the standard (2) Exceeds the standard (3) Measure 7: Discuss performance management and employee relations techniques and advantages and disadvantages of each Can discuss some performance management and employee relations techniques and some advantages and disadvantages of each Can discuss most performance management and employee relations techniques and most advantages and disadvantages of each Can discuss almost all performance management and employee relations techniques and most advantages and disadvantages of each

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.33/3.0. 100% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 8: Employee Relations and Productivity (O: 4)**

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students will be able to effectively and accurately discuss how usage of performance management and employee relations techniques will enhance employer productivity.

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

**Target for O4: Employee Relations**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 8 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 4: Understand and effectively apply performance management and employee relations techniques Does not meet the standard (1) Meets the standard (2) Exceeds the standard (3) Measure 8: Discuss how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity Cannot discuss how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity Can discuss in some detail how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity Cannot discuss in extensive detail how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Identify ROI of HR functions (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify relevant costs of benefits of various HR activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Quantify contributions and costs of HR**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 9 to randomly-selected case analyses. Calculate costs and benefits of HR Functions 1 = Can identify 1-2 few costs and benefits metrics; 2 = Can identify 3-4 costs and benefits metrics; 3 = Can identify more than 4 costs and benefits metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Link HR ROI to organizational profitability (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link ROI of HR functions to organizational profitability, including labor and productivity costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Quantify contributions and costs of HR**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 10 Rubric to randomly-selected case analyses in MGS 8300. Quantify HR functions and benefits 1 = Can create a 1-2 relevant HR metrics; 2 = Can quantify 3-6 relevant metrics; 3 = Can quantify more than 6 relevant HR metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Develop and manage compensation budgets (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to construct, defend, monitor, and evaluate a final compensation budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Understand and manage compensation budgets**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 11 Rubric to randomly-selected projects. Develop and manage compensation budgets 1 = Can correctly identify and include 1-2 facets of compensation budgets 2 = Can correctly identify and include 3-4 facets of compensation budgets 3 = Can correctly identify and include all more than 4 of compensation budgets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Link compensation budget to firm performance (O: 1, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link all facets of compensation budget to firm performance and develop and defend a case for labor costs at the organizational level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Understand and manage compensation budgets**

All students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 12 Rubric to the compensation budget portion of term project in MGS 8390. Identify all relevant linkages between the compensation budget and firm performance. 1 = Can identify a 1 linkages to firm performance 2 = Can identify 2-3 linkages to firm performance 3 = Can identify more than 3 linkages to firm performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Analyze training needs (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze training and develop needs from various sources at the levels of the employee, organization, and task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Perform training and development**

80% of MS/HRM students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measure will be done by applying Measure 13 Rubric to student activities in MGS 8300. Use all relevant data to analyze training and development needs, 1 = Can use data with 2-3 components to perform needs analysis 2 = Can use most data with 4-5 components to perform needs analysis 3 = Can use all data with more than 5 components to perform needs analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Use appropriate design and evaluation of training (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate design of content and delivery of training and development programs and use all relevant measures to evaluate success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Perform training and development**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 14 Rubric to randomly-selected projects in MGS 8300. Use appropriate design and evaluation of training 1 = Can use appropriate design with 1-2 measures 2 = Can use appropriate design with 3-4 measures 3 = Can use appropriate design with more than 4 measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Develop HR forecast (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will identify all relevant measures of turnover and projected growth to develop an HR forecast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Use all data to complete forecast of future HR needs**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 15 Rubric to randomly-selected student activities in MGS 8300. Identify all inputs to perform HR forecast 1 = Can identify 1-2 inputs 2 = Can identify 3-4 inputs 3 = Can identify more than 4 inputs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Develop and &quot;sell&quot; an HR forecast to management (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to use all relevant data to develop a forecast of HR needs, and will be able to defend its validity to management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O8: Use all data to complete forecast of future HR needs**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 16 Rubric to projects in MGS 8300. Develop and "sell" an HR forecast to management 1 = Can develop a superficial or uncertain forecast with weak defense 2 = Can develop an adequate forecast with good defense 3 = Can develop a detailed forecast with strong defense.

**M 17: Use of contingent workers (O: 9)**

Identification of all relevant costs and benefits (monetary and other) to support the business case for use of contingent workers

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O9: Develop case to support contingent workers**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 17 Rubric to student project in MGS 8300. Identify all costs and benefits to be used as inputs into a decision about use of contingent workers. 1 = Can identify 1-2 costs and benefits 2 = Can identify 3-4 costs and benefits 3 = Can identify more than 4 costs and benefits

**M 18: Use all inputs to build a case for contingent workers (O: 9)**

Students will be able to use all relevant costs and benefits to develop and present a business case to support contingent worker use.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O9: Develop case to support contingent workers**

80% of students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 18 Rubric to student project in MGS 8360. Identify all costs and benefits to be used as inputs into a decision about use of contingent workers. 1 = Can correctly use 1-2 considerations 2 = Can correctly use 3-4 considerations 3 = Can correctly use more than 4 considerations

---

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

### Compensation System Design

With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's ability to design comprehensive compensation system, two actions will be taken:

- In MGS 8390 add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.
- In MGS 8390 provide a written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Integration of All Compensation Components | Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Employee Recruitment and Selection

With respect to the second learning outcome, the student's ability to understand and effectively apply all major components into a comprehensive employee recruitment and selection system, two actions will be taken:

- In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise job analysis, job description, and job specification. Evaluate after next offering.
- In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise questions, scoring system, work sample, and other tests. Evaluate after next offering.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Behavioral Interview Questions | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### 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 8330 and provide additional supplemental handouts on performance management. Evaluate after next offering.
- Add a homework assignment in MGS 8300 on linking performance management to specific employer productivity measures. Require students to find research results for performance management techniques. Evaluate after next offering.

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

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Added Case Example**
Provide sample of case analysis with issues, laws, and conclusions. Evaluate after next offering.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Law Issue Identification  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Employment Law  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### 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:** Finished  
**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

### 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
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: Finished
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)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Evaluate entering student skill levels in basic language and writing and refer those needing assistance to University Center.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors in MGS 8320
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increase class time on topic
Add 30 minutes to lecture on integrating components, including addition of short in-class activity.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Design an in-class activity that covers integration of components of compensation systems. Spend 30 minutes with combination lecture and this exercise.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8390
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Performance Management Concepts | Outcome/Objective: Employee Relations
Implementation Description: The instructor of MGS 8300 will add 30 minutes to the lecture on performance management covering in detail the components of a viable system, linkages with other HR function, and legality of systems.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300
Additional Resources: None

Apply more CTW techniques to grad class
Apply more writing assignments and rubrics used in the undergraduate CTW classes to the MGS 8320 class.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements | Outcome/Objective: Employment Law
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8320
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add HR forecast component to MGS 8360
Expand requirement for HR forecast project in MGS 8360 and add additional elements

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Add components to expand a student project in MGS 8360 dealing with HR forecasts.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360  
Additional Resources: None

**Calculate costs and benefits of HR Functions**  
Add an additional segment to class project in MGS 8300. Include an activity in MGS 8360.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: Planned*  
*Priority: Medium*  
*Implementation Description: Add cases and activities to MGS 8300 and MGS 8360 concerned with ROI of HR functions*  
*Projected Completion Date: 06/2014*  
*Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8300 and MGS 8360*  
*Additional Resources: None*

**Case for use of contingent workers**  
Add a case in MGS 8360 concerning building a business case to support the use of contingent workers.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: Planned*  
*Priority: Medium*  
*Implementation Description: Add a case to MGS 8360 concerning contingent workers. Look for identification and use of costs and benefits.*  
*Projected Completion Date: 06/2014*  
*Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360*  
*Additional Resources: None*

**Expand budget portion of compensation project**  
Expand the budget portion of the MGS 8390 term project to include more emphasis on compensation budgets and linkages to firm performance.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: Planned*  
*Priority: Medium*  
*Implementation Description: Expand budget requirement for MGS 8390 term project*  
*Projected Completion Date: 06/2014*  
*Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8390*  
*Additional Resources: None*

**Monitor case performance**  
Continue to monitor case performance and provide more detailed feedback on case assignments.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*  
*Priority: Medium*  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
  - **Measure:** Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Employment Law  
*Implementation Description: Instructor of MGS 8320 will provide more detailed feedback on case analyses.*  
*Projected Completion Date: 06/2014*  
*Responsible Person/Group: Instructor or MGS 8320*  
*Additional Resources: None*

**Perform training and development design**  
Add a project to MGS 8300 to expand coverage and application of design of needs, delivery and evaluation of training and development programs.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: Planned*  
*Priority: High*  
*Implementation Description: Add a project to MGS 8300 where students will get hands-on experience in performing needs analysis, design of delivery, and evaluation of training.*  
*Projected Completion Date: 06/2014*  
*Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300*  
*Additional Resources: None*

**Provide a second case example**  
Provide a second case example with class discussion on case law conclusions. Continue to monitor.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*  
*Priority: Medium*  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
  - **Measure:** Law Issue Identification  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Employment Law  
*Implementation Description: Use a handout to illustrate case conclusions and relevance to HR.*  
*Projected Completion Date: 01/2014*  
*Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8320.*  
*Additional Resources: None*

**Quantify HR functions and benefits**  
Include questions on HR metrics in MGS 8300 and MGS 8360.  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Include exam questions and discuss in MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
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?

For the first time in several years we met many of our targets. This was due to addition of new faculty members, additional cases and exercises, and better specification of grading rubrics for our students. Our new HR faculty members were very involved in developing new content and material and in specifying new goals and actions for next year. We were able to move farther away from the academic content of our courses and take more into consideration the needs of employers of our 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.

Our student projects and activities reflect a deeper understanding of HR issues and a deeper level of critical thinking. In the past, our faculty (especially part-time instructors) had relied heavily on PowerPoint presentations and mastery of facts and data. Our new faculty and existing FT faculty have shifted the emphasis to hands-on learning with demonstrable mastery of problem solving and creation of HR policies.

Annual Report Section Responses

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 increasing number of MS students with no work experience as well as international students with no U.S. work experience need more individual help from instructors, especially with projects and skills-building. This is putting increased work load on instructors, and some perceptions from MBA students in the same classes who feel MS students are getting more intensive attention.

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

We quantified a number of outcomes to be more specific and to help instructors be consistent across different courses. This helped us a great deal in measuring our outcomes and setting new goals.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

As we completed a number of goals, we added more outcomes with functional HR skills, based on employer feedback and faculty perceptions that many international students and domestic students with no work experience are not familiar with a number of HR functions. We based these functional areas on informal feedback from employers about what they expect our graduates to be able to do on the first day of the job.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Instructional Technology MS

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 and business, 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 (NGO) and non-governmental organization (NPO) 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.

**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.

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)
4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**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.

**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.

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)
5. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**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.

**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.

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)

**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.

**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.

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)

**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.

**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.

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)
5 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

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

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

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

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

---

**M 2: Internship Report (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

---

**M 3: End of Course Assessments (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: 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 2012-2013 - Target</strong>: <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 <strong>O3</strong>: 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 2012-2013 - Target</strong>: <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 <strong>O4</strong>: 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 2012-2013 - Target</strong>: <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 <strong>O5</strong>: 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 2012-2013 - Target</strong>: <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

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | **Outcome/Objective:** Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | **Outcome/Objective:** Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | **Outcome/Objective:** Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | **Outcome/Objective:** Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | **Outcome/Objective:** 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
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

**Continue to Recruit Students from Business and Industry**
As a new division (Learning Technologies) we continue to focus on targeting growing our recruitment from students in business and industry.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** As a new division (Learning Technologies) we continue to focus on targeting growing our recruitment from students in business and industry. This will include new/revamped website, and creation of a graduate level certificate.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Learning Technologies Division

**Create Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology**
Create new Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Create new Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology as: 1) a way to grow our program and also to; 2) offer classes to students who wish to take classes in our field but not necessarily to earn a masters, for example if they already have a masters degree or are working toward a masters in another field.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Learning Technologies Division

---

**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 are reflective in both their projects and final portfolio submissions.

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 demonstrate analytical skills and questioning in submission of projects and 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?

Being that many classes are online in our program, continued emphasis on following written instructions that pertain to class assignments and projects is an ongoing effort.

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 see this as an ongoing process, as more and more class activities are submitted virtually, with an effort to provide continuous feedback.

**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 drastic changes to the assessment process in the degree program. Rather, we revised course outputs as needed so that they reflect learning outcomes more directly. For example, in some courses, larger assignments are broken down into smaller assignments with opportunities to gauge progress better and to provide feedback frequently. We also implement practical hands-on learning for example working with external agencies and organizations who have practical projects and learning opportunities for our students as they become available.

**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 findings and feedback we have submitted a proposal for a graduate certificate in instructional design and technology for students who wish to gain additional training but not necessarily earn an additional masters degree. Also, we have submitted name changes for a couple of courses to more accurately describe the course goals and expectations for the students. We have an ongoing suggested sequencing of courses depending on what semester students join the program.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong>: Engages in scholarship</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5</strong>: Understands foundations of education</td>
<td>100% of program completers met all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6</strong>: Develops a professional identity</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7</strong>: Develops an extended knowledge base</td>
<td>100% of program completers met all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field. Three new courses were created and one discontinued to reflect current best practice.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field. The amount of required research experience was increased.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field. We reviewed agreements with other departments offering foundational courses to ensure that our students had timely and adequate access.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
### Findings 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Develops leadership for the profession</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Demonstrates research expertise</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Engages in scholarship</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Understands foundations of education</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Develops a professional identity</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Demonstrates research expertise</th>
<th>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the first or second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Engages in scholarship</th>
<th>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the first or second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Understands foundations of education</th>
<th>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the first or second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</th>
<th>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the first or second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**

95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**

95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**

95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**

95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

**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
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
  - Develops a professional identity
  - Develops an extended knowledge base
  - Develops leadership for the profession
  - Engages in scholarship
  - Understands and uses technology
  - Understands foundations of education

Implementation Description: 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
  - Develops leadership for the profession
  - Engages in scholarship
- Measure (Key Assessment): Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity
  - Develops leadership for the profession
  - 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
  - Develops leadership for the profession
  - Engages in scholarship
- Measure (Key Assessment): Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity
  - Develops leadership for the profession
  - 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

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

Revise Curriculum
In keeping with the greater emphasis on research at the university, and in accordance with revised guidelines from the college, we have revised the program of study requirements for the Ph.D. We have reduced the number of required courses and increased the
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(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 8: Extended Work Experience

Full Description: Students will complete an internship providing foreign business experience, cultural awareness and functional expertise. Students will file monthly internship reports that consist of three parts: a) examples of foreign business experience, b) examples of comparisons for cultural differences, and c) particular examples of tasks and responsibilities undertaken.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Complete analyses Goal 1 (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Related Measures: M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives Measure 1 Understanding of International Business Environment – Critical Success Factor Analysis Fails to meet standards = 1: The student cannot sufficiently distinguish critical success factors, align major resources with these factors, and construct logical cause-effect relationships. Meets standards = 2. The student can identify most critical success factors, and generally align most factors with firm's major resources. Exceeds standards = 3. The student captures almost all critical success factors, tightly aligns resources with these factors, and effectively compares the firm's position in a thorough manner. Measure 2 Understanding of International Business Environment – Identification of Viable Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot set out clear, viable alternatives for action based on critical success factors in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generate some viable alternatives that are aligned with the critical success factors in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student generates clear and well-supported viable alternatives of action that 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
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Target Levels Goal 3 (M: 8)
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.

O/O 7: Complete Analyses Goal 4
I M.8: There are three assessment methods, either one should be met. Completion of foreign language requirement at a foreign institution Or Passing an examination approved by the GSU IIB Department Or Sit for an examiner as determined by IIB Measure 8 Second Language Proficiency Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department. Meets standards=2. The student does a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department. Exceeds standards=3. The student does a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department an their skill level is distinctly higher than that needed for a pass.

O/O 8: Complete Analyses Goal 5
SLO 5: Complete Analyses Goal 3
SLO 9: Complete Analyses Goal 5
SLO 10: Target Levels Goal 5 (M: 10, 11)
SLO 11: Complete Analyses Goal 6

90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria. 30% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceeds Standards” criteria. Measure 9* Team Skills Team Assessment Fails to meet standards=1. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student cannot apply multiple views and perspectives to create consensus. Meets standards=2. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student can bring multiple views and perspectives to problem solving and create synergies from diverse perspectives. Exceeds standards=3. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student can apply 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 functional 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. 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)

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
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.

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 5: Complete Analyses Goal 4
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 reliable sources for data and analyzes the trends in three macro variables. Meets standards=2. The student consults three or more reliable sources for data and analyzes trends in four or more macro variables. Exceeds standards=3. 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 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 analyzes the country market analysis data in that way. Exceeds standards=3. The student will effectively distinguish the different levels of analysis and integrate the different perspectives from each in the country market analysis.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 10: Target Levels Goal 2 (M: 5, 6, 7)
30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 4, 5 and 6 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 4, 5 and 6
90% of students will get 2.0 on Measure 7. 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measure 7.

**O/O 8: Target Levels Goal 4 (M: 9)**
80% of MIB students pass one of the three measures on their first attempt. 90% of MIB students pass one of the three measures on their second attempt.

**O/O 12: Target Levels Goal 6 (M: 12, 13)**
90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Pass” criteria. 10% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceed” criteria.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Measures (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Measure 1 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Measure 2 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Measure 3 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Measure 4 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Measure 5 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Measure 6 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and from firm level variable to conduct the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Measure 7 (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Measure 8 (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Measure 9 (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.9: Team Assessment: Ability to bring multiple views/perspective to problem solving, and demonstrate individual performance when functioning in the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Measure 10 (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Measure 11 (O: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.11: Faculty assessment of monthly internship report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communication professions in which they work

**SLO 3: Understand diversity relating to communications**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications

**SLO 5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness (M: 3)**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity

**SLO 8: Write correctly and clearly**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve

**SLO 9: Critically evaluate own/others' work**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness
SLO 10: Apply numerical/statistical concepts

Apply basic numerical and statistical concepts

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 3: Ethics (O: 5)

The rubric below was applied to students completing a final assignment on ethics. The Assignment included a discussion of right and wrong, questions & theories of ethics and application of professional ethical codes. A total of nine students completed the assignment. The average score (based on rubric and noted as a percentage) was 73.3%. Criteria 4 3 2 1: Ethical Self-Awareness; Student analyzes both core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity. Student analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs. Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs. Student states either core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both. Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts; Student names the theory or theories, and explains the details of the theory or theories used. Student can name the major theory and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies. Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory. Student only names the major theory she/he uses. Ethical Issue Recognition; Student can recognize ethical issues in a complex, multilayered context AND can recognize relationships Student can recognize ethical issues in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp relationships. Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or relationships Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships. Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts; Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, and is able to consider full implications of the application. Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, but does not consider the specific implications of the application. Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate. Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts to a new example. Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts; Student states a position and can state assumptions and implications and the student’s defense is adequate and effective. Student states a position and can state assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, but the student's response is inadequate. Student states a position and can state assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them. Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

CTW

Adding the CTW course as a capstone to the Journalism curriculum will allow for additional assessment measures of students’ research abilities.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

CTW

With the addition of the CTW courses to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the critical thinking learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized in the junior-level and capstone courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

CTW

With the addition of the CTW courses—specifically the capstone course options—to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the research learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning of Fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

CTW

With the addition of the CTW courses—specifically the capstone Media, Ethics & Society course—to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the ethics learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

CTW
With the addition of two CTW courses in the Journalism curriculum next year, additional measures will be easily included, e.g. embedded assignments in the junior-level CTW course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure is needed to assess the theories learning outcome. A rubric to score a sample of student papers written about theory in Jour 3070 was abandoned this year but perhaps should be reconsidered. An assessment exam about theories was abandoned several years ago, but perhaps embedded questions in existing Jour 3070 exams should be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure should be added to assess the diversity learning outcome. Perhaps a specific assignment requiring multiple viewpoints to be included should be required in at least one of the core Journalism courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure should be added to assess the evaluation learning outcome. Perhaps a writing style/editing assignment or an embedded exercise about editing on an exam could be used.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure should be considered to assess students' ability to critically evaluate others' work. Perhaps an embedded assignment in at least one of the Journalism core courses or an exercise on an exam should be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

revised curriculum
The revised Journalism curriculum has more technology in more courses earlier in the major map than the existing curriculum. The assessment of the use of tools/technology will be much easier as embedded assignments in at least two of the new Journalism core courses will be measured. The curriculum revision will not be fully implemented until AY 2011 so next year will be a transition year, allowing for a pilot study of measures to be tried.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

align outcomes with goals
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Revise/increase number of goals to align all eleven learning outcomes with a goal.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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)
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
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of courses

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
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of journalism history 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?

Expanded levels of assessment to include rubrics for all assessed materials. These changes allowed for more objective analysis of submitted material. As we assess other outcomes, we will need to develop objective measurement protocols.

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 past assessments of writing skills of our students, we are developing a journalism writing workshop. This year, we are discussing implementing baseline testing in our early journalism writing classes and requiring students to complete online tutorials in basic writing skills. No curricular changes have been made. As for other outcomes, students seem to grasp concepts to varying degrees. It may require more standardization of coursework across sections of the same course.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2012-2013 Law

| As of: 12/15/2016 06:59 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; 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 set is a "balanced" one, meaning that there are generally equally good arguments for both sides, and 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...
Measures, Targets, and Findings

Other Outcomes/Objectives

M 2: Production of satisfactory written product (O: 1)

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing

Our target is to ensure that every single student at the College of Law acquire the proficiency described herein. While that is not possible, our more modest goal is simply to say that students who do not achieve this proficiency will not pass RWA. In fact, there is a significant correlation between those students who do not pass RWA the first time (or at least make a C) and those who do not end up graduating from the College of Law. A significant number of students who are excluded for academic reasons at the end of their first year have either failed or done very poorly in RWA.

M 2: Writing Intervention exercises (O: 1, 2, 4)

In addition to RWA, all students must also take Civil Procedure I in the Fall and Civil Procedure II in the Spring. Traditionally, these courses have both been tested and graded using one exam at the end of each semester. Especially in Civil Procedure I, the exams have been almost exclusively essay exams. Since Civil Procedure is both required and rather esoteric (especially Civil Procedure I), it seems like a good course to attempt to assess and measure the degree to which students' writing skills are up to par. Picking up on that idea, two Civil Procedure professors first started using a "writing intervention" program throughout the course of the semester to see if such interventions would improve upon the skills already first learned in RWA I. In its first iteration, one professor used the intervention program, while the other did not. So as to make fair comparisons of the results in the two classes, each professor otherwise used the same syllabus and the same final exam. The intervention used in the first (experimental) year and beyond consisted of giving students five three-page, take-home papers, in addition to the final exam. The papers were designed to help students learn how to break a legal rule into its component parts, analyze and apply facts to each of the rule's elements, and make arguments on both sides. Two weeks into the semester, the intervention professor gave her students an initial single issue "practice" paper. After the students turned the paper in, the intervention professor read approximately ten papers to get a sense of the common errors and issues. Before assigning the next paper, she reviewed the IRAC formula (issue, rule, analysis, and conclusion) with the class. She also gave students general feedback on common problems she saw in the papers she read and discussed how to avoid these problems in the future. Since that first experimental year, these methods have been incorporated into that professor's class, and they are being copied by other professors, as well.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for 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.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Managerial Sciences seeks to provide its undergraduate majors with a rich understanding of fundamental principles 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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**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 2.8/4.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In the 2012-2013 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area did not offer a class that was in the CTW program, but they will offer a class in the 2013-2014 cycle. This will allow the assessment to return to the same distribution of three different discipline areas as in prior assessments. For this assessment cycle a total of twenty-four papers were selected. Twelve papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. A new document titled 2013 Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the first learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.67, 2.63, 2.75 and 2.38 respectively. None of these means were above the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 13, 8, 17, and 21 respectively. Only the second component of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 42, 46, 50, and 44 respectively. All of the components exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is slight improvement on average across these measures when compared to the prior cycle the goals are still not being met.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making**

Students will average a 2.8/4.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In the 2012-2013 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area did not offer a class that was in the CTW program, but they will offer a class in the 2013-2014 cycle. This will allow the assessment to return to the same distribution of three different discipline areas as in prior assessments. For this assessment cycle a total of twenty-four papers were selected. Twelve papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. A new document titled 2013 Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the first learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.67, 2.75, 2.50 and 2.33 respectively. None of these means were above the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 13, 8, 17, and 17 respectively. Only the second component of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 42, 46, 50, and 58 respectively. Two of the four components exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is slight improvement on the third measure from the last cycle average across these measures when compared to the prior cycle the goals are still not being met. The improvement in the third measurement on the first two components but only the second component in the second measurement suggests that we are impacting the “close to” standards student a bit more than the “far from” standards student. The sample was slightly different, however, due to only two different CTW discipline classes being taught and sampled in the cycle.

**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 problems in the area of their concentration. 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 2.8/4.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In the 2012-2013 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area did not offer a class that was in the CTW program, but they will offer a class in the 2013-2014 cycle. This will allow the assessment to return to the same distribution of three different discipline areas as in prior assessments. For this assessment cycle a total of twenty-four papers were selected. Twelve papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. A new document titled 2013 Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the second learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.67, 2.63, 2.63 and 2.46 respectively. Two of the four means were above the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 4, 4, 8, and 17 respectively. Here the first three components of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 33, 29, 42, and 50 respectively. Two of the four components exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is slight improvement on average across these measures when compared to the prior cycle the goals are still not being met.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making**

Students will average a 2.8/4.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In the 2012-2013 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area did not offer a class that was in the CTW program, but they will offer a class in the 2013-2014 cycle. This will allow the assessment to return to the same distribution of three different discipline areas as in prior assessments. For this assessment cycle a total of twenty-four papers were selected. Twelve papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. A new document titled 2013 Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the second learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.67, 2.63, 2.63 and 2.46 respectively. Two of the four means were above the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 4, 4, 8, and 17 respectively. Here the first three components of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 33, 29, 42, and 50 respectively. Two of the four components exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is slight improvement on the third measure from the last cycle average across these measures when compared to the prior cycle the goals are still not being met. The improvement in the third measurement on the first two components but only the second component in the second measurement suggests that we are impacting the “close to” standards student a bit more than the “far from” standards student. The sample was slightly different, however, due to only two different CTW discipline classes being taught and sampled in the cycle.
Students will average a 2.8/4.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In the 2012-2013 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area did not offer a class that was in the CTW program, but they will offer a class in the 2013-2014 cycle. This will allow the assessment to return to the same distribution of three different discipline areas as in prior assessments. For this assessment cycle a total of twenty-four papers were selected. Twelve papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. A new document titled 2013 Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the third learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.67, 2.75, 2.50 and 2.33 respectively. None of these means were above the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 13, 8, 13, and 17 respectively. Only the second component of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 33, 33, 46, and 58 respectively. Two of the four components exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is slight improvement on the third measure from the last cycle average across these measures when compared to the prior cycle the goals are still not being met. The improvement in the third measurement on the first two components but only the second component in the second measurement suggests that we are impacting the “close to” standards student a bit more than the “far from” standards student. The sample was slightly different, however, due to only two different CTW discipline classes being taught and sampled in the cycle.

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

**Revision of MGS**

Managerial Sciences needs to expand and improve its measurements. New measures have to be able to better detect the sources of the disappointing performance that MGS is experiencing relative to other students who are not Management majors. The first step in this will be having the department assessment team attend the daylong assessment workshop that the College is sponsoring on Sept 19th. Subsequently, members of the department assessment team need to apply lessons from that session and quickly develop new measures and ways of measuring. Those measures will then be implemented in the department in the 2008-09 cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Oct 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>William C. Bogner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 curriculum.

<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>This will be implemented by interactions between the four-person MGS Assessment committee and the faculty members that teach in the undergraduate program. Work will have to be done to bring PT1 and PhD instructors into any initiatives for hte classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>05/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>MGS Assessment 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?

Although the results were not desirable the results from the 2011-2012 cycle where deemed valuable and valid. In the 2012-2013 cycle there was a variation in the way in which the data was collected because the entrepreneurship CTW course was not offered. This will be returned to the curriculum (a different course will be designated as the entrepreneurship CTW class). With the results from the next cycle we should have a valid reading on the extent to which the goals are being increasingly met. Other than the return to the three-source approach there will be no other changes in the assessment for the 2013-2014 cycle.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

Changes in the prior year were largely made on the CT class level. The focus will be on the common class, MGS 4000 in the comingAY. These results, however, will not likely show up in the assessment findings for another year. The MGS 4000 class is a decision making oriented class and the emphasis on critical thinking sequencing—that is, the steps in applying and using a critical thinking process will be the focus any changes. This will increase the ability of students in all of the Managerial Sciences Department’s different disciplines to approach problems and support recommendations more effectively.
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 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" Employs both qualitative and quantitative information in the analysis. 

(15 Points) Total possible points for this item = 30 Target score average = 25.5

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score on this measure was 25.2 out of 30 possible point. This was 84%, of total possible points. Out of 70 usable case analyses (across three sections of MK 4900): 23 students (33%) were above target. (27+) 24 students (34%) were at target (24-26) 23 students (33%) were below target (< 26.0) Because these results were less positive than last year when nearly 3 out of 4 were at or above average, we consider this goal to have been partially met. [Preview Formatting] Established by David Nasser on 9/26/2012

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

The average score on this measure was 10.7 out of 15 or 71% Out of 70 usable case analyses: 5 students (7%) were above target. (90%+) 24 students (34%) were at target. (80%-90%) 41 students (59%) were below target. (< 80%) This aspect of marketing analysis continues to be a problem. In fact, despite the increasing number of students who enter the capstone class having taken Marketing Metrics, the results are essentially unchanged since last year's assessment. Thus, our target for this goal was not met.

**Target for O3: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions**

An average score of 85% on items relevant to feasible recommendations for marketing strategy and tactics. Rubric item read: "Recommended course of action is specific, realistic and well supported with logic and facts. Adequately backs up ideas presented" Total Points for this item = 15 Target Score = 12.75

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score for this item was 11.86 out of 15 possible points (81%) Out of 70 usable case analyses: 10 students (14%) scored above target (90%+) 35 students (50%) scored at target (80% - 90%) 25 students (36%) 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 deficient quantitative analysis will affect the quality of one's recommendation. Since a clear majority (64%) of students have scored at or above target (a slight improvement over 2011-2012 results), 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. [Preview Formatting] Last Updated by David Nasser on 10/1/2012 Established by David Nasser on 9/26/2012

**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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average raw score on this item was 29 points out of 30 (96%). Among 70 usable case analyses: 10 students (14%) scored above target. (90%+) 52 students (74%) scored at target (80%-90%) 8 students (11%) scored below target (< 80%) We consider this target to have been met. [Preview Formatting]

**M 2: Case Discussion (O: 5)**

Students are given a numerical score (e.g. 40 out of 50 total points) for their contribution to case discussions in class over the course of the semester. Typically, there are 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O5: Oral communication**

Average of 85/100 total points for in class case discussion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The average score across three sections was 80% out of 100. Out of a total of 70 usable records: 24 students (31%) scored above target (90%+) 29 students (37%) scored at target (80%-90%) 15 students (32%) scored below target (< 80%) With the majority (68%) scoring at or above target, we consider this target to have been met. [Preview Formatting] Last Updated by David Nasser on 10/1/2012 Established by David Nasser on 9/26/2012
Increase Usage of Written Assignments

We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they develop more assignments that require writing in their classes. This can be as simple as short, one-page reaction papers. We will also encourage them to require students to employ specific writing frameworks (e.g., memorandum) that force them to develop their thoughts logically and clearly. We must also note, here, that we are not writing instructors, and our students are required to take only one business communication course.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case Analysis Write Up
- Outcome/Objective: Clear concise writing

Implementation Description: Spring 2010
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increased Class Discussion

We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they increase their use of class discussion through posing problem solving questions and the use of mini-cases.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case Discussion
- Outcome/Objective: Oral communication

Implementation Description: Fall Semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increased problem solving assignments

The undergraduate curriculum committee will issue a formal recommendation to all undergraduate instructors asking them to include at least 3 problem solving assignments in their syllabus, with provision made for in-class discussion and feedback. We will also recommend that these assignments can be in the form of mini-case analyses. These are often present as end-of-chapter activities in most textbooks and should be fairly easy to implement. These could be either individual or group assignments. They could be take-home or entirely in class. What matters is that they provide students with opportunities to develop their logical and critical thinking abilities. We hope that the cumulative effect will be an improvement in our students' ability to articulate clear, feasible recommendations on major assignments. We will issue a recommendation along with a copy of this report to all undergraduate instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case Analysis Write Up
- Outcome/Objective: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions

Implementation Description: Fall Semester, 2009
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Introduce Required Course in Marketing Metrics

In the 2008-2009 academic year, we introduced a new course entitled "Marketing Metrics". Our purpose was to better prepare our students for performing the kinds of quantitative analyses employed in marketing management. This is not a marketing research or statistics course but rather it covers such tools as break-even, margin analysis, pro forma development, etc. The course becomes a requirement of all majors in the 2009-2010 academic year. In addition, it will be a pre-requisite for MK 4900, in which these techniques must be applied. Our goal is to improve the ability of our students to perform these types of analyses and to apply the learning from them. We expect that this will be reflected in improved scores on assignments pertinent to this objective.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case Analysis Write Up
- Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools

Implementation Description: Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Department Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Recommend Case Analysis/Discussion in All Required Courses

Current departmental policy does not require that instructors use case analysis and discussion in all required courses. Therefore, many, if not most, marketing majors have no experience in this learning format prior to taking our capstone class. One of the recommendations that will be forthcoming from our Undergraduate Curriculum Task Force is to incorporate at least one case analysis/discussion in each required course. We believe that this should make students more comfortable and experienced at this format.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication
Implementation Description: We have no authority to force the adoption of this plan on department faculty. We will strongly recommend that it be implemented and included in syllabuses and seek as wide cooperation as possible.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: none

Require Marketing Metrics Course
As of Fall Semester 2009, all students entering the Marketing Major have been required to take Marketing Metrics as part of their plan of study, and prior to enrolling in the capstone course (MK 4900). The 2010-2011 Academic Term will be the first in which the majority of majors should have taken this course at the time of assessment via the instruments employed in MK 4900. We also will be recommending that marketing metrics be included in all required courses for the department.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
Implementation Description: Requirement for Marketing Metrics has been implemented.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continued Focus on Marketing Metrics
Our department is continuing its plans to place more emphasis on marketing metrics throughout the undergraduate curriculum. All courses are to include at least one case analysis that includes metrics. At this point, nearly all students in our capstone classes have taken Marketing Metrics prior to the capstone class.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
Implementation Description: Ongoing.
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: None

Improve Case Discussion participation
It is not clear what can be done to improve this measure. It is possible that this year’s findings are an anomaly, since case discussion is a required part of the course. One of the instructors of our capstone class will be taking the Harvard Business School seminar on case discussion leadership this (fall) semester. We are hoping that this will lead to new ideas and improved techniques for encouraging case discussion.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: David Nasser
Additional Resources: None

Increased Case Analysis in Curriculum
We are implementing a plan to increase the use of case analysis throughout our undergraduate curriculum.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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?

The program has now made Marketing Metrics a pre-requisite for enrollment in our capstone class, Marketing Problems.

**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 undergraduate curriculum committee will review the results of 2012-2013 assessment and offer recommendations for changes in our curriculum in order to strengthen our students analytical skills.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Marketing MS**

*As of 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The MS in Marketing Program is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to excel in a leadership position in Marketing. The MS in Marketing Program extends the students' previously acquired basic business and marketing skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in a selected area. The MS Program, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as marketing specialists capable of making decisions in an increasingly complex marketing environment.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 1, 2, 3)**

MS-MKT graduate will be able to identify marketing opportunities and problems.

**SLO 2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions (M: 4, 5)**

The MS-MKT graduate will be able to fashion appropriate and effective marketing solutions.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation (M: 6, 7)**

The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate a customer/client orientation.

**SLO 4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information (M: 8, 9)**

The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret appropriate information for solving marketing problems.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Application of Segmentation Analysis (O: 1)**

Application of segmentation analysis
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 2: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 1)**

Development of viable target market(s) and positioning.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 3: Impact of Competition (O: 1)**
Assessment of impact of competition on the firm's actions.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 4: Solution Consistent with analysis. (O: 2)**

Solution Consistent with analysis.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 5: Realistic implementation plan. (O: 2)**

Realistic implementation plan.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 5 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 6: Attention to customer satisfaction. (O: 3)**

Attention to customer satisfaction.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 7: Attention to customer loyalty (O: 3)**

Attention to customer loyalty.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 7 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 8: Student defines the necessary information (O: 4)**

Student defines the information necessary to address question.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 9: Student correctly interprets information collected (O: 4)**

Student correctly interprets information collected.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 9 Rubric to the common case assignment.

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

**Communication of Assessment Results**

Provide each faculty member who teaches classes to our MS students with the results of the assessment. These results, including the outcomes/objectives, measures and grading rubrics for each criterion, will communicate to the faculty what the program is striving to achieve. This information in combination with the assessment results will guide faculty in knowing what areas need or would benefit from additional emphasis.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Application of Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Attention to customer loyalty | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Impact of Competition | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Solution Consistent with analysis | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Student defines the necessary information | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Student correctly interprets information collected | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Viable Target Markets/Positioning | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
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

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 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 Use placement testing to help determine appropriate entry into the quantitative literacy program; and, Provide foundational experience(s) within (usually) the first year of the student's college work. 1

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

**Improve Response and Success Rates**
Better communicate with all instructors (especially GTAs) the importance of providing the students with these QL quizzes. Instructors should emphasize that students will receive bonus points if they take QL Quizzes. Track students to see how many are progressing from Math1070, Math 1111, 1113 to 2211 to see if “seeing” the quizzes more than once is inflating the success rates of later classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: PreQL Success Rates
  - Outcome/Objective: Computation
- **Implementation Description:** Course coordinators will implement their strategies for increasing student participation in the fall semester.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Target for O1: Computation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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. Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 1111 and 1113 in the fall and spring, by Math2211 (Fall). The results of Math2211 are missing in Spring 2013. Many Math2211 instructors were unwilling to pull the data by hand as this is an extremely time consuming task.

**Target for O2: Translation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 1111 and 1113 in the fall and spring. The results of Math2211 are missing. Many Math2211 instructors also did not send the data to the coordinator.

**M 2: PostQL Success Rates (O: 1, 2)**
Obviously, for some questions the students are not attaining the desired “success rate” of 70%, but we have seen that from the Pre-QL to the Post QL there is improvement. The questions that appear to give students the most trouble are the “Area of Inscribed Circle”, “Elevator”, and “Betty and Wilma” problems. 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.

**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

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

- **Planned**
- **Medium**

**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

- **Planned**
- **Medium**
Improve Response and Success Rates
Better communicate with all instructors (especially GTAs) the importance of providing the students with these QL Quizzes. Instructors should emphasize that students will receive bonus points if they take QL Quizzes. Check the improvement for increasing the participation after using the strategies.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Course coordinators currently implement their strategies for increasing student participation.

Responsible Person/Group: Yichuan Zhao

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

In Fall 2010, the Math1070 has been changed to a new teaching model. The assessment of pre/post QL is much easy to access. The response rate and success rate increased much and is stable now. We continue to be challenged by Desire2Learn, i.e., there are often problems exporting the data if more students get a problem wrong than right in Math2211. Math1101 is changed to MyMathLab for online homework, quizzes, pre/post QL, etc. It makes a little easy to retrieve the response results. We continue to adopt the new teaching and assessment methods in the coming academic year. We believe assessment is needed for accountability. The assessment process has been changed over the years to redefine our educational goals aligned with the university’s strategic plan, articulated multiple measurable objectives for each goal, designed appropriate approaches and measures to assess how well students are meeting the articulated objectives. These changes gives me an opportunity to re-examine objectives, methods and measures as feedback to help students to improve their learning.

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

Math1070 adopts new teaching model in Fall 2010. The success rates and response rates of pre/post QL have improvement and are stable right now. Moreover, Math1111 and Math1113 have been successful based on the new teaching model. It is helpful for Math1101 and Math2211 to adopt this new model. Also, students are finding it extremely difficult to "blend" different areas of mathematics as is exhibited by the two geometry problems (find the area of an inscribed square or circle). Instructors of these courses will try to incorporate more "blended" types of problems in the coming year. Math1111 student learning outcomes have been improved to 78% from 50%. Math1113 shares the same pattern. Math1070 and Math2211 have improved the student learning outcomes. Along with the change in teaching and learning model, assessments and assessment techniques used in the program has a great impact to identify the weaknesses and strengths of the program. The assessments we have used allowed us to judge and monitor the students’ progress through observations, experiments, written assignments, and research projects. These research projects include implementation of review sessions, different software usage, and the material used in the classes. Also those assessments provide pedagogical templates that help professors to develop effective instructional techniques and provide comprehensive information about student progress, including students’ strengths and weaknesses. Math1111 and Math1113 revised the curriculum, made several changes with the approval from the department. Also depending on the assessment results, the course material has been revised with more related real life examples and collaboration has been made with other departments to respond the needs of the industry and higher education. Also, assessments have had a significant impact on instruction. Students are more motivated to learn and are more engaged.

Responsible Person/Group: Yichuan Zhao
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Mathematical or Statistical Literacy (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge in their chosen concentration of mathematics or statistics.

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
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

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.
3.2 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).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Conducting Research or Data Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will be able to apply their mathematical or statistical knowledge to conduct research or data analysis. Students will demonstrate the ability to 1) comprehend the current mathematics/statistics literature; 2) propose suitable topics and research problems for PhD dissertation research based on preliminary study; 3) develop appropriate approaches to obtain new results or applications; and 4) develop an understanding of the impact of these new results or applications on the mathematics/statistics research 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.

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

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.
3.2 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).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: PhD Qualification and Research (O: 1, 2)
The successful PhD students are expected to pass the PhD qualifying Exams and defend their PhD dissertations. The PhD qualifying Exams and dissertations provide a measure of the accomplishments of the students in scientific content, inquiry, and communication. Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend the current mathematical or statistical literature, form conjectures, prove or
disprove conjectures; 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 comprehensive knowledge in their chosen areas of mathematics or statistics. Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

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

**Target for O1: Mathematical or Statistical Literacy**

85% of the PhD students should complete at least eight graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program. 70% of the PhD students are expected to pass PhD Qualifying Exams in three areas by the end of their second year in the program.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% of the PhD students completed at least eight graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program. 80% of the PhD students passed PhD Qualifying Exams in three areas by the end of their second year in the program.

**Target for O2: Conducting Research or Data Analysis**

80% of PhD students who have passed the PhD Qualifying Exams are expected to successfully complete and defend their dissertations.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of PhD students who have passed the PhD Qualifying Exams successfully completed and defended their dissertations.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Mathematics BS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST (Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

#### Mission / Purpose

Mathematics is one of the great unifying themes in our modern culture. It is a language, a science, an art form, and a tool of tremendous power. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, in its courses for both majors and non-majors, seeks to introduce students to this vast area of knowledge and to show them how mathematics can be used to solve problems. The overarching goals of any program in mathematics are that mathematics instruction should (from MAA's Source Book for College Mathematics Teaching, Schoenfeld, 1990): Provide students with a sense of the discipline of mathematics. Develop student’s understanding of important concepts in core areas of mathematics. Develop student’s ability to explore problem situations in a range of settings, at several levels of difficulty, and with a variety of methods. Help students to develop a mathematical point of view – perceive and represent structure and structural relationships. Help student’s to develop the ability to read and use mathematical literature and reference material.

#### Goals

**G 1: Problem-solving**

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

**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

**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
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.

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 proved to be successful. The department kept the structure of last year’s assessment. In the coming year, the department will try its best to make the process more effective and more constructive.

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

The department takes the data obtained from the assessment findings very seriously. Although no major changes are expected, the department keeps fine-tuning the system in order to improve the degree program.

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Mathematics Education (MTE) 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 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.

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. The major goals of the MED-MTE program are to ensure that candidates: 1) gain knowledge and understanding of mathematics content and process skills, 2) create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences, 3) demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision, and 4) use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction and to monitor student learning.

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 (G: 1) (M: 1)
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: 1)
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: 1)
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: 1)
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: Findings (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The program had no completers in Summer 2012, Fall 2012, or Spring 2013.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Knowledge of Mathematics
100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2012-2013 academic cycle marks the sixth 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective

Target for O2: Diverse Learning Environments
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
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 O3: Dispositions
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
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 O4: Student Learning and Assessment
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2000-2010 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: 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. Iman Chahine)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the 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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 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 2008-2009 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the 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 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 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 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 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
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
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
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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
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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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
<th>Implementation Status:</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group:</th>
<th>Additional Resources:</th>
<th>Budget Amount Requested:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.
Program overview
Continue to monitor degree program

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Iman Chahine

Strengthening content knowledge: Creating EDMT 8820
Ethnomathematics and the historical development of math strengthens students’ understanding of math by examining the historical and cultural evolution of concepts. The course has a study abroad component where students travel and conduct ethnographic research to examine mathematical concepts that emerge in non-conventional settings.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Findings | Outcome/Objective: Diverse Learning Environments
  | Knowledge of Mathematics | Student Learning and Assessment
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. 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?
Students are encouraged to do more inquiry-based learning in the courses offered through the MED program. Students are also encouraged to do action research and project-based explorations to support their learning of content and pedagogy.

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?
Integrating technology-supported environments in teaching is still a challenge.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
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 revised the learning outcomes to facilitate student acquisition of content and pedagogical knowledge. The changes align with requirements in Common Core Standards and support adequate preparation for teachers to teach new content.

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

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
We have an increase in the number of applicants to the program. All completers met the desired program outcomes.

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 include providing technological support for new projects.

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
No changes.
Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
Outcomes were modified to align with Common Core Standards for teaching mathematics.

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

International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
We developed three study abroad programs for the students to explore the use of mathematics in transcultural settings and culturally-relevant pedagogies. The programs are conducted in Morocco, South Africa, and Brazil.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
N/A

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).
N/A

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Mathematics Education Online MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 student.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates strong content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students in M.Ed. in Mathematics Education through GOML (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 M.Ed. Online Program in Mathematics Education are expected 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 through GOML (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 through GOML (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 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 graduation requirement 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the expectations of this objective.

**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 related section 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the expectations of this objective.

**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 at least 7 out of 10 to achieve this goal.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the expectations of this objective.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the expectations of this objective.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of the students met 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 along with the reflection paper 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 in 2013.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education.
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Action Plan: Dispositions**
All students met this requirement. We will continue working closely with students to make sure they understand the standard well and work accordingly.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (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 80% of the students met the expectation and 20% of the students exceeded 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 spring semester in 2014.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2014
- **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 80% of the students met the expectation and 20% of the students exceeded the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course assignments; 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:** 12/2013

**Action Plan: Mathematical Preparation**
All students met this requirement but expressed difficulty in the process due to the connection to their practice. To address these difficulties, one of the mathematics educators in the program has started to co-teach some of the courses. We will continue

- **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 were helpful for students to meet this expectation. However, sample teaching video will be provided to help students to have a better understanding of the expectation.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Microteaching Video | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 12/2013

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

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: 12/2013

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?

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?

No change has been done in the assessment process. With the release of new Common Core State Standards, learning outcomes, measures and targets will continue to 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 extent their knowledge on curriculum and assessment techniques in mathematics education. The curriculum change will require developing a new mathematics education methods course to address those issues.
### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Arts in Teaching program for Mathematics is aligned with the mission of the Georgia State University 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 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 believes that all students can learn.

**G 1: Become Content & Pedagogical Knowledge Experts**

The teacher candidate will be effective with their mathematics content and pedagogical knowledge for teaching that 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.

### 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.

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1)**

Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 1.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For this standard 100 % of candidates demonstrated adequate proficiency and above. Plan to maintain procedures.

**M 2: INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2)**

Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 2.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% of candidates have met the overall expectations of this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livedata for Standard 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% of candidates have met the overall expectations of this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livedata for Standard 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates have met the overall expectations of this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livedata for Standard 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% of candidates have met the overall expectations of this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livedata for Standard 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% of candidates have met this expectation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 liveText for Standard 7.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met this expectation.

### 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 liveText 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met this expectation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 11: KA#1: Georgia Content Test (O: 1)**

The GACE content tests is a requirement for certification and completing the master’s degree.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**

90% of candidates will pass the GACE content Tests [#022 & #023]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 12: KA#2 Content Knowledge (O: 1)**
The content knowledge of the candidates is enhanced when they complete 5 or more content courses for the master's degree.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**
90% of candidates will meet the target of successfully completing 5 content courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 13: KA#3 Planning (O: 2, 3)**
Evidence of planning will be demonstrated in the livetext portfolio.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**
90% of the candidates are expected to demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners' needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners**
90% of the candidates are expected to effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**
90% of candidates will demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**
90% of the candidates are expected to demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners' needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners**
90% of the candidates are expected to effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn**
90% of the candidates are expected to demonstrate that all learners can learn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners' needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners**
90% of the candidates are expected to effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn**
90% of the candidates are expected to demonstrate that all learners can learn.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

**M 16: KA#6: Dispositions (O: 5)**
Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in live text 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 demonstrate the attitude of a reflective educator.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

### 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 2012-2013 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
  - 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 2012-2013 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
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 2012-2013 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 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 2012-2013 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 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 2012-2013 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
 Measure (Key Assessment): KA#3 Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
 Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs
 Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4: Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
 Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge | Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs | Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
 Measure (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 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 2012-2013 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 2012-2013 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 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 2012-2013 academic year and beyond.

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

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

**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 2012-2013 academic year and beyond.

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

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

**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 from the College of Arts and Sciences to co-teach a module of content.

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

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

**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):**

**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):**
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: 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 3 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 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 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): 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
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
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 the student teaching students have cleared up most, if not all, of their misconceived ideas. This is a work in progress so we continue to monitor its development. However, the students also continue to work on these issues with their mentor teachers and mathematics coaches.

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

While there is still room for improvement in all areas, two areas are of immediate concerns: (1) Creating Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners and (2) demonstrating pedagogical content knowledge. Assistance needed would be efforts to reconstruct the program to include a course that facilitates pre-service and in-service teachers' creativity for producing better learning environments for diverse learners and demonstration of effective pedagogical content knowledge. In the year 2011-2012, Mathematics educators from campus-site and school-site and a mathematician planned to collaborate in the methods course. 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. In the year 2012-2013, mathematics educators and mathematician continue to collaborate in co-teaching a module of CCGPS - Statistics within a methods course. The feedback received at the end of the course will provide action for the future years in the program. Research on the implementation was done in 2012-2013 and ongoing.

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. In 2012-2013, we continue with the collaboration of mathematics educators and mathematician within our methods course and mathematics courses. Another important collaboration is having our inclusion faculty visiting the methods course to facilitate students’ focus on diverse learners in their unit plans, lesson plans, and student teaching observations. This phenomenon has been extremely helpful to our students.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process have you made for your degree program? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, 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 impact of the data obtained from assessment findings has been positive. The pedagogy courses in the program will be revised for greater impact. The impact of the data obtained from assessment findings has been positive. The pedagogy courses in the program will be revised for greater impact. As we continue to make changes to the pedagogy courses in the program, we seek maintenance of the CCGPS standards and the new GACE II content tests. However, we, at Georgia State University, are looking for an increase in achievement and to maintain the high achievement levels of our graduates with respect to the new implementation of the Common Core GPS for Mathematics (CCGPS-M). We will monitor, maintain and have high expectations for an increase in achievement as we implement the CCGPS-M. As we continue to make changes to the pedagogy courses in the program, we see maintenance of standards being a common focus. However, we continue to monitor, maintain and have high expectations for an increase in achievement on the new GACE II content tests as we implement the CCGPS-M within our methods courses. An important implementation that is ongoing, that is, co-teaching with mathematics educators and mathematicians in the methods course will have impact on our students achievement in the new GACE II. We are aware that it is a change that takes time but we are all for it and looking forward for progress.

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

The 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. In this current year 2012-2013, we continue with the collaboration of mathematics educators and mathematician within our methods course and mathematics courses. Another important collaboration is having our inclusion faculty visiting the methods course to facilitate students’ focus on diverse learners in their unit plans, lesson plans, and student teaching observations. This phenomenon has been extremely helpful to our students in enhancing their experiences with diverse learners and clearing misconceptions they may have about diverse learners.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Mathematics MS**

_As of 12/12/2016 05:56 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: Mathematics/Statistics Professionals**
There are two tracks: non-thesis (emphasizing course content) and thesis (emphasizing scientific literacy and research). Successful students will have comprehensive knowledge of mathematics or statistics, possess the ability to write papers or reports professionally, and have good presentation skills.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Mathematical or Statistical Literacy (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge in their chosen areas of mathematics or statistics.

**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
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

2.1 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.
3.2 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).
4. Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Conducting Research or Data Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)

Students will be able to apply their mathematical or statistical knowledge to conduct research or data analysis.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Thesis (O: 1, 2)

The thesis is the capstone assignment. The theses provide a measure of the accomplishments of the thesis students in scientific content, inquiry, and communication. Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend the current mathematical or statistical literature; form conjectures, prove or disprove conjectures; 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 comprehensive knowledge in their chosen areas of mathematics or statistics. Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Mathematical or Statistical Literacy

85% of the thesis students should complete at least eight graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of the thesis students completed at least eight graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program.

Target for O2: Conducting Research or Data Analysis

50% of the thesis proposals are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.
**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

13 thesis students completed their MS degrees between Fall 2012 and Summer 2013. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 24 months.

**M 2: Non-thesis (O: 1, 2)**

Non-thesis track students must complete at least 30 credit hours of coursework (with GPA at least 3.0) and complete a (non-thesis) research paper or project report. The research paper or project report provides a measure of the accomplishments of the student in scientific content, inquiry, and communication. Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend the current mathematical or statistical literature; form conjectures, prove or disprove conjectures; 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 comprehensive knowledge in their chosen areas of mathematics or statistics. Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

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

**Target for O1: Mathematical or Statistical Literacy**

85% of the non-thesis students should complete at least 10 graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the non-thesis students completed at least ten graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program.

**Target for O2: Conducting Research or Data Analysis**

90% of the non-thesis students are expected to complete the research paper or project report successfully in one semester.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the non-thesis students have completed their research papers or project reports successfully in one semester.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 MBA/MHA and Concentration in Health Administration MBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST (Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The vision of the Institute of Health Administration (IHA) within the J. Mack Robinson College of Business at Georgia State University is to be a premier master’s level educator of future healthcare/business leaders. The flagship double degree MBA/MHA program is accredited by the 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**

SLO 4: Provide CAHME specified competency areas

This consists of the 4 domains, 26 competencies for CAHME.
**SLO 5: Competency in Business skills and knowledge**
This is the business competency in the MBA/MHA.

**SLO 6: Competency and Knowledge of the healthcare environment**
This competency deals with the healthcare sector.

**SLO 7: Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills (M: 9)**
This competency is in the area of communication, motivation, empowerment, group participation and leadership, change management, and physician and other clinical relationships.

**SLO 8: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills**
Competency in the areas of self-awareness and confidence; self-regulation and personal responsibility, honesty and integrity, public service, and life-long learning.

**SLO 9: Develop real world experience in the HA field**
This competency is to ensure that MBA/MHA students have real world experience.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: GPA of each HA student**
GPA of each HA student
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 2: Percent CAHME educational content provided**
Percent CAHME educational content areas provided in specified courses and administrative residencies
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**M 3: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA**
Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 4: Student evaluation of HA program**
Student evaluation of HA program
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas**
Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance**
Preceptor evaluation of residency performance
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty**
Assessment of residents by HA faculty
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 8: Student assessment of residency**
Student assessment of residency experience/learning
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 9: Oral Presentation - HA 8190 (O: 7)**
xyz
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills**
on rubric 90% meet or exceed target of basic knowledge and understanding of communication skills.

### 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
2012-2013 Mental Health Counseling MS
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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.

**SLO 7: Human Growth and Development (M: 9)**
Students will gain an understanding of the nature and needs of persons at all developmental levels and in multicultural contexts, including theories of individual and family development and transitions across the life span.

**SLO 8: Addiction and Addictive Behaviors (M: 10)**
Students will gain knowledge of theories and etiology of addictions and addictive behaviors, including strategies for prevention, intervention, and treatment.

**SLO 9: Diagnosis (M: 11)**
Students will gain knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior.

**SLO 10: Crisis Intervention and Assessment (M: 12, 13)**
Students will gain knowledge of crisis intervention and suicide prevention models, including the use of psychological first aid strategies.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

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

**Target for O1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who were taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.

**M 2: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

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

**Target for O1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who were taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.

**M 3: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

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

**Target for O1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who were taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.

**M 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
All students (100%) in the Mental Health Counseling program who enrolled in CPS 6410 (Basic Counseling Skills) achieved a minimum score of 25 on the final performance video.

### M 5: Group Cultural Presentation (O: 3)

Students who are enrolled in CPS 7340 (SocioCultural Issues in Counseling and Psychological Services) must earn a minimum of 80% on the group presentation. This assignment requires a synthesis of multicultural models and developmental theories specific to a diverse community.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

### Target for O3: Diversity and competence multicultural counseling

Students who are enrolled in CPS 7340 (SocioCultural Issues in Counseling and Psychological Services) must earn a minimum of 80% on the group presentation. This assignment requires a synthesis of multicultural models and developmental theories specific to a diverse community.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All (100%) students who were enrolled in CPS 7340 (Social and Cultural 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 2012-2013 - 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 examinations.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All (100%) Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling Systems) completed a group assignment by attending ALL 9 of the 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All (100%) Mental Health Counseling students in CPS 7000 (Consultation, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum of 85% on 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

More than 90% of all students who enrolled in CPS 7500: Individual and Family Over the Lifespan earned a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examinations.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

More than 90% of all students who enrolled in CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) earned a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examinations.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

More than 90% of all Mental Health Counseling students who enrolled in CPS 8100 earned a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examinations.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All (100%) 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

All (100%) Mental Health Counseling students successfully complete 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: Finished
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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: MHC Practicum and Internship Coordinator

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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: MHC Practicum and Internship Coordinator and practicum/internship site supervisors

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

Assessment of development in practicum/internship experiences 2013-14
The Clinical Mental Health Faculty will meet every semester to discuss student issues as they matriculate through the practicum and internship program. If faculty members express concern, the Coordinator of the program will meet with the student to discuss the aforementioned issues and ways to address faculty concerns.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: MHC program faculty and MHC Program Coordinator.

MHC Program Evaluation, Development, and Revision
Collaborate with MHC program faculty (core and affiliated), alumni, Community Advisory Board (employers), and current students to evaluate and possibly revise program length, sequence, offerings, and focus. The collaboration is expected to result in creation of a program that supports the best training possible for students in terms of CACREP standards and career competitiveness.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Initiated by MHC Program Coordinator.

Program Evaluation and Development 2013-14
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.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: MHC program faculty (core and affiliated)

Program faculty will maintain and monitor 2013-14
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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. Specifically, at the program level, the MAT MLE TEEMS LA/SS program is designed to develop preservice teachers' social studies and language arts content, education knowledge, professional dispositions, and ability to apply said knowledge in contemporary classroom settings to the benefit of a diverse student body at the middle level, grades 4-8.

Goals

G 1: Unique needs of middle level learners
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

G 3: Innovative technology
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

G 4: Learning environments for diverse learners
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

G 5: Advocates for students
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

G 6: Community oriented
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the...
Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner (G: 1, 4, 5) (M: 3, 4)**
Possess a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students.

**SLO 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge in Language Arts and Social Studies with technology integration to create, implement, and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

**SLO 3: Learning Environment (G: 1, 4, 5) (M: 3, 4)**
Create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

**SLO 4: Professional Community Oriented Educator (G: 5, 6, 7) (M: 3, 4, 6)**
Demonstrate a) the belief that all students can learn b) advocacy on behalf of their students and profession, and c) 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 in addition to advanced content 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 in middle level social studies and language arts.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Students must have a minimum of 12 credit hours in English coursework and 12 credit hours in Social Studies coursework in addition to advanced content coursework and must pass the GACE II content test in Middle Level Language Arts and Middle Level Social Studies before being recommended for certification. Our students passed the GACE content at 100% this cycle.

**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 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 II/III (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student's mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors. 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 obtain a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument used to assess their pedagogical content knowledge via teaching.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Data for the key assessment of Content Knowledge are taken from the 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 Practicum I (field experience) and the final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum II/III (student teaching). 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.
of the Practicum I (field experience). The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum III/IV (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 completed during each visit to the classroom during the course of the program (beginning of the program) 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. MID Point Assessment: Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Observed (0 pts) Mode Mean Mod Stdev Subject Specific Content/Concepts 7 0 0 0 0 4 0 0 Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) 6 0 1 0 0 3 7 4 0.78 Content Connections 4 3 0 0 0 3.57 4 0.49 Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge 6 0 0 0 0 3.35 4 0.35 Final Assessment: Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not demonstrated (1 pts) Not Observed (0 pts) Mean Mod Stdev Subject Specific Content/Concepts 10 1 0 0 0 3.91 4 0.29 Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) 10 1 0 0 0 3.91 4 0.29 Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge 10 1 0 0 0 3.91 4 0.29

**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. Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the first 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 planning portion of the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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. Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the first 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.

**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 assessing PCK in the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the first 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.

**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.
Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate, observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the school semester, the teacher 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 after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. 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 rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

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, Planning, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the final semester of their training on areas of strength and strengths 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. Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts)

Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

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 final semester of their training on areas of strength and strengths 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. Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts)

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 taken 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 setting, 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 gives feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the teacher 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 after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. 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 rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

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” in their field work.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

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 taken 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 setting, 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 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. MidPoint Assessment: Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Students’ Development 5 2 0 0 0 3.71 4.05 FinalAssessment Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Students’ Development 1 0 1 0 0 3.91 4.03

Target for Q2: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

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 taken 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, 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 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. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor provides new feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor provides new feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor provides new feedback to the candidate after the lesson.

Target for Q3: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

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: Professionaism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is taken 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, 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 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. MidPoint Assessment: Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Classroom Environment 5 2 0 0 0 3.71 4.05 Classroom Management 2 5 0 0 0 3.29 0.5 Communication 7 0 0 0 0 4.0 4.0 Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments 6 1 0 0 0 3.86 4.04 Final Assessment: Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Classroom Environment 6 5 0 0 0 3.55 4.05 Classroom Management 1 0 1 0 0 3.91 4.03 Communication 7 4 0 0 0 3.64 4.05 Overall
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 in professionalism.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

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 taken 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, 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 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. At the end of 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 practice. 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. Midpoint Assessment on Professionalism Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Reflection and Growth 7 0 0 0 0 4 4 0 Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 7 0 0 0 0 4 4 0 Overall Assessment of Professionalism 7 0 0 0 0 4 4 0 Final Assessment: Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Reflection and Growth 10 1 0 0 0 3.91 4.0 3 Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 10 0 0 0 4 4 0 Overall Assessment of Professionalism 8 2 1 0 0 3.64 4 0.6

M 5: Effects on Student Learning (O: 2)

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 their work with students 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 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

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 their work with students 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 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. Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Clarity and Accuracy of Report 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 5 0.6 Alignment with Learning Goals 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 5 0.3 Interpretation of Data 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 4 0.5 Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 0 0 0 0 1 11 5 0

M 6: Professional Dispositions (O: 4)

The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Students are not required to submit specific assignments for this assessment. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies TEEMS and others, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate high levels of professionalism by obtaining a rating of "Exceptional" or "Acceptable" on the assessment of students' professional dispositions.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Students are not required to submit specific assignments for this assessment. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies TEEMS programs, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching. Students are assessed on items ranging from punctuality to professional communication and attitude towards students. MidPoint Assessment: 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 learners' point of view; believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner. 7 0 0 0 4 4 0 POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learners' capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can't or won't.7 0 0 0 4 4 0 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. 7 0 0 0 4 4 0 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. 7 0 0 0 4 4 0 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. 7 0 0 0 4 4 0 Final Assessment: 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 learners' point of view; believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner. 9 2 0 0 3 8 2 4 0 POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learners' capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can't or won't.9 2 0 0 3 8 2 4 0 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. 1 1 0 0 0 4 4 0 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. 7 4 0 0 3 6 4 4 0.5 MEANINGFUL PURPOSE AND VISION: Focused on the long range; is visionary and reflective as a professional; commits to growth for all learners; cares about what is really important. 5 6 0 0 3 4 5 3 0.5

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

Improve 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 analysis in the Fall of 2013 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. Student performance indicators are strong, however, program coordinators and faculty can continue to focus and provide opportunity for students to improve their pedagogical content knowledge - which is in many ways the core of teaching. Integrative technology, content knowledge, and pedagogical strategies play a critical role in this area.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge Demonstrated in Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
- Measure (Key Assessment): Effects on Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
- Measure (Key Assessment): GACE II Content Area Exam Language Arts and Social Studies | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Faculty will concentrate added emphasis specifically in the methodology courses.

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator - Faculty

Professionalism

Faculty and students working together can improve the preservice teachers' professional dispositions and habits. Providing assistance with communication skills, time management, materials management and other logistics issues will give students' opportunities to improve their professional performance.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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): Professional Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Professional Community Oriented Educator

Implementation Description: Students will be given support in methodology classes via improved communications lessons, case study investigations, etc. to provide models and other tools for students to increase their performance on this standard.

Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Additional Resources: n/a

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

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

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

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

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
Our program faculty have found that the assessment process is adequate to serve our needs of data analysis and program change. As such, we continue to analyze the data available and make changes based on student performance. I have updated this report in light of feedback from the assessment committee. In the upcoming year, we will respond to mandates from assessment agencies and internal processes that demand change to improve student performance, implement changes based on current trends and research, and innovate our program to benefit both our students and students in the K-12 setting that we serve.

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 improve our access and use of innovative and integrated technology as well as seek ways to strengthen content knowledge and assessment processes.

Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section  
2012-2013 Middle Level Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT  
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 K-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)  
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates earned a score of "adequately demonstrated " or higher on all elements of the rubric.

**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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of the targets were met: For the learning goals assignment, the targeted score was achieved. For the mid-term and final evaluation rubrics, the candidates received appropriate rating. For the electronic portfolio, 100% of candidates received a satisfactory rating.

**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.

**Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates scored at the level of "acceptable" or higher on all elements of the rubric at both the midpoint and endpoint disposition assessments.

**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.

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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of students scored at the level of "acceptable" or higher. In fact, 100% of students scored at the "proficient" and "exemplary" levels on each rubric row: 1) clarity and accuracy of report 2) alignment with learning goals 3) interpretation of data 4) evidence of impact on students' learning.

**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
Strengthening knowledge of professionalism

While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between university supervisors and teacher candidates, thus will foster our teacher candidates' understanding and reflective practices of professionalism.

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

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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The program coordinator will sit down with individuals responsible for the two methods courses and find ways to weave in sufficient material related to classroom management without pushing out other critical content in these courses.
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)

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: 09/2012

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

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
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.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Impact on Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning

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?

Based on student achievement and surveys, the major accomplishments include content knowledge and positive impact on middle grades students for this academic year. We achieved all of our goals this year.

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

Incorporating the technology portfolio has allowed us to discern the critical thinking among students from the entry level to the exit class. Students were able to demonstrate growth in a more technological way. This not only demonstrated ability in content knowledge, pedagogy, etc., but it also accessed students' technological 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?

Classroom Management and Technology still need development in this program. We have reviewed how these two important aspects can be implemented in multiple ways that are helpful for students. We need assistance from all those affiliated with the program to review course content and to ensure that these aspects are adequately covered in the 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?

This year we have analyzed student evaluations to aid in program improvement. All students were involved and all faculty who are apart of the program helped to analyze the data and create next steps for progammatic improvements.

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?

Next academic year, our students will be piloting edTPA. We have included a focus in academic language for our students to ensure that they and their middle grades students are understanding and appropriately using academic language in the content areas.

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

Based on this year's assessment, we will incorporate technology and classroom management strategies explicitly into the degree program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Middle Level Education BSE
As of: 12/12/2016 06:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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. Our program purpose is for our educators to be: informed by research, knowledgeable 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: Candidates possess expert content knowledge.
Candidates are informed educators who possess expert knowledge in two content fields in middle level education (Reading, Language Arts, Mathematics, and Social Studies).

G 2: Candidates possess specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions for successfully teaching middle school students.
Candidates possess specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions for successfully teaching middle school students.

G 3: Candidates possess teaching practices that have a measurable impact on students’ learning.
Candidates possess teaching practices that have a measurable impact on students’ learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of their chosen content fields. (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their two chosen teaching fields.

SLO 2: Candidates plan, implement, and reflect upon instruction. (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 effective 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 students’ 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’ 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 demonstrate knowledge of their chosen content fields.
90% of students will receive a score of “3” (adequately demonstrated) or higher on all rubric components related to content knowledge.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
This target was met because all students but one received a rating of “3” of higher on all rubrics related to content knowledge. (The one student received a rating of “2” - partially demonstrated in content connections which is a subsection on the rubric for content knowledge.) Here are the findings: Subject Content/Specific Concentrations 76% of all students effectively demonstrated subject specific content/concepts. 23% of all students adequately demonstrated subject specific content/concepts. Pedagogical/Instructional Methods 75% of all students effectively demonstrated pedagogical (instructional methods). 24% of all students adequately demonstrated pedagogical (instructional methods). Content Connections 70% of all students effectively demonstrated content connections. 27% of all students adequately demonstrated content connects. 1% of all students partially demonstrated content connections. Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge 88% of all students effectively demonstrated overall assessment of content knowledge. 11% of all students adequately demonstrated overall assessment of content knowledge.

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 that relates to planning instruction.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Candidates plan, implement, and reflect upon instruction.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
Approximately 96% of students received a 3 or higher in all areas. (Three students scored a “2,” and all in the same area of Adaptations Based on Needs of Individual Students.) The first part of the target was MET. Approximately 95% of students received a 4 or higher in all areas. The second part of the target was MET. The third part of the target was NOT MET. The final element on the rubric, Adaptations Based on Needs of Individual Students, proved to be an area of concern. Only 65% of
students received a 5 in this area.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
The following percentages of students scored a 3 or higher on these evaluation rubrics: (2) knowledge of students and learning: 100% of students (3) learning environments: 99% of students (1 student scored a “2”). (4) assessments: 100% of students (5) planning and instruction: 100% of students Given that one student did not make the target because s/he scored a “2” on portion 3 of the rubric (related to learning environments), this goal was only PARTIALLY MET.

**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 effective 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
99% of students scored a level 3 or higher. Only 1 student did not score a 3 or higher on 4 of the 5 subcategories. (It was the same student who scored a “2” in all four subcategories.) Given that the target was 100%, this part of the target was NOT MET. In all categories, between 82% of students and 91% of students scored a 4. The target of 50% of students scoring a 4 was MET. Overall, this target was only PARTIALLY MET.

**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 students’ learning.**
95% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Students scoring acceptable or higher: All but three students scored a 3 or higher (or 95.1%.) This part of the target was MET. Students scoring proficient or higher: between 99% and 94% in each category. This part of the target was MET. Students scoring exemplary or higher: between 61% and 83% in each category. Because some of the categories had less than the target of 75%, this part of the target was NOT MET. Overall, the target was PARTIALLY MET.

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

**Increase Candidates’ Impact on Student Learning**
We will focus more in our methods courses on ways to help our students be aware of ways to increase and measure student learning.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**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 students’ 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 students’ 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 students' learning.

Remediation on Analysis of Students' Learning

This goal was only partially met. Though a large proportion of students scored acceptable or proficient, not enough students scored exemplary. The range was from 61% to 83%. Thus, it will be important to provide remediation in how to analyze students' learning, especially related to data analysis and use of evidence. This will be especially important as the program is switching from the Teacher Work Sample project to the edTPA, where the requirements for analyzing student learning are even more detailed and in-depth. This remediation will come in the form of: (1) additional training for university supervisors on how to support students in their data analysis, (2) additional support from the instructors of record for the Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum course through regular course assignments, and (3) additional support from the instructors of record for the Critical Issues course in the spring semester that accompanies their student teaching placements.

Remediation on Differentiated Planning

According to the data, only 65% of students received a "5" or higher on the final element of the planning rubric in the Teacher Work Sample. This element related to Adapting Instruction Based on the Needs of Individual Students, or differentiated planning. This is 5% less than the target. An action plan to address this shortcoming will be to offer remediation on differentiated planning, through student teaching seminars (already planned for Fall 2013) and additional attention paid to differentiated instruction in core classes.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

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

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

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

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

No changes were made to the assessment process in the 2012-2013 year. In the coming academic year, the major assessment of the Teacher Work Sample will be replaced by the new, state-mandated edTPA. Thus, our future goals, outcomes, and targets will need to be aligned with the new edTPA requirements. The Dispositions key assessment will remain the same.

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 this year's report, we need to offer additional support for students in the following areas: (1) Impact on students' learning (2) Differentiated instruction (3) Analysis of student learning Though the majority of students met or exceeded our targets, there are a few outliers in each area. Additional support will be provided to those students from their course instructors, university supervisors, Program Coordinator, and the Inclusion Liaison between our department and the Special Education department. The major revisions to our courses and curriculum will not be the result of this data analysis, however. In the coming
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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, all of which will be good enough to determine that the student is functional in the target language after four semesters in Lower Division Spanish. Being functional means that the student, despite some deficiencies in the several skills of language mastery (listening, speaking, reading, writing, command of grammar, and awareness of the target language culture) will be able to interact with native speakers, or speakers with native-like command, of the language for the purpose of retrieving and conveying messages in most of the situations covered in the Lower Division course sequence.

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: Oral interview with students completing 2001 and 2002 levels. (O: 1)
The oral interview is a conversation (See Oral Interview Outline and Oral Interview Rubric in the Appendixes) of about 10 to 15 minutes in which a student completing the 2001 and the 2002 levels talk with an interviewer (his or her own language instructor) about topics of general interest. The interview takes place the last two weeks of the semester. French and German have interviewed all the students taking Span 2001 and 2002, but Spanish, a significantly larger program, has made an effort since 2010 to interview about 25% of the student population in Spanish 2001 and 2002 (See the Results Summary in the Appendixes).

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O1: ORAL COMMUNICATION
We expect students to receive a score of at least 8.0 in each category on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

please put a brief summary of the findings here, and link the document that is already in document management

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Develop fluency
These results will be used to identify the best tasks for the classroom to increase fluency, an aspect often overlooked in first-year classes. It is expected that the information will help develop lessons on formulaic sequences, paraphrasing, and other real language strategies that are usually neglected in the lower-level language classes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lower Division Spanish instructors

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. The plan above was implemented fully and a new meeting is now set for Fall 2013. The LOA committee will now review all the quantitative data and suggest further course of action. The LOA leader for Lower Division courses will suggest that the interviews be continued and that new forms of measurement be added—for instance, DFW rates and student evaluations. Also, new forms of measurement should be added to include assessment of ‘interpersonal communication’ and ‘presentational communication,’ two aspects of language mastery that will require some additions to course design in MCL Lower Division courses. The additions will mainly consist of creating instances (e.g., presentations, group discussions) in which students will have a chance to communicate with one another more significantly (possibly online) and present research projects to the class.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: 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.
Additional Resources: None

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 added 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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 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.
Projected Completion Date: 03/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Weave reporter and Spanish Coordinator Dr. Oscar Moreno, with the assistance of Dr. Solange Bonnet, French Coordinator, and Dr. Robin Huff, German 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?

In 2010, when the LOA interviews were implemented, the faculty first had to (re)define the ultimate goal of the language programs: functional mastery of the target language and knowledge of the culture(s) that were proper to each language. Secondly, once the first results became available, as reported then, there were three areas of concern about the validity of the promising figures, especially those for Spring 2010, the first semester any assessment had been attempted. It became necessary to establish a number of students to be interviewed that were representative of the levels in question. A small number of interviewed students—perhaps with the only exception of German—suggested that the number of students that were interviewed, especially in Spanish and French, might have not been representative of the number of students in 2001. Secondly, with this in mind, these figures appeared to indicate that the core courses in French, German, and especially in such a large program as Spanish, were highly effective, which thus suggested, contrary to the perception of some faculty members, that no improvement or change was needed. Third, the students who were interviewed were volunteers, and the sample was thus limited to, and influenced by, those who were willing to help or could be available for the interview at a time (last two weeks of the semester) when students in general were busy and preparing and/or taking their final exams. A large number of students who worked also made it conspicuously hard to find students who could be available at times other than class time. Thus, the Spring 2010 sample might have included, especially in Spanish (notice the zero percentage of students in need of improvement in Table 2), only those highly motivated individuals who routinely scored high in the core courses and who most probably were, or were likely, to become majors and minors. This, unfortunately, would filter out a significant number of non-major, non-minor students who might indeed need to be served more adequately and whose feedback, though essential to improving the MCL core curriculum, was not being recorded. In Spring 2011, an effort was made to obtain more even numbers and, ideally, as close as possible to 25% of the target population at every level. This may be the reason for better balanced figures for the 2001 level in Spring 2011. Tables 1 and 2 show (see the Results Summary in the Appendixes), for instance, that Spanish 2001 went from a rubric score of 9.4 (Optimal performance) in Spring 2010 to 8.7 (Middle) a year later, more in accordance with the figures for French and German, which did not change. In the 2012-2013 period, there was no need to introduce changes. All the assessment effort focused on conducting the interviews in the 2001 and 2002 levels and on recording the data for analysis. As planned in 2010, the next step in the LOA process at MCL is now approaching: in Fall 2013, the LOA committee will meet again to discuss the current results and possible courses of action. As a result of our experience during these years of the LOA effort, other forms of assessment—such as DFW rates, student evaluations, etc.—may be integrated and officially inform the LOA reports, and subsequent actions for better and more effective instruction. Also, ways to implement assessment of ‘interpersonal’ and ‘presentational’ communications will be discussed and integrated to the MCL Lower Division 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
In the 2012-2013 period, we continued to work along the lines established in 2010 (improvement of data collection) and further implemented in 2011 (expanding the interviews to 2002 level). According to the plan, as outlined in 2010, this Fall 2013 (initially set for Spring 2013), the LOA committee will get together to analyze the results (see the results appendix) and review the whole 3-year process. This assessment experience has created a good sense among the members of the LOA committee that this type of assessment has been beneficial and that it should be expanded. A brief historical description of how the LOA process has unfolded at MCL shows the benefits and suggests way in which the LOA effort may continue. In 2003, MCL started working on assessing learning outcomes. The assessment committee then set up general guidelines for the assessment effort in Lower Division language courses. At the time, the Lower Division Language Program in French, German, and Spanish were working independently of each other. There was then a perception that the programs were different in many ways—such as teaching philosophies, methodologies, regulations, and practices. In 2008, the faculty, as represented by the language coordinators (Solange Bonnet in French, Robin Huff in German, and Oscar Moreno in Spanish) began a joint assessment effort. Drawing on the work done previously, the learning outcome assessment (LOA) committee implemented a student interview (LOA interview. See the Oral Interview Outline and the Oral Interview Rubric in the Appendices). This interview was to be conducted at the 2001 level (third semester) first and then also at the 2002 level. The Results Summary and accompanying analysis is based on the interview results from Spring 2010 to Fall 2012. 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, the LOA committee determined that the assessment effort would be revisited after three years in place. This Fall (2013) the LOA committee will reconvene and, on the basis of the data collected and analyzed so far, will suggest ways to proceed. It is anticipated that there will be additions to the LOA efforts, basically including other essential parameters—such as DFW rates and student evaluations—as well creating instances that promote interpersonal and presentational communication in the MCL Lower Division Courses. Though the results are encouraging (see the Results Summary in the Appendices), with a large majority of students in MCL Lower Division Courses progressing adequately toward the program goal of being functional in the target language, there is consensus, too, that students may need more skills when it comes to the speaking ability in the target language. It is anticipated that the additions may involve adding semester calendar entries with activities promoting the latter.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most important accomplishments for year—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.**

In the 2012 and 2013 period, the LOA effort is finally a systematic and reliable initiative. Oral interviews are being conducted in the 2001 and 2002 levels of language in French, German, and Spanish. With this, the LOA effort can now inform the MCL faculty on how to proceed, how to expand the assessment of learning outcomes, and how to adapt the MCL courses to new needs. The LOA committee is now in a position to review a whole 3-year process of data collection and suggest ways to continue to assess and to improve our course offerings. Our next meeting will take place in Fall 2013.

**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.**

In Spring 2013, the LOA committee conclude a 3-year period of assessment. With the collected data, it is now in a position to analyze the data and suggest ways to continue the LOA effort so that the MCL course offering can be improved. The challenge is now to establish, on the basis of the findings, clear directives on how to continue to assess our language programs and what course design changes or additions should be considered. It is anticipated that (1) the LOA assessment itself should be increased and expanded by adding new parameters—for instance, DFW rates and student evaluations—and (2) our course design should also include more instances for interpersonal communication (possibly through an online component) and presentational communication (through in-class presentations in the target language of topic of general or cultural interest).

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

No changes were made to the assessment process during the 2012-2013 period. Changes were made in 2010, and they are fully described in the annual reports for previous years.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.**

No modifications were introduced in the 2012-2013 period. These are anticipated, though, after the LOA committee meets in Fall 2013.
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

G 2: Understands student development regarding learning.
Understands student development regarding learning.

G 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

G 4: Can effectively plan for and assess instruction.
Can effectively plan for and assess instruction.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy. (G: 1) (M: 1)
The teacher demonstrates understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches by creating learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children standards.

SLO 2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn (G: 2) (M: 2)
The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn and develop over a period of time, by providing learning opportunities that demonstrate a child's intellectual, social, and/or behavioral development/growth.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 3: Effectively teaches diverse learners. (G: 3) (M: 3)
The teacher demonstrates understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and uses effective communication and professional behavior while differentiating instruction based on student need.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

O/O 4: Effectively plans for instruction. (G: 4) (M: 4)
The teacher plans for and uses assessment in instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student needs, the community and curriculum goals.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Teaching Sequence (O: 1)
EXC 7190 Teaching Sequence using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include: Rationale and design, lesson plans and continuous assessments and post-assessments and discussion of findings.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.
90% of more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
With an N of 24 students, 96% of the students scored at or above a 3 out of a 4 on the teaching sequence rubric. The range was 2.3 to 4.0. The mean score was 3.57.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
With an n of 21 students, 95.2% scored at or above a 3 out of a 4 on the pupil change project rubric. The range was 2.57 to 4.0. The mean score was 3.83.

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 2012-2013 - 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 3.05 – 4.0. The mean score was 3.85.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
With an n of 35 lesson plans (and several students having done 2 Lesson Plans), 94.3 % scored at or above a 3 out of a 4 on the lesson plan. The range was 2.4 – 4.0. The mean score was 3.65

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. Revision has occurred and continuing to revise.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.

Implementation Description: In progress
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
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. Further changes may occur across the evaluation system this year, so this was put on hold until more information is obtained.

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

Implementation Description: Some changes have occurred, but discussion is ongoing
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
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. Faculty examined those areas and stress them more in their coursework. This indicator was scored as met this year. However, questions came up regarding how WEAVE data utilizes the Livetext data which is part of the NCATE and PAAR reports. MSD program faculty are continuing to examine the use of other modalities to capture student data to see if additional data is needed.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
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: 05/2014
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 is continuing to 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: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.

Implementation Description: MSD will continue to meet and examine student performance and evaluation measure
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MSD faculty
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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
The Spring 2013 section of this class had 92 students enrolled. Of those 92, 25 scored a 3 or 4 (unacceptable) on the rubric and 67 scored a 1 or 2 (acceptable). Thus 73% received an acceptable rubric rating.

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.
Assess the Same Way

Because we met the target in the previous cycle but did not in this cycle we would like more data before determining an action plan. We will wait at least one more reporting cycle before making any changes.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Music Society and Culture
- Outcome/Objective: Evaluation of Performance

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

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

We did not make any changes during last year's assessment. We are planning to continue to revise the rubric for concert reports in the future, perhaps in this 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.

We are not planning any changes at this time.
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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

SLO 1: Performance (G: 1) (M: 3)
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.

SLO 2: Musicianship Skills and Analysis
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.

SLO 3: Composition (G: 1)
Students must acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

SLO 4: History and Repertory (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students must acquire basic knowledge of music history and repertoires through the present time.

SLO 5: Conducting (G: 2) (M: 1)
Students must be a competent conductor.

SLO 6: Improvisation (G: 2) (M: 4)
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Conducting Proficiency (O: 5)**
Student possesses conducting knowledge and proficiency as evidenced by results of the final conducting examination in Basic Conducting Class (MUS 2490).
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
In the summer 2013 section of this course 18 students were enrolled. Of the 18, 16 received an assessment of Outstanding on their last conducting assessment. This represents 89% of the class.

**M 2: Repertoire Analysis (O: 4)**
Programs are reviewed for diversity of genres, eras, composers, and styles.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 3: Piano Proficiency (O: 1)**
Students demonstrate piano proficiency through the rigorous piano proficiency examination given at the end of the piano sequence. It is expected that 85% of the students enrolled in the course will receive an assessment of pass on this examination.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 4: Basic Improvisation Performance (O: 6)**
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.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
For the Spring 2013 semester 13 students were enrolled. Of those 9 received a 1, 2 received a 2, and 2 received a 4. We did not meet our target of 100% of students receiving a 1 or a 2.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
For the Spring 2013 semester 13 students were enrolled. Of those 9 received a 1, 2 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

Target Too High
Although we believe that this is a good measure we have not met the target for the last two years. It is quite possible that the target is set to high with 100% of the students expected to receive a rubric assessment of 1 or 2. This leaves room for not even a single student to perform below an acceptable level. We will likely lower the target slightly in the next assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Basic Improvisation Performance | Outcome/Objective: Improvisation

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 last reporting cycle. It is possible that the rubric for Basic Conducting will be modified before the next reporting cycle in order to create one more set of categories. We have found that the rubric categories may be too high in terms of achievement for first semester conductors.

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 information we gleaned from our assessment in Basic Improvisation has led to discussions of removal of this class completely. We learned that the students were receiving much of this information in other classes. The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) does not require the course. Therefore, it is likely that the class will be discontinued in the next couple of years.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Music Masters
As of: 12/13/2016 05:59 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
23 of 24 (96%) of students passed their recital jury 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.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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. Neuroscience doctoral students are trained in research, teaching, and public outreach via a variety of mechanisms. The objective of the degree program is to provide comprehensive training in the neurosciences and professional development. This training is meant to prepare students for a variety of career paths involving research, teaching, and/or science advocacy.

Goals
G 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in neuroscience and in their research specialty area.

G 2: Critical Thinking Skills
Use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.

G 3: Communication and Collaboration
Be able to communicate scientific information and work effectively with peers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Apply knowledge from other scientific disciplines to the understanding of fundamental neuroscience principles. Use concepts in neuroscience to describe, explain, and evaluate phenomena and to generate new ideas.

SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Ask scientific questions and construct reasonable hypotheses. Establish a research focus that identifies and builds on primary interests in neuroscience. Practice scientific method and understand its limitations. Perform laboratory skills consistent with the requirements of their field. Use statistical reasoning routinely for evaluating research and develop appropriate applications of statistics and other analytical methods. Seek the most precise and parsimonious explanation. Use skepticism consistently as an evaluative tool. Formulate and test alternative explanations and models on the basis of evidence. Evaluate relevant content from a broader range of available resources; show refined and flexible use of published research. Create compelling arguments with attention to subtle meaning of content; anticipate and defend against criticism, adapt arguments for wide range of audiences.

SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Communicate effectively in oral and written forms. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature. Critique and analyze claims of others in a scientific context. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology. Work effectively in group situations.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students write a research grant application and defend it orally to their committee members. Students are evaluated by their examination committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
Four students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and two passed on their first attempt. One student passed on his second attempt. The other student stopped the Qualifying Exam process at the pre-proposal level. Therefore, 50% of students passed the Qualifying Exam on their first attempt and 75% of students passed the Qualifying Exam overall during this period.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
Four students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and two passed on their first attempt. One student passed on his second attempt. The other student stopped the Qualifying Exam process at the pre-proposal level. Therefore, 50% of students passed the Qualifying Exam on their first attempt and 75% of students passed the Qualifying Exam overall during this period.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and two passed on their first attempt. One student passed on his second attempt. The other student stopped the Qualifying Exam process at the pre-proposal level. Therefore, 50% of students passed the Qualifying Exam on their first attempt and 75% of students passed the Qualifying Exam overall during this period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students write and orally defend a comprehensive plan of future research that details the rationale, methods, and procedures for the proposed dissertation research. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five students proposed a dissertation for the first time and all five were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five students proposed a dissertation for the first time and all five were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five students proposed a dissertation for the first time and all five were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 3: Dissertation Defense (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students write a dissertation and defend it orally. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two students defended a dissertation for the first time and both were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two students defended a dissertation for the first time and both were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two students defended a dissertation for the first time and both were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content

The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: **Not Met**

There were serious concerns with 2 out of 39 students. Therefore, there were concerns with 5.1% 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 2012-2013 - Target: **Not Met**

There were serious concerns with 2 out of 39 students. Therefore, there were concerns with 5.1% 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 2012-2013 - Target: **Not Met**

There were serious concerns with 2 out of 39 students. Therefore, there were concerns with 5.1% of the students.

### No actions planned due to infancy of the graduate program

This program was approved by the Board of Regents in November, 2009 and the first cohort of students was admitted in January, 2010. As this program is still new, no actions are planned at this time.

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

### New program with action plan in development

This program is still new and the first cohort of students were admitted in January 2010 with two additional cohorts admitted in August 2010 and 2011. Due to the infancy of this program we are still developing our action plan. In addition to reviewing student performance on their Qualifying exams, and dissertation defense we are working on the following action items: 1. Continued enhanced Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR) training. RCR training is required by the National Institutes of Health and may soon be required by the National Science Foundation as part of graduate student training. This training is designed to expose students to best ethical practices for conducting research. We are teaching our first "official" graduate RCR course (Intro to Graduate Studies) and data collected from this course will verify that we are in compliance with RCR guidelines and can used if we decide to apply for graduate training grants in the future. 2. We have had two cohorts of students take the new Neuroscience PhD qualifying exam. After reviewing the Milestone Evaluation forms we have determined that we will better be able to assess student performance if we separate out the oral exam scores from the written exam scores. We will revise this document in Fall 2011. 3. Using the revised Milestone Evaluation form we will be able to delve deeper into specific indicators of student performance instead of just focusing on overall global scores. Using a more in-depth analysis of data from the Milestone Evaluation forms we will be able to better determine if our students are adequately prepared for the exam as well as determine if assessments used in our Core courses are sufficient in training our students in the scientific process. 4. We propose to implement Professional Development courses and workshops for our students to better prepare them for conference presentations, job interviews, enhancing teaching performance etc. 5. As part of the interdisciplinary nature of our PhD program we worked with the Philosophy Dept. to develop a "Concentration in Neuroethics" that our students can voluntarily participate as a way of enhancing their graduate training.

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

### Additional mentoring

Based on the annual reports there were serious concerns with two first year students, both of whom had difficulty completing research projects in labs in which they rotated during 2012-13. Both students met several times with the Director of Graduate Studies and repeatedly with their rotation mentors. One student is now on leave due family medical issues. The other student had problems handling the increased expectations of balancing classes and research. Both students received additional mentoring and time-management advice and will continue in the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **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>Annual Review</td>
<td>Neuroscience Theory and Content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increased mentoring

To better prepare students for the Qualifying Exam we have moved the requirement to take the "Survival Skills" Scientific Thinking and Proposal Writing Course (Neur 6600) from the second semester of year two in the program to the second semester of year one in the program. Students need to be exposed to grant writing and scientific thinking earlier in the program and more often. We have also incorporated additional proposal writing and scientific methodology more consistently into our introductory curriculum. The student who did not complete the qualifying exam in Spring 2013 after the first attempt received additional writing and experimental design guidance from her graduate mentor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **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>Proposal Writing Course</td>
<td>Neuroscience Theory and Content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Measure:** Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration

**Quality in Exam Action Plan consists of taking one class earlier in the program and increased mentoring.**

To better prepare students for the Qualifying Exam we have moved the requirement to take the "Survival Skills" Scientific Thinking and Proposal Writing Course (Neur 6600) from the second semester of year two in the program to the second semester of year one in the program. Students need to be exposed to grant writing and scientific thinking earlier in the program and more often. We have also incorporated additional proposal writing and scientific methodology more consistently into our introductory curriculum. The student who did not complete the qualifying exam in Spring 2013 after the first attempt received additional writing and experimental design guidance from her graduate mentor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Neuroscience Theory and Content

**Implementation Description:** First year students have already been instructed to take Nuer 6600 in Spring 2014. The student repeating the QE is doing so Fall 2013 which an expected completion date of Dec. 5th.

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and all Neuroscience graduate faculty

**Additional Resources:** None

**Students will take proposal writing class in second semester of program.**

To better prepare students for the Qualifying Exam we have moved the requirement to take the "Survival Skills" Scientific Thinking and Proposal Writing Course (Neur 6600) from the second semester of year two in the program to the second semester of year one in the program. Students need to be exposed to grant writing and scientific thinking earlier in the program and more often. We have also incorporated additional proposal writing and scientific methodology more consistently into our introductory curriculum. The student who did not complete the qualifying exam in Spring 2013 after the first attempt received additional writing and experimental design guidance from her graduate mentor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies

**Additional Resources:** None

**Time mangement training**

Based on the annual reports there were serious concerns with two first year students, both of whom had difficulty completing research projects in labs in which they rotated during 2012-13. Both students met several times with the Director of Graduate Studies and repeatedly with their rotation mentors. One student is now on leave due family medical issues. The other student had problems handling the increased expectations of balancing classes and research. Both students received additional mentoring and time-management advice and will continue in the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Annual Review | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013

**Additional Resources:** None
**G 3: Generalist Nursing Knowledge**
Integrate knowledge of self, the arts and science when providing safe patient-centered care to diverse and vulnerable populations in various settings.

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: CTW (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates who enter the program in Fall 2009 or thereafter will take two critical thinking through writing courses. Relevant Associations: The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential IX: Baccalaureate Generalist Nursing Practice: The baccalaureate graduate understands and respects the variations of care, the increased complexity, and the increased use of healthcare resources inherent in caring for patients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Critical Thinking Exam (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Relevant Associations: The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential IX: Baccalaureate Generalist Nursing Practice: The baccalaureate graduate understands and respects the variations of care, the increased complexity, and the increased use of healthcare resources inherent in caring for patients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Research Article Critique (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Relevant Associations: The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential III: Scholarship for Evidence Based Practice: Professional nursing practice is grounded in the translation of current evidence into one's practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Literature Search Activity (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in NURS 3500 Nursing Research will complete a literature search activity paper on a topic related to nursing. Students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points on the rubric. Relevant Associations: The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential III: Scholarship for Evidence Based Practice: Professional nursing practice is grounded in the translation of current evidence into one's practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (G: 3) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Exit Survey (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating seniors completing the exit survey will indicate that they felt prepared to &quot;integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community&quot; (program outcome). 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: CTW NURS 2080 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: CTW NURS 4600 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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%.

**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 UG students scoring less than national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment will show an improvement on the exit Critical Thinking Assessment.

**Findings 2012-2013** - **Target: Met**

For summer 2012 graduates, the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment was not administered. This test was a new product initiated after these students were admitted to the program. For fall 2012 graduates, 6 students scored less than the national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment. 5 of 6 students improved their score on the Critical Thinking Exit exam. (5/6: 83.3%)

For spring 2013 graduates, 3 students scored less than the national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment. All three of these students improved their score on the Critical Thinking Exit exam. (3/3: 100%) For this reporting cycle, 8 students scored less than the national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment. 8 of 9 students improved their score on the Critical Thinking Exit exam. (8/9: 88.8%)

**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. Beginning summer 2012, this was a group assignment and graded as such.

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 2012-2013** - **Target: Met**

For summer 2012, 23/24 (95.8%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research critique. For fall 2012, 46/46 (100%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research critique. For spring 2013, 66/66 (100%) 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 2012-2013** - **Target: Met**

For summer 2012, 23/24 (95.8%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the literature search activity. For fall 2012, 45/46 (98%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the literature search activity. For spring 2013, 65/66 (98%) 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 2012-2013** - **Target: Met**

For summer 2012, 17/18 (94.4%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt. For fall 2012, 45/50 (90%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt. For spring 2013, thus far, 15/15 (100%) of the 63 graduates have taken and passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt. For the cycle, 77/83 (92.77%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on their first attempt. There are however 48 spring graduates on which we have no information at the time of writing this report. It is anticipated that our overall number will increase as these students sit for the NCLEX exam.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For summer 2012, 100% of the graduating seniors felt they were satisfactorily prepared or better, 72.3% of the graduating seniors indicated they felt good or better and 16.7% indicated they were excellently prepared. For fall 2012, 90% of the graduating seniors indicated they felt satisfactorily prepared, 65% indicated they felt good or better, and 27% indicated they were excellently prepared. For spring 2013, 97% indicated they were satisfactorily prepared, 87% indicated they felt good or better, and 37% indicated they were excellently prepared. For the cycle, 94.7% 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 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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam
Implementation Description: This is the end of the next academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
Additional Resources: None at this time

CTW NURS 2080
NURS 2080 will develop clearer objectives related to this writing project. Consistent graders for each student's paper will be initiated Fall 2009. All graders will meet in the beginning of the semester to discuss issues noted the previous semester. One instructor will review all papers for a consistent numeric grade.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW
Implementation Description: By the end of Fall 2009 semester, these changes will be in place.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty assigned to NURS 2080
Additional Resources: None at this time

CTW NURS 4600
We will continue to monitor the CTW assignment in NURS 4600 for continued achievement of target goal.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW NURS 4600 | Outcome/Objective: CTW
Implementation Description: Continue to monitor for this academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Nursing faculty assigned to teach NURS 4600
Additional Resources: None at this time
Evidence Based Practice
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON 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 reworded when the survey is revised the next time. It is the opinion of The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON that the graduates may not understand the intent of this question on the current survey. The committee will evaluate if the question(s) need clarification, or if there are too many variables, and the graduates may not understand what is being asked. Additionally by grouping the variables, if a student feels lacking on one variable, but not the others, they may answer negatively because of the one area lacking, and the other areas may not be lacking. The The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will assess the questionnaire.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
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: 08/2010
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: 08/2010
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: 08/2010
Clinical narrative papers generated from NURS2080
It is commendable that the target was exceeded for Spring 2011. However the target was not met for the Fall 2010 class. This years overall score was significantly improved from the last cycle. for this reason the UG program coordinator has met with the faculty involved in this course and reviewed practices. Continued 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

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 standarized 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 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  

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  

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  

Implementation Description: Standardized 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  

Responsible Person/Group: CA of NURS3610, CA of NURS3710

Additional Resources: none
**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 health care delivery in Georgia and beyond.

**Goals**

**G 1: Integration of Knowledge**
To integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in advanced practice nursing.

**G 2: Legal and Ethical Issues in Advanced Nursing**
Incorporate knowledge of legal and ethical issues in advanced practice nursing.

**G 3: Theory as a Basis for Advanced Practice Nursing**
Evaluate concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced practice nursing.

**G 4: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specializations**
Demonstrate behaviors consistent with the selected advanced practice role.

**G 5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Healthcare**
Analyze the influence of socio-political, economic, and ecological forces on nursing practice, health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers.

**G 6: Activities for Improvement of Health**
Initiate activities that promote nursing and the improvement of health and healthcare.

**G 7: Integrating Knowledge into Practice**
Integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in advanced practice nursing.

**G 8: Collaboration in the Provision of Healthcare**
Collaborate with individuals, families, communities and others for the purpose of providing nursing care and promoting health and wellness.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Professional Commitment (G: 1, 4, 7) (M: 1, 9, 10, 11)**
At end-of-program, 80% of the masters students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment as reported on the end-of-program survey.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners; American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health); National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners; National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

**SLO 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 12)**
100% of the master's students will demonstrate evidence of ethical and legal practice as demonstrated by evaluation of clinical practicum experiences.

**SLO 3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice (G: 3, 4, 7) (M: 3)**
80% of the students will report that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing in advanced practice nursing as evidenced by end-of-program survey results.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate Behaviors in Specialization (G: 4, 8)**
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.

**SLO 5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice (G: 4, 6, 7, 8) (M: 1, 2, 4)**
At end-of-program, 80% of the master's students will meet/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

**SLO 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (G: 4, 8) (M: 6)**
At end-of-program, 90% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others.

**SLO 7: Participation in Research (G: 7) (M: 7)**
At the end-of-program, 80% students will indicate that they are prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

**SLO 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.) (G: 1, 7) (M: 8, 12)**
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice experiences.
### SLO 9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4) (M: 2, 4, 6, 9)
At end-of-program, 90% students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

### SLO 9: Practice in Specialty Area (G: 4) (M: 9)
Graduates (90%) of the master's program will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation.

### SLO 10: Scholarly Productivity (G: 1) (M: 7, 10)
Alumni survey results will be involved scholarly activities [participation in research (25%); publications (15%); presentations at professional meetings (50%)] by 5-years post-graduation.

### 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% of students will indicate that they met/exceeded the objective of analyzing various approaches to nursing practice.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Professional Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

At end-of-program 100% (69/69) of the masters students indicated that they met/exceeded this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By end-of-program 90% of the master's students enrolled in clinical courses will demonstrate evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses and end of program evaluation data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

96% of master's students indicated they met/exceeded this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

At the end of program 79% (55/70) of students indicated that they met/exceeded this target.

#### M 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Practice (O: 2, 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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. In addition, according to end-of-program survey 96% of students indicated that they are able to make ethical decisions related to patient care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See measure 1, target/finding 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of students reported that they met/exceeded this target/objective.

**M 3: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice (O: 3)**

At the end of the program, 85% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective that they will evaluated concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced nursing practice.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

91% of graduating students reported that they met/exceeded this objective.

**M 4: Demonstration of Caring in Nursing Practice (O: 5, 9)**

At end-of-program, 90% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the objective that they demonstrated caring in nursing practice.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice**

See Measure 1, target/objective 5

**Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice**

At the end-of-program, 90% of graduating students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% (69/69) of graduating students indicates that they met/exceeded this objective.

**M 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (O: 6, 9)**

At end-of-program, 90% of graduating students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others for the purpose of improving health. Benchmark not met consistently for the current and past cycles; action plan under development

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O6: Collaboration in Provision of Care**

90% of graduating students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

99% of students indicated that they met/exceeded this program objective.

**Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice**

See Measure 6, target/objective 9

**M 7: Participation in Research (O: 7, 10)**

At the end-of-program, 80% of graduating students will indicate that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O7: Participation in Research**

At the end of program, 80% of graduating students will indicate that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

78.6% (55/70) graduating students indicated that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice. In addition, only 68%(47/69) report understanding basis principles of statistical testing. On the other hand 90% (63/70) indicate they were prepared to evaluate the need for change to improve practice; 94.3% indicated they are prepared to implement evidence-based practice.

**Target for O10: Scholarly Productivity**

Alumni survey results will be involved in scholarly activities [participation in research (25%); publications (15%); presentations at professional meetings (50%)] by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not-reported this cycle.

**M 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Sciences, Etc.) (O: 8, 12)**
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice experiences.

**Target for O8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.)**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

98.6% of the students indicated that they met/exceed this program objective.

---

**Target for O12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare**

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. Benchmarks not met; action plan under development.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

92.8% (65/70) students indicated that they met/exceeded this program objective.

---

**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

**Target for O1: Professional Commitment**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

See data from Measure 1, objective/target 1

---

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

See Measure 2, objective/target 9

---

**Target for O9: Practice in Specialty Area**

Graduates (90%) of the master's program will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not measured this cycle.

---

**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

**Target for O1: Professional Commitment**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

See Measure 9, objective/target 1.

---

**Target for O10: Scholarly Productivity**

Alumni survey results will be involved in scholarly activities [participation in research (25%); publications (15%); presentations at professional meetings (50%)] by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

See Measure 7, objective/target 10

---

**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

**Target for O1: Professional Commitment**

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.
### Target for O11: Professional Membership
Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will report membership in professional nursing organizations (80%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (O: 2, 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 sociopolitical forces on health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers. Benchmarks not met; action plan under development.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

### Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Measure 2; Target and Findings 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.)
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Measure 8; Target Findings 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare
At the end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of sociopolitical forces on health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.4% (65/70) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded this program objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

#### 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

#### Alumni data
Alumni data difficult to obtain; will continue in this effort. Reevaluate next cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

#### Alumni data
Alumni data difficult to obtain; will continue in this effort. Reevaluate next cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Research</td>
<td>Scholarly Productivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alumni data**
Alumni data difficult to obtain; will continue this effort. Reevaluate next cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Practice in Specialty Area | Outcome/Objective: Practice in Specialty Area

**Alumni data**
Alumni data is difficult to obtain after students graduate. Will continue in this effort. Re-eval in next cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Evaluate concepts and theories in nursing**
Master's Program Coordinator, N7900 course administrator, and the master's program committee will continue to monitor this objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **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
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** As above.

**Prepared to engage in research activities**
This objective and it's target are consistently not meet each year. Since there is no requirement for a thesis in the master's program and since the curriculum committee decided to remove all requirements for research projects, students do not get an opportunity to participate in research activities. Since curriculum nor program plans do not afford master's students this opportunity will not continue to measure here.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Participation in Research | Outcome/Objective: Participation in Research

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

None were made since 2011-2012

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

We continue to not meet target for obtaining alumni data. Will bring this before the MPC meeting in Sept. as an item of discussion. Will report these items in Oct 2013 of suggestions on how to obtain this data.

---

### Annual Report Section Responses

**Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.**
In order to comply with advanced practice registered nurse regulatory model endorsed by the majority of nursing professional organizations, the master's program integrated addition content into two of the specialty tracks; the Adult Health Clinical Nurse Specialist/Nurse Practitioner (AH CNS/NP) track and the Psych Mental Health Family Nurse Practitioner (PMH NP) Track. For the AH CNS/NP gerontology content was integrated according to Adult-Gerontology CNS Competencies (2010) and Population Focused NP Competencies from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing. The PMH NP track complies with the Population Focused NP Competencies ((2013). The program also made sure we were in compliance with the Criteria for Evaluation of NP Programs (2008).

**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.**
Plans are to separate the AH CNS/NP track within the next year. This will require a curriculum change to ensure we meet competencies, certification standards, and evaluation criteria from the various profession nursing organizations.
**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

Master's students do not have opportunities for research activities in their program plan (thesis, projects, etc.). This is a measure/objective we will look at revising or deleting altogether.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

See above. Also were we have consistency met outcomes >95% over the past 5 years possibly look at other outcomes to measure.

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

Reported elsewhere.

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

Reported elsewhere.

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

Graduate students are encouraged to be involved in medical mission trips. One SON part time faculty offers students clinical experiences in Haiti annually.

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

Pharmacology and Pathophysiology courses have Graduate Teaching Assistants that provide reviews for the students. Study groups are encouraged. If students are unsuccessful at midterm, that meet with the course administrator (CA) and review their exams in hopes of identifying their problem. Faculty advisors are also notified of midterm failures and are available to students for assistance. Students are referred to the counseling center for assistance with testing issues in clinical courses, faculty make site visits to determine student progression. If issues are identified, the CA and the preceptor develop a plan of action to assist the student in being successful. Additional clinical hours can be added to assist the student in being successful in the clinical component of the course. Clinical sites can be changed if needed to ensure successful completion of the clinical objectives. If students have difficulty completing course requirements (didactic or clinical) with valid reasons, they may be given additional time to complete assignments and may also be given an incomplete in a course until all requirements are completed. If students are unsuccessful in two courses, they have the option of applying for reinstatement or readmission. These are evaluated on an individual basis and students have been reinstated or readmitted and have been successful.

**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).

The SON nursing collaborative composed mostly of certified nurse practitioners offer advanced practice nursing care to different community organizations such as Head State, homeless shelters. This health care includes school based health, primary care, and back to school physical exams. Graduate students are provided opportunities to assist in this collaborative effort. Also, the collaborative initiates an annual flu vaccines program for GSU.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Nursing PhD**

*As of 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing is to create a premier multicultural learning community that produces leaders, clinicians, scholars and researchers who exemplify nursing excellence and enhance healthcare delivery in Georgia and beyond. The Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing will be nationally recognized for innovative, responsive, educational nursing programs focused upon diversity, urban healthcare, and vulnerable populations. The School will be noted for expert practitioners, community partnerships, and leading-edge research.

**Goals**

**G 1: Research Implementation**

Plan and implement nursing research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

**G 2: Theory Utilization**

Link theory and research to the promotion of health in vulnerable populations.

**G 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations**

Analyze health promotion issues in vulnerable populations.

**G 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

Explore, develop, and apply diverse modes of inquiry to the discipline of nursing.

**G 5: Scholarly Activities**

Complete scholarly activities such as grant submission, presentations at regional and national meetings, submission of an article for publication in a refereed journal, etc.

**G 6: Completion of PhD Program**
Students will successfully complete requirements for graduation with a PhD in nursing.

**G 8: Leaders of change**
80% of graduates will accept positions that will lead changes in health care and health education at the state and regional level.

**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.

**SLO 11: Leaders of change (M: 10)**
80% of graduates will accept positions that will lead changes in health care and health education at the state and regional level.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (O: 3)**
In Summer 2013, 5 (100%) of the doctoral students enrolled in NUS 8100 Vulnerable Populations successfully linked theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations as demonstrated by successful completion of the written assignments of the course.

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

**M 1: Qualitative Research Implementation (O: 1, 4)**
80% (n=4) 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 2013 5 (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)**
Seven doctoral students successfully implemented socially relevant research projects and graduated in 2012-2013.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**M 4: Theory Utilization (O: 2)**

In Spring 2013, 5 students (100%) 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)**

Three (60%) doctoral students successfully completed NURS 8050 Quantitative Research Methods I in Fall 2012. Three (60%) of the students successfully completed NURS 8051 Quantitative Research Methods II in Spring 2013.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 6: Manuscript Submission (O: 6)**

Of the 39 students, eight (20.5%) have reported submitting manuscripts for publication.

Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

**M 7: Grant Application Submission (O: 1, 7)**

Of the 39 students, 1 (3.9%) received funding from external sources.

Source of Evidence: Honors and awards outside the institution

**M 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (O: 8)**

Of the 39 students, 11 (28%) have reported presenting oral or poster abstracts at professional meetings.

Source of Evidence: Honors and awards outside the institution

**M 9: Completion of PhD Program (O: 1, 9)**

In Fall 2012, we had a total of 39 students. At the end of Summer 2013, 13 students were enrolled in core courses, and seventeen were completing dissertations or comprehensive exams. Two students withdrew from courses for personal reasons. Seven students completed their dissertations.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

**M 10: Leaders of change (O: 11)**

80% of graduates will accept positions that will lead changes in health care and health education at the state and regional level.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Nutrition BS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST*

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

#### Mission / Purpose

The Department 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 Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND)-accredited program, known as a Didactic program in Dietetics (DPD) is at the junior year. The program graduates approximately 30 students each year. Mission of the DPD: To graduate students with the knowledge, insight, and skills to participate effectively as dietetic professionals in a contemporary society.

#### Goals

**G 1: Prepare graduates to be competent for entry into ACEND accredited supervised practice programs or entry level dietitian p.**

Over a five year period, 60% of graduates will apply to a supervised practice program (DI or CP) the year they complete the DPD. Over a five year period, 80% of those applying to supervised practice programs the year they complete the DPD will be accepted into a program. Over a five year period, the pass rate for DPD graduates taking the registration examination for the first time will be at least 80%. Ninety percent of supervised practice directors will indicate that students were prepared for the supervised practice program. At least 50% of graduates who are not accepted into a supervised practice program will submit an application to take the registration examination for dietetic technicians. Over a five year period, 70% of graduates who are not accepted to supervised practice programs and who respond to the one-year post graduate survey are employed in a nutrition dietetics related field or are in graduate school.

**G 2: Promote professional development by emphasizing problem-solving skills, lifelong learning skills, and critical thinking skills.**

One-year post graduation, 90% of graduates responding to survey will indicate the program prepared them for the profession. Within three years of DPD completion, at least 50% of graduates responding to survey will indicate participation in at least one professional activity. On average, recent graduates will rate their ability to apply scientific reasoning in problem solving as 4 or better on a 0 to 5 scale.

**G 3: Attract and retain well qualified candidates.**

Ninety percent of students enrolled in DPD will complete program/degree requirements within 6 semesters. Over a five year period,
90% of students who begin the DPD will complete the program. Over a five year period, the pass rate for DPD graduates taking the registration examination for the first time will be at least 80%.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice (M: 1, 2)
1. Students are able to demonstrate how to locate, interpret, evaluate and use professional literature to make ethical evidence-based practice decisions. 2. Students are able to use current information technologies to locate and apply evidence-based guidelines and protocols, such as Evidence Analysis Library of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, 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. 3. Students are able to locate, understand and apply established guidelines to a professional practice.
Relevant Associations: Goal 1 and 2

SLO 2: Professional Practice Expectations: beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviors for the professional dietitian level of practice
1. 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. 2. Students are able to demonstrate assertiveness, advocacy and negotiation skills appropriate to the situation.
Relevant Associations: Goal 2

SLO 3: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and popula (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
Students are able to apply management and business theories and principles to the development, marketing and delivery of programs or services.

SLO 5: Demonstrate science understanding (M: 2)
Students are able to demonstrate an understanding of the influence of chemical, microbiological, and physiological disciplines as they affect food and nutrition.

SLO 6: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle (M: 2, 3)
1. Students are able to apply knowledge of the role of environment, and food and lifestyle choices to develop interventions to affect change and enhance wellness in diverse individuals and groups. 2. Students are able to develop an educational session or program' educational strategy for a target population. 3. Students are able to demonstrate counseling techniques to facilitate behavior change.

SLO 7: Integrate social sciences (M: 3)
1. Students are able to explain the impact of a public policy position on dietetics practice. 2. Students are able to explain the impact of health care policy and administration, different health care delivery systems and current reimbursement issues, policies and regulations on food and nutrition services.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Research Paper (O: 1)
This paper is a component of the capstone Critical Thinking through Writing course (NUTR 4950). It is completed in stages, with two revision cycles. 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). Ninety percent 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.

M 2: Discipline-specific Critical Thinking (O: 1, 3, 5, 6)
Critical thinking is essential for dietetic practitioners. This ACEND-accredited program focuses on preparing dietetic practitioners. The measure used for this assessment is direct measures of student performance on specific, critical thinking assignments. Assessment Method for 2012-2013 1. Ninety percent of the junior students in NUTR 3600 (Life Cycle Nutrition) receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments. 2. Ninety percent of the junior students in NUTR 4600 (FoodService Systems) receive at least 80% or better on the Human Resources case study. 3. Ninety percent of the senior students in NUTR 4200 (Medical Nutrition Therapy) receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Expanded evaluation of writing
In 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, rubrics were revised and applied to a junior course NUTR 3010 and the senior course NUTR 4950 to address critical thinking and critical writing skills. The evaluation process entailed selecting a random sample (30-35% of the class) of final papers from NUTR 3010 and conducting a paired comparison of those papers with papers from NUTR 4950 the following year. These comparisons were made and data were used to improve assignments and progression of assignments.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
The target was met with 90% of the students receiving 80% or better on the case study.

Revision of Program Goals
Assessment report will be revised to include the required ACEND Goals, Knowledge Requirements and Learning outcomes for the program. New Goals: Goal 1: Prepare graduates to be competent for entry into ACEND 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
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

Annual Report Section Responses
Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
- Exceeded the national average for placing graduates in supervised practice programs. - Able to retain 27 of the 28 students who entered the DPD in the Fall of 2012.

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: 1. Loss of key faculty members (did not receive tenure). These faculty taught 20% of the required courses in the DPD.

Modifications in Measurement Methods--If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
Modification of measurement for critical thinking occurred. Case study assignments replaced evaluation of questions on select exams.

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

Publications and Presentations--Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

Contributions to Student Retention--Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
- Student advisement implemented twice during fall and spring semesters. - Secured tutors (graduate students) for DPD juniors in NUTR 3700 (Medical Biochemistry).
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).

Atlanta Community Food Bank 78732 Joseph E Lowery Blvd Nw, Atlanta, GA Developed business plan to incorporate nutrition education and identify nutritional value of foods received/distributed. Update Hunger 101 curriculum Mid-town Food Pantry Intown Collaborative Ministries P.O. Box 8808 Atlanta, GA 31100 Provide assistance to develop food distribution protocols. Clarkston Communities Sustainability; gardening Head Start YMCA's in metro Atlanta Nutrition education for children, staff, parents

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Operations Management MS
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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 customers. 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 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: 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.

Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM
Target Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 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
The student should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Our findings indicate a greater appreciation for environmental and sustainability issues. These findings are based on classroom discussions and written assignments. We find that 90% of our students are well versed on these topics.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O4: Become a Strong Team Member**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Objective 4: Become a Strong Team Member Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 6 Team Skills The student did not develop team skills by indicated by poor returns on peer evaluations. The student develops team skills by indicated by average returns on peer evaluations. The student develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Our findings reflect that the majority of our students (95%+) appreciate the value of a collaborative work environment engaged in divergent/ convergent thinking. Our students understand and appreciate the value of establishing criteria for problem solving and assessing alternatives against these criteria in a team setting.

---

**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 and 8760 lessons on effective teams. · Require team members in the group project of In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8760 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

---

**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?

Among the six courses, and six instructors, we have made no significant changes in the assessment process. Minor changes to MGS
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 elective course MGS 8710 title has been changed from Operations Planning to Logistics and Operations Planning. This change better reflects the course curriculum and student needs in this area of study.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

During the last several reporting periods we have the following items that are germane to our Operations Management MS program.
1) Consistency of instruction over the last four reporting cycles: We have five full-time professors and one part-time professor teaching the course work. The reviews for the faculty reflect a keen interest in the course work, as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of the instruction. 2) The MS program is made up of six courses (one mandatory & 5 electives). The attendance for both Spring and Fall semesters reflects good student representation for the electives. We are currently studying the possibility of a Fast Track MS program which would have an emphasis on business analytics, operations, and supply chain management (logistics). The new course would replace the current OM-MS offering. 3) Each of the six courses include a comprehensive team project which focuses on the course topic and includes process analysis, critical path analysis, risk assessment, supply chain event management, human resource issues and some financial analysis. In addition, the assignment includes a class presentation made at the senior management level. Both components of the assignment represent a significant component of the grade for the course. In most cases there are articles and cases that are a component of the final grade. Each case and/or article must be analyzed and written up with specific issues to be addressed for each.

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.

Modified the Operations Planning course (MGS 8710) to Logistics and Operations Planning to include emphasis on logistics and supply chain management. The globalization of the marketplace has significantly changed in the 21st century, and the changes to the course reflect these changes.

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

We have no plans to modify the measurement.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

As our current outcomes are good, we do not plan to change them.

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

Peter Zhang is on the university-wide research proposal review committee and Walter Wallace is on the Critical Thinking through Writing task force committee and is one of the original Ambassadors representing the Managerial Sciences Department.

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.


International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

Walter L. Wallace spend two summers (2010 & 2011) at Sichuan University, Suzhou Institute teaching four MBA courses in Operations Management, Operations Strategy, Service Operations, and Logistics and Supply Chain Management. In 2012, Walter accompanied 20 PMBA students to Hong Kong and mainland China, visiting a variety of U.S. companies headquartered in Shanghai and Beijing, as well as Chinese based companies.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

To increase retention rate, the faculty in the area has regularly talked to students for future job opportunities and let students know skills for job search. The Global Logistics RoundTable which is a component of the Managerial Sciences Department invites graduate students from our MS and MBA program to attend monthly programs and meet senior executives form member companies. In the past several years the RoundTable has been instrumental in placing five students into member companies.

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).

The Global Logistics RoundTable which is a component of the Managerial Sciences Department invites graduate students from our MS and MBA program to attend monthly programs and meet senior executives form member companies. We feel this outreach with corporate organizations in the Southeast has been instrumental for our student involvement as well as our operations management faculty to engage in research and consulting opportunities.
Mission / Purpose

The MS in Leadership and 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 Leadership and Organizational Change extends the students’ previously acquired basic management and organizational behavior skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in leadership and applied change management practices. The MS in Leadership and 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. It is a simulated business negotiation. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In the past year, there have been 3 M.S. students who took MGS 8430. The average was 67th percentile, and all students met the 60th percentile criterion.

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. It 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

In this year, 3 M.S. students took MGS 8430. The average was 747,000, which is at the 90th percentile. However, only two of the three students met the 60th percentile criterion.

M 3: Leadership Self-Assessment (O: 3)

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

There were 3 students with an average of 2.7. All 3 met the criterion.

M 4: Leadership Development Plan (O: 3)

Measures: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

There were 3 students in the assessment group. They averaged 2.7 on the criteria with all 3 students meeting the 2.0 threshold.

M 5: Coaching Scenario Assignment (O: 4)

Measures: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

There were 3 students in the assessment group. This group had an average of 1.7 and 2 students met the 2.0 threshold.

M 6: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness (O: 4)

Measures: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were 3 students in the assessment group. This group had an average of 1.7 and 2 students met the 2.0 threshold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 2.35 with all students meeting the 2.0 criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 2.23 with 83% of students meeting the 2.0 threshold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 2.4 with all students meeting the 2.0 threshold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**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: Finished
- 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

**Implementation Description:** With additional data, it appears that students are meeting the criteria.

**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:** 05/2014

**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: Finished
- Priority: High

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

- Measure: Coaching Scenario Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
### 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:** Finished  
  **Priority:** High  
  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
    - Measure: Leadership Self-Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Prepare Leadership Development Plan  
  **Implementation Description:** With additional data, this change appears to have been beneficial.
  **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: Divided Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Divide Value in Negotiation  
  **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
  **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:** Finished  
  **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:** Finished  
  **Priority:** High  
  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
    - Measure: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Create Value in Negotiation  
  **Implementation Description:** Planning session has been implemented. Because of the small number of students in the program, we are waiting to collect more data to feel assured that the addition is having the desired effect.
  **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:** Finished  
  **Priority:** High  
  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
    - Measure: Divided Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Divide Value in Negotiation  
  **Implementation Description:** Additional activity was added to the course. Preliminary indications are that the change increased student performance.
  **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:** In-Progress  
  **Priority:** High  
  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
    - Measure: Coaching Scenario Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment  
  **Implementation Description:** Continuing implementation.
  **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MGS 8425 instructors

### 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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Reflect on Own OD Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Recognize OD Consulting Opportunities

Implementation Description: More complex example has been implemented.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: OD Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan

Implementation Description: Addition has been implemented.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Organizational Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Apply OD Consulting Skills

Implementation Description: Re-write has been helpful. Will edit again in the next iteration of the course.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

Add coaching debrief activity
Add a team based activity requiring students to do a debrief on all of the five coaching sessions conducted during the semester.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment

Implementation Description: This activity will take place immediately following each coaching session.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Add lecture on OD intervention
Add a lecture to include examples of an effective OD intervention

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: OD Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

Focus class opening on project
Focus the course opening (first day of class) more on the primary class projects.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Organizational Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Apply OD Consulting Skills

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

Revise instructions for creating value class activity
In the previous cycle, we added an activity designed to provide more practice on planning for the creation of value in negotiation. We implemented the activity, but are not yet content with the precise instructions. In the current cycle, we will adjust the instructions while continuing with the activity.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Create Value in Negotiation
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8430 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?

In the coming academic year, our department will be completing our self-study for Academic Program Review. Based on priorities stated by our Dean and Associate Dean, we anticipate that this particular degree track will be discontinued or combined into another track within the coming year. This decision is based on program enrollments that are too low to sustain a critical mass of students in the program. Given these anticipated changes, no other changes are anticipated in the coming year.

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

The enrollments in this program are extremely small. For example, some findings in the past year are drawn from a total of three students. Therefore, in any given year, we are not always convinced that findings are sufficient evidence that programmatic changes are justified. The changes we have made this year are, therefore, changes at the individual course level. These changes are reflected in the Action Plan.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2012-2013 Personal Financial Planning MS

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

MS-PFP PROGRAM MISSION: The MS in Personal Financial Planning is designed to prepare students to: (1) Enter the field of financial planning at the planner level; (2) Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam; and; (3) Serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm. It will do so by developing students’ technical expertise in the topics of financial planning and their ability to integrate that expertise to help individuals plan their financial lives. The MS-PFP provides a more concentrated and in-depth consideration of financial planning topics than is offered by the MBA-PFP and thus better serves the needs of the those who are certain of their intent to pursue a financial planning career and assume a leadership position in a financial planning firm.

**Goals**

G 1: Enter the PFP field as a planner
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to enter the field of financial planning at the planner level.

G 2: Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to pass the Certified Financial Planner exam.

G 3: Prepare for leadership role
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Technical expertise - overall (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3)**
The MS-PFP graduate will have the overall technical financial planning expertise of at least an entry-level planner. The MS-PFP graduate will understand the 89 topics of the 2004 CFP Job Analysis at or above the level of an entry-level financial planner. This standard is set by the Certified Financial Planner exam administered by the CFP Board. A passing score on the exam is at least 60%.

**SLO 2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
The MS-PFP graduate will have the technical financial planning expertise of at least an entry-level planner in each of the six major technical areas of personal financial planning (i.e., Planning Fundamentals, Income Tax Planning, Insurance Planning, Investment Planning, Retirement Planning, and Estate Planning) at or above the level of a beginning financial planner. This standard is set by the related questions in the Certified Financial Planner exam administered by the CFP Board. A passing score on the exam is at least 60%.

**SLO 3: Identify a good client-planner fit (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)**
The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to identify a good client-planner fit, and then gather and organize pertinent personal and
financial client data to support an effective analysis of and plan for meeting the client's financial needs. The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to evaluate critically his/her own financial planning strengths and weaknesses and, based thereon, be able to identify those clients and circumstances with which he/she will be most effective in providing advice and guidance.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)**

The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to effectively integrate technical financial planning concepts to assist individuals with meeting their financial needs. The MS-PFP graduate will be able to integrate each of the major technical areas of PFP (Planning Fundamentals, Income Tax Planning, Insurance Planning, Investment Planning, Retirement Planning, and Estate Planning) by properly analyzing pertinent data, identifying financial needs, and developing objectives, strategies, and an appropriate action plan for meeting those needs.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course) (O: 1, 2)**

In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student takes a mock CFP exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the course work in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself.

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

**Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall**

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

**Target for O2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas**

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

**M 2: Financial Plan prepared in PFP 8520 (capstone) (O: 4)**

In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a financial plan, acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts**

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

**M 3: CFP® Exam (O: 1)**

The CFP® Exam is administered three times each year. Many of the program’s graduates take this examination and the CFP Board of Standards reports the results to the Program Director. This examination tests competence to become a CFP certificant. The percentage of our graduates passing the examination will be compared to the national average to assess mastery of the technical and analytical skills necessary to practice as a financial planner. The long-range passing percentage for program graduates will be kept and compared with the most recent performance of the graduates and the national performance averages. Each year, the Program Director will analyze the data received from the CFP Board. The Program Director also will use his or her best efforts to monitor the frequency, bases, and nature of any disciplinary action taken by the CFP Board against any graduate of the program and will report the results of this monitoring effort.

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

**Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall**

| CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average. |

**M 4: Planner File prepared in PFP 8520 Capstone Course (O: 3)**

In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a file of supporting data and analyses, including an analysis of client fit in support of his/her financial plan.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Identify a good client-planner fit**

| A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE FOUR RUBRIC to all Planner Files submitted during each 4-year evaluation period. |

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

**Action plan based on Mock Exam**

Our sample was based on one year’s data. The data collection process will be improved by keeping more complete records of exam performance by area in future years. The assessment committee will also rely more on quizzes given by area prior to the mock exam. The quiz material will be reinforced prior to comprehensive exam. All quizzes will be kept for a more complete assessment of performance by area.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

**Action plan for mock exam**

Our sample was based on one year’s data. The data collection process will be improved by keeping more complete records of exam performance by area in future years. The assessment committee will also rely more on quizzes given by area prior to the mock exam. The quiz material will be reinforced prior to comprehensive exam. All quizzes will be kept for a more complete assessment of performance by area.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello

**Improve identification of client fit**

Identification of client fit will be improved through the development and implementation of a more focused practitioner workshop series that emphasizes client selection and retention.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Planner File prepared in PFP 8520 Capstone Course
- Outcome/Objective: Identify a good client-planner fit

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 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

**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

**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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Philosophy Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For this 2012-2013 cycle, average 1010 student’s ability to identify premises and conclusions was assessed a 3.06

**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
The disappointments this cycle are both regarding Phil 2010. We realize that it may be a problem with our past scoring scale or with the courses; we will watch this carefully, especially as we implement the new scoring scale.

The changes this cycle are both regarding Phil 2010. The change will cause a discontinuity with previous years' data, but we expect that the increase in accuracy warrants the change.

In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 2010 student's ability to think critically and effectively was assessed a 1.82.

In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 2010 student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.09.

In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 1010 student's ability to critically evaluating the arguments of others was assessed a 2.31.
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Graduate Studies (who helps select instructors for Phil 2010) and others involved will monitor.
Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Director of Graduate Studies with whole department.
Additional Resources: Funds for a new lecturer to teach more of our 2010 sections.

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 classes are fully operational and appear successful.

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?  
More years of data needed.

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 can always benefit from more WAC consultants.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?  
We’ve added Phil 3000 and Phil 4990, but CTW essentially is what Philosophers do.

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 now--starting in 2013-2014--a new scoring method.

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’ve added classes, removed classes, improved classes, always making use of all available data, including that derived from the assessment process.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.38 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.88. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 1.82. Thus, we see introductory students at 1.82, progressing students at 2.38, and finishing students at 2.88. This progression suggests the program is successfully helping students to improve their critical thinking skills.

M 2: BA Measure 2: Content (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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 3000 student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.55 and the average 4990 student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.87. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.09. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.09, progressing students at 2.55, and finishing students at 2.87. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In this 2012-2013 cycle, the average 3000 student’s written communication ability is assessed a 2.39 and the average 4990 student’s written communication ability is assessed a 2.93. 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)

New rating system proposal
Assessment Coordinator has proposed to the Department that we replace the current scale used in assessment with the following:
Proposed Assessment Scoring Scale 0: High School Dropout or below 1: Low performing High School Graduate, rising College Freshman 2: High performing High School Graduate, rising College Freshman 3: Low performing rising College Sophomore 4: High performing rising College Sophomore 5: Low performing rising College Junior 6: High performing rising College Junior 7: Low performing rising College Senior 8: High performing rising College Senior 9: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year
Goals

Mission / Purpose

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 classes are fully operational and appear successful. We’ve also managed to reduce our reliance on classes crosslisted as upper-level undergraduate (4xxx) and graduate (6xxx).

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?

More years of data needed.

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 can always benefit from more WAC consultants.

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

We've added Phil 3000 and Phil 4990, but CTW essentially is what Philosophers do.

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 now--starting in 2013-2014--a new scoring method.

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've added classes, removed classes, improved classes, always making use of all available data, including that derived from the assessment process.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2012-2013 Philosophy MA

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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: Goal of the M.A. Program

Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in the English-speaking world has one overarching theme: it
is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering critical thinking skills and clear argumentative writing as with imparting information. We believe our major should and does do both. As such, students who earn the M.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate a knowledge of representative philosophers and movements in historical and contemporary philosophy as well as knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in the various fields of philosophy. They will also demonstrate the ability to read critically with comprehension, think critically, and write clearly and critically. This is the same goal that we have B.A. students, but we expect graduates of the M.A. program to have a greater mastery of the content knowledge and a higher level of philosophical and communication skills than graduates of the B.A. program.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content (M: 1, 3)**

Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to gain a greater mastery of the content knowledge that graduates of the B.A. program attain. These include: general knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/medieval and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods; general knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods; familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements; knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the main areas of philosophy (ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic, all defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy); knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry; and knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life.

**O/O 2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills (M: 2, 3)**

Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to gain a higher level of the philosophical skills than graduates of the B.A. program attain. These include: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: MA Content Knowledge (O: 1)**

All students receiving the MA defend a thesis to a committee of at least 3 faculty members. Upon successful defense, the committee members all indicate a content knowledge score (on a 4.0 scale).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content**

Our target is that the average an M.A. student is assessed on their knowledge of content applicable to their thesis at a 3.3.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012 calendar year, M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 3.51 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012 calendar year, M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 3.41 on their philosophical skills.

**M 3: Acceptance into Phd Program (O: 1, 2)**

As an additional piece of evidence regarding how the Department succeeds in teaching our grad students both content and philosophical skills, we determine the percentage of those students that applied to PhD programs from January through December of the preceding year who were admitted to those programs. Preparing students for PhD programs is part of our mission and acceptance to such programs is a clear sign that we are creating quality MAs; this is to say that this is a clear sign that our MA graduates have content knowledge and philosophical skills.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content**

Achievement Target: We hope that any of the students who graduate with an MA who wish to continue on to a PhD program are accepted into a program they will thrive in. We set, as a realistic target, 75%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012 calendar year, we had 14 MA graduates apply to PhD programs, 11 in philosophy, 2 in psychology, and 1 in communication. All were accepted to at least one school. One was accepted to 5 programs; on average our graduates were accepted to 2.2 programs. The acceptance rate is thus an astonishing 100% for those who applied. We take this as clear indication that our grad students are learning philosophical skills and content. (Five graduates did not apply to PhD programs;
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

New rating system proposal
Assessment Coordinator has proposed to the Department that we replace the current scale used in assessment with the following:

Proposed Assessment Scoring Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>High School Dropout or below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low performing High School Graduate, rising College Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High performing High School Graduate, rising College Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low performing rising College Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High performing rising Second Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low performing rising First Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low performing rising College Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High performing rising College Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>High performing rising Third Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>High performing rising Fourth Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High performing rising Second Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low performing rising Fourth Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>High performing rising Third Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>High performing rising Fourth Year Grad Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would thus expect the 1010 assignments to be scored somewhere between 1 and 4 with a target of 3.25, the 2010 assignments to be scored between 3 and 6 with a target of 5.25, the 3000 assignments between 5 and 8 with a target of 7.25, the 4990 assignments at 7 and 10 with a target of 9.25, and the MAs between 11 and 14 with a target of 13.25.

This proposal was discussed extensively at the Department's February 2013 meeting (2/8/2013) and after some debate regarding having too many categories, was accepted as is. We realize that its implementation will cause a discontinuity with previous years' data, but we expect that the increase in accuracy warrants the change.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: New scale will be used in the 2013-2014 year.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Our CTW classes are fully operational and appear successful. We've also managed to reduce our reliance on classes crosslisted as upper-level undergraduate (4xxx) and graduate (6xxx).

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?
More years of data needed.

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 excepting complete separation of courses crosslisted as upper-level undergraduate (4xxx) and graduate (6xxx).

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
We've managed to reduce our reliance on classes crosslisted as upper-level undergraduate (4xxx) and graduate (6xxx).

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 now--starting in 2013-2014--a new scoring method.

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've added classes, removed classes, improved classes, always making use of all available data, including that derived from the assessment process.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Physical Therapy DPT
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
In accordance with, and in support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Brydine F. Lewis School of Nursing and Health Professions, the mission of the Department 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
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's/client's needs above the physical therapist's needs. o Exhibit caring, compassion, and empathy in providing services to patients/clients. o Demonstrate integrity in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, other health care providers, students, other 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 Effectively 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, 6, 7, 8, 9)
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)
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

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

**SLO 2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring (G: 4, 6) (M: 1, 2, 7, 8, 9)**

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)

**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)

**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)

**SLO 3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity (G: 1, 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

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)

**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)

**SLO 4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

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)

**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)

**SLO 5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication (G: 1, 5, 6) (M: 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9)**

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)

**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)

**SLO 6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 3, 7)**

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.
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, 6, 7, 8, 9)
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, 9)
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, 9)
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)

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, 9)**

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, 8)**

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, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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)**


**Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17

Based on performance criteria #3, #6 (Accountability, Professional Development) Professional Practice- Accountability

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Class of 2013
Score of ≥ 17

Class of 2014
Score of ≥ 9

Class of 2015
Score of ≥ 5
**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #2 (Professional Behavior) Professional Practice- Professional Behavior: Winner Intermediate Adv. Inter. Entry Level Class of 2013 18.63 Class of 2014 15.61 Class of 2015 11.6

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**


**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #1 (Professional Behavior, Professional Development) Professional Practice- Professional Behavior: Winner Intermediate Adv. Inter. Entry Level Class of 2013 18.63 Class of 2014 15.61 Class of 2015 11.6

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #4 (Communication) Professional Practice- Communication: Winner Intermediate Adv. Inter. Entry Level Class of 2013 18.0 Class of 2014 14.8 Class of 2015 10.8

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #3 (Accountability) Professional Practice- Accountability: Winner Intermediate Adv. Inter. Entry Level Class of 2013 18.2 Class of 2014 15.6 Class of 2015 11.3

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #5 (Cultural Competence) Professional Practice- Cultural Competence: Winner Intermediate Adv. Inter. Entry Level Class of 2013 18.3 Class of 2014 15.3 Class of 2015 11.4
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 Practice Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter. = 13 Entry Level=17

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Based on performance criteria #13 (Procedural Interventions) Professional Practice- Procedural Interventions Beginner Adv. Intermediate Entry Level Class of 2013 17.6 Class of 2014 14.2 Class of 2015 8.6

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)

Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available.. Ultimate pass rate for our program 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available.. Ultimate pass rate for our program 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available.. Ultimate pass rate for our program 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available.. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available.. Ultimate pass rate for our program 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.
Target for **O7**: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 graduates of the class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O8**: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O9**: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O10**: Professional Practice Expectation: Education

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O11**: Patient/Client Management Expectation

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O12**: Practice Management Expectations

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 668.49 compared to the national mean of 653.85. 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 25 graduates of the 2013 class scored 99% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score were not available. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>Role; Teaching/Learning</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>Role; Teaching/Learning</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>Role; Teaching/Learning</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>Role; Teaching/Learning</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**


**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. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Intermediate= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2013 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 9 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 5

**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. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Intermediate= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2013 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 9 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 5

**Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Intermediate= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2013 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 9 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 5

**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. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Intermediate= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2013 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 9 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**


M 5: Research Project (O: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Practice Management Expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter. = 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2013 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2014 Score ≥ 9 Class of 2015 Score Of ≥ 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met


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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met


Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met


Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

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

### Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination.
Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
For the school year 2012-2013 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2013: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 85 Class of 2015: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

M 7: Graduate Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)
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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%, 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%, 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%, 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%, 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

2013 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 98%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 97 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 94%.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% 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%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.

**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%.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Employer survey revealed 5 responses with an average score of 4.7 on all criteria. 100% scored graduates in the top 10%.

**M 9: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10)**
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

**Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

**Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

**Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

**Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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

**Core Faculty Positions**
By the end of Spring 2014 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:** 05/2014
- **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:** Finished
- **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:** $0.00 (no request)

**Student Evaluation Tool**
Develope 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:** On-Hold
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Graduate Survey | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation

- **Implementation Description:** Start in association with upcoming CAPTE report due Feb 15, 2013.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Head

**100% ultimate pass rate action plan**
Over the past 3 years we have had one student that has not passed the FSBPT national PT test after re-testing. Our goal as a program is ultimate 100% pass rate. At this time we do not currently have a plan of action to address this issue. As a faculty we will develop an action plan as to address students who do not pass the national testing. This charge will be handled by the Curriculum Committee.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
Addition of PTCAS for admissions

PTCAS (Physical Therapist Centralized Application Service) is an admissions service that will be used with our program starting the 2014-15 admissions cycle. Though not indicated by outcome data as a program we recognize the current process in collecting information for admissions has been challenging. The PTCAS system is designed to streamline the process as well as allow our program to reach out to students throughout the this and other countries.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Agreement between the program and APTA has been signed
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Head: Dr. Andrew Butler; Admissions Committee
- **Additional Resources:** None

Content material associated scored below national testing

Interventions/Equipment and Devices/Therapeutic Modalities content material scored below the national testing average. Faculty discussion has occurred regarding this deficit and will be further discussed in the Curriculum committee as how to address.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Discuss with faculty and develop action plan through curriculum committee to improve scoring for this content.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Head: Course coordinator for applicable content.

Curriculum Change

Last year faculty voted and approved recommended curriculum change by the Curriculum Committee to begin the Summer of 2014. Faculty will start the process of this transition the Fall of 2013 as to insure uninterrupted content coverage for all courses and fulfillment of all program needs. We have discussed the need to consider experienced PTI’s as several semesters will require dual teaching over the next three years. This planning process will remain in place over the next 2+ years until the three year cycle of change is complete.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty discussion is in place. Program leadership has begun process of assuring goals of process
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Head: Core Faculty; Curriculum Committee
- **Additional Resources:** Hiring of PTI’s: Consideration of full time clinical faculty hire.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $40,000.00 (recurring)

DPT Joint Programs

Our department is current looking into partnering with other GSU schools to develop joint programs as a compliment to the DPT degree that will allow the student to enhance their education within specialty areas. Programs under consideration include MHA and MPH.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** In early stages with dialogue currently in place between programs
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Head: Dr Andrew Butler
- **Additional Resources:** Pending

Electronic Documentation Curriculum Addition

During annual program assessment it has been determined the DPT program is in need of electronic document training to be used throughout the program curriculum. This same need has been discussed and relayed from both the nursing and respiratory therapy programs. Electronic documentation is now currently a consistent part of all clinical environments and at this time our students only get exposure during their clinical rotations. Exposing our students in the BFLSNHP to this documentation format serves to better prepare them for their clinical education as well as to enhance their documentation skills as required by all federal and private payer sources.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** $37,000 grant approved by the University to implement program for entire school. Currently in planning stage and expecting partial implemetnation by Fall 2013 and full by Spring 2014.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assistant Department Head
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $42,000.00 (one time)

Interprofessional education course with other BFLSNHP programs: Nursing, Respiratory Therapy, and
**Nutrition**

This academic year is the second year the interprofessional education course with all Lewis School programs has been implemented. Data has been collected allowing for improved activity content including the addition of Mass Casualty training. A second attempt to acquire a HRSA grant to fully fund this educational content in progress.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Currently in progress
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Inter-professional Education Committee: Dr Kimberly Morelli
- **Additional Resources:** Pending

**PhD Program in Health Sciences at GSU**

The Lewis School is currently considering the addition of a PhD program to allow opportunity for students to advance their education and research qualifications.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Currently being developed as to present to Dean for further consideration
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr Andrew Butler, Dr Tai Wang, Dr Gordon Warren
- **Additional Resources:** School/University support to start up once approved: Amount pending

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

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

Several changes in the assessment process have occurred including: 1. Improved visual aids (charting and graphing) for viewing and understanding results and outcomes that required detailed data. This was needed as to allow for improved faculty discussion of the annual academic results. 2. Addition of National Testing content criteria as to allow for the program and instructors to better understand where our graduates were scoring in relation to details areas of course work as related to our program 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.

The included data continues to indicate we have a strong program in relation to the above average outcomes of our students. We have also accomplished many of our action plans including a faculty hire and opening of the PT Faculty clinic which will serve to further improve the program needs for future educational experiences. Our planned curriculum change has been approved and is expected to challenge the program and faculty over the next three years to maintain the high outcome levels. We are actively engaged in planning for this change as to avoid any disruption of student learning outcomes. Though we have a very high overall National Test passing rate, we expect all of our graduates to pass this exam and score above average. As a result of this evaluation action plans are in place to address any deficits related to this content. We have added several action plans after meeting and approving as a faculty including: Planning for a PhD and dual program to compliment the DPT degree, implementation of inter-professional education opportunities with the school, and planned inclusion of electronic health records into the program curriculum. We expect each of these changes to enhance the educational offering of the program and expect each will be inclusive to the future evaluation of the program. In summary the findings from this report continue to encourage the program to maintain similar efforts in the instruction of our students as we consider new options to improve our educational process as to stay ahead of the education needs of this profession and the community it serves.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Physics & Astronomy Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Physics and Astronomy teaches a number of courses in the University Core. Introductory physics and astronomy courses may be either terminal sequences or preparation for additional courses or professional degree programs. The mission of the department in introductory science courses is to provide the students with the ability to understand and analyze their world by making use of the theoretical and practical tools of science, in particular physics and astronomy. The mission of these courses is to a) provide foundational knowledge of the workings of the physical world, b) allow students to develop the ability to perform reasoning and analysis from a scientific perspective, c) teach both conceptual and practical knowledge of physical processes, and d) enhance the students abilities in applying mathematical or technological tools in their analysis. Where these courses serve as prerequisites to upper division courses or professional degree programs the department also seeks to give the students the content knowledge and skills required to succeed in those courses or programs.

**Goals**

**G 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 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**
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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
For Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, Phys1111K students scored an average of 26% on the pre-test and 44% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.24. Phys2211K students scored an average of 38% on the pre-test and 56% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.28.

**M 4: Electricity & Magnetism Diagnostic Test (O: 3)**
Within the lab portion of the courses, students in Phys1112K and Phys2212K take a multiple choice diagnostic test of electricity & magnetism conceptual understanding. Since the language is often unfamiliar to the students at the beginning of the course and published research indicates there is no value in giving it as a pre-instruction test, it is given only once near the end of the course.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: Understanding of Electricity & Magnetism Concepts**
Only limited data has been published for performance on this diagnostic. In that work at an institution comparable to GSU, post-instruction scores were reported of 44% for a Phys1112 equivalent course and 47% for a Phys2212 equivalent course. We have adopted these values as our initial targets for this measure.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
For the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, students in Phys1112 scored 32% while students in Phys2212 scored 38%. 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 new IMPACT (Improving Physics & Astronomy Curriculum & Teaching) group so that critical thinking remains a significant factor in the consideration of curricular or pedagogical changes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Implementation Description:** 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 Description:** 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 was delayed and should be available for Fall 2013.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** John Wilson

### 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. In 2013-2014, redesign of the laboratories to include inquiry-based labs and tutorials led by undergraduate learning assistants will be developed and implementation will be begun. Pilot use of learning assistants was begun in spring 2012. Pilot versions of the redesigned Phys2211 labs and tutorials will occur in Spring 2014. All redesigned labs will be operational by fall 2014.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2014  
**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 2012-2013 the department investigated the factors causing low scores in the electricity & magnetism assessment in prior years. It was determined that there was a mismatch in the timing between the assessments given in the laboratory portion of the Phys1112 and Phys2212 courses and the covering of the relevant material in the lecture portion of the courses. A new assessment schedule was developed that will be implemented beginning in Fall 2013. No new assessment instruments were developed for introductory astronomy after adoption of new Area D learning outcomes. In 2012-2013, the department developed these instruments which will be in use beginning in Fall 2013. In Summer 2013 the department created a new committee structure including a standing assessment committee. In Fall 2013 this committee will begin restructuring the assessment and reporting responsibilities to better assure successful 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.

Assessments in all lower division physics courses show achievement of learning outcomes lower than desired and below targets. In 2013-2014 the department will be making interventions in both algebra-based physics (Phys1111/1112) and calculus-based physics (Phys2211/2212). In Phys1111/1112, an internal grant will allow the production of videos for viewing outside of class to improve student preparation for in class work for "studio" physics classes. In Phys2211/2212, redesign of the laboratories to include inquiry-based labs and tutorials led by undergraduate learning assistants will be developed and implementation will be begun.
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Physics BS
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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)**
Students collaborate effectively with other students in a laboratory setting as they perform physics experiments.

**SLO 6: Research Implications (G: 2)**
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)**
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)**
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)**
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 outcomes with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty. The criteria for each course are in the Document Repository and are linked below.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O1: Classical Mechanics

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Eleven physics majors completed Phys4600, Classical Mechanics, in the Spring 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.3 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 2.7 out of 5.0.

#### Target for O2: Electricity & Magnetism

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty three physics majors completed Phys4700, Electricity Magnetism, in the Fall 2012 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.5 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.3 out of 5.0.

#### Target for O3: Statistical & Thermal Physics

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Twenty two physics majors completed Phys3401, Modern Physics I, in Fall 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.2 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.3 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2012 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.6 out of 5.0 for scientific collaboration.

#### Target for O7: Scientific Critical Thinking

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2012 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.5 out of 5.0 for scientific critical thinking.
**Target for O8: Scientific Communication**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2012 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.3 out of 5.0 for scientific communication.

**Target for O9: Scientific & Research Technology**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2012 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.5 out of 5.0 for scientific and research technology.

**M 4: Research Project (O: 10)**

The capstone of the physics bachelor's degree program is now Phys4900, Research Project - CTW. In this course students work in the research lab of a professor (within Physics and Astronomy or another department) to perform a research project while at the same time attending a class meeting each week to work on writing a research proposal and a report on their semester long research project in the style of a scientific article. 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. The outcomes are assessed by according to a rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O10: Critical thinking through writing**

At least 80% of students will achieve 3 out of 4 (competency) on each criterion of the rubric after all revisions are completed. At least 50% of the final evaluations will be 4 out 4 (mastery) for each criterion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

In Spring 2013 a total of twelve students registered for Phys4900, Research Project. One student stopped attending and failed the course while two other students received grades of incomplete. Nine students completed and passed the course with high marks. Each of these students performed a research project with an existing research group in the department of physics & astronomy. Each student wrote a research proposal in the first two weeks of the term and received comments from the course coordinator and two fellow students. This research proposal then served as the starting point for a long research report in the appropriate style for scientific journals. The research report was written consecutively in sections: introduction, methods, results, discussion, abstract, and conclusion. Each section was shared and the student received feedback from the course coordinator and two other students. Final evaluations of all five students based on the completed long research report were completed by the course coordinator using the physics rubric. All nine students scored 3 (competency) or 4 (mastery) in all seven criteria in the final assessment with 30 out of 63 scores rated as 4 and the remaining 33 scores being 3. In comparison with our targets, 100% of students achieved at least 3 (competency) on each criterion in the rubric and 48% of the scores were 4 (mastery). The average score on each of the criteria in the rubric were: A: Develop research questions - 3.2 B. Collect appropriate data - 3.4 C. Analyze and interpret data - 3.6 D. Formulate new questions - 3.6 E. Appropriate communication - 3.2 F. Scientific writing - 3.8 G. Appropriate audience - 3.6.

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

**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. New curriculum committee has been formed in the department. New courses are being added and some evaluation of current requirements is planned in 2013-2014.

- **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 have your degree program made since last year's report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, 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 Summer 2013 the department created a new committee structure including a standing assessment committee. In Fall 2013 this committee will begin restructuring the assessment and reporting responsibilities to better assure successful 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.
Over the last few years the numbers of students in the upper division physics courses have increased dramatically. The assessments of both content knowledge and scientific skills has shown a decrease in this time period, but not a very large one. Although maintaining similar results to the evaluations despite significantly larger class sizes could be viewed as some success, the assessment results were below targets to begin with. In response to low scores in research skills, a number of changes are being made to the Advanced Physics Laboratory course, Phys3300, beginning in fall 2013. More intentional instruction in experimental design, critical thinking in physics, and scientific writing are being added to the course.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Physics MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Coming Soon

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Coming Soon**

Coming Soon

**G 2: Research Skills**

Students receiving a M.S. in physics should demonstrate the skills and abilities needed to use their scientific knowledge and problem-solving skills in a collaborative, technological environment.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2, 3)**

Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

**SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

**SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)**

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

**SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

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

**SLO 5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 4, 6, 7)**

Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, and quantum mechanics. Astronomy concentration students will instead demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in at least two of the above areas, as well as in the fundamentals of astrophysics.

**SLO 6: Scientific & Research Technology (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 OS: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Four students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I. The average rating for Physics and Astronomy Knowledge was 3.8 out of 5.0 and the average rating for Math Skills was 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor and committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student's progress in collaboration, knowledge content, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the advisor at the completion of M.S. degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Astronomy MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Two students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I. The average rating for Physics and Astronomy Knowledge was 3.8 out of 5.0 and the average rating for Math Skills was 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I.

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I.

**M 3: Physics 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 Physics MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor in 2012-2013. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor in 2012-2013. The average rating for Communication in Scientific Research was 3.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor in 2012-2013. The average rating for Use of Technology in Scientific Research was 4.0 out of 5.0.

**M 4: Physics Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Physics MS Committee Evaluation Form.

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor in 2012-2013. The average rating for Use of Technology in Scientific Research was 4.0 out of 5.0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Motivations and Implications of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their research paper. Average rating for Motivations and Implication of Research was 3.5 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Scientific Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their research paper. Average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 3.7 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Scientific Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their research paper. Average rating for Scientific Communication was 3.5 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their research paper. Average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.0 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 5: Astronomy Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Motivations and Implications of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Scientific Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Scientific Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 6: Physics Presentation and General Examination (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Motivations and Implications of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Seven assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their presentation or thesis defense. Average rating for Motivations and Implication of Research was 3.4 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Seven assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their presentation or thesis defense. Average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 3.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Seven assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their presentation or thesis defense. Average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Seven assessments were completed by research committee members for Physics M.S. students in 2012-2013 based on their presentation or thesis defense. Average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.1 out of 5.0.

**M 7: Astronomy Thesis Defense (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

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

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. defense in 2012-2013.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. defense in 2012-2013.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students were rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. defense in 2012-2013.

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

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**

The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the M.S. students in both the physics and the astronomy track. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in both tracks of the MS in Physics program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
- **Measure**: Astronomy Advisor | **Outcome/Objective**: Collaboration in Scientific Research  
- **Measure**: Astronomy Committee Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective**: Motivations and Implications of Research  
- **Measure**: Astronomy Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective**: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills  
- **Measure**: Astronomy Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective**: Scientific & Research Technology  
- **Measure**: Astronomy Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective**: Scientific Communication  
- **Measure**: Physics Committee Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective**: Motivations and Implications of Research  
- **Measure**: Physics Presentation and General Examination | **Outcome/Objective**: Motivations and Implications of Research  
- **Measure**: Physics Presentation and General Examination | **Outcome/Objective**: Physical & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills  
- **Measure**: Physics Presentation and General Examination | **Outcome/Objective**: Scientific Communication  
- **Measure**: Physics Presentation and General Examination | **Outcome/Objective**: 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

New Assessment and Reporting System  
Collection and reporting of assessment data for the program has been irregular and inefficient leading to incomplete assessment data and reports. Newly re-formed department standing committee on assessment will re-evaluate the assessment and reporting system. Greater involvement from graduate directors will be sought in new assessment plan.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** John Wilson

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?

Collection and reporting of assessment data for the program has been irregular and inefficient leading to incomplete assessment data and reports. Newly re-formed department standing committee on assessment will re-evaluate the assessment and reporting system. Greater involvement from graduate directors will be sought in new assessment 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.

Since data has been irregularly collected in the past year, no significant data-driven changes have been made to the degree program.

Georgia State University  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
2012-2013 Physics PhD  
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 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, comittee 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)**

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)**

In January 2013, students in first and second year of the Physics PhD program completed qualifying exams in Electricity & Magnetism, Quantum Mechanics, Classical Mechanics, and Statistical Physics. Assessment results were collected for the first two of those exams. 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

In January 2013, students in first and second year of the Physics PhD program completed qualifying exams in Electricity & Magnetism and Quantum Mechanics. Different numbers of students take each exam since some have passed exams in the previous year. Eleven students took the Electricity & Magnetism exam achieving a score of 3.6 out of 5.0 in Physics knowledge and 3.3 out of 5.0 in Math Skills. Seven students took the Quantum Mechanics exam achieving a score of 3.9 out of 5.0 in Physics knowledge and 3.9 out of 5.0 in Math Skills.

**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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Five students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 4.8 out of 5.0.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.4 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication in Research was 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.2 out of 5.0.

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.4 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.4 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.3 out of 5.0.

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

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**

The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the Ph.D. students in physics. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in the 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:** Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Physics Knowledge and Math Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Physics Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Physics Knowledge and Math Skills
- **Measure:** Research Advisor Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration in Scientific Research
- **Measure:** Scientific & Research Technology | **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:** 05/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

**New Assessment and Reporting System**

Collection and reporting of assessment data for the program has been irregular and inefficient leading to incomplete assessment data and reports. Newly re-formed department standing committee on assessment will re-evaluate the assessment and reporting system. Greater involvement from graduate directors will be sought in new assessment plan.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

**Responsible Person/Group:** John Wilson

**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 this year. Collection and reporting of assessment data for the program has been irregular and inefficient leading to incomplete assessment data and reports. Newly re-formed department standing committee on assessment will re-evaluate the assessment and reporting system. Greater involvement from graduate directors will be sought in new assessment 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.

Since data has been irregularly collected in the past year, no significant data-driven changes have been made to the degree program.
### 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 in American Government
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.

#### G 3: Analytic skills
The department seeks to improve basic analytic skills through the core curriculum courses.

#### G 4: Communication Skills
The department seeks student learning in oral and written communications.

#### G 2: Substantive Knowledge in Global Issues
The department seeks to develop substantive knowledge in global issues and develop a recognition 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 commensurate with living in a globalized and interdependent international environment.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Substantive Knowledge in American Government (G: 1) (M: 1)
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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 1.0 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. |

**Standard Associations**

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

#### SLO 2: Substantive Knowledge of Global Issues (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)
Students should demonstrate knowledge of the key political, social, economic, humanitarian issues facing the world community as a whole and the recognition of the universality of politics in human experience and understanding of major global issues, an appreciation of political issues from a global perspective, and an appreciation of global issues from a political perspective.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 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. |
| 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) |

#### SLO 3: Analytic Skills in Introductory Political Science (G: 3) (M: 3)
Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points |
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Measures of Substantive Knowledge in American Government (O: 1)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Substantive Knowledge in American Government**

The department assesses student learning outcome in this area by two measures in 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. A pilot project over the summer of 2013 has resulted in a new set of measures to be used to assess learning outcomes in this area. They will be used in the academic year 2013-14

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report of learning outcomes in substantive knowledge in POLS 1101 FY 2012-2013.

**M 2: Measures of Substantive Knowledge of Global Issues (O: 2)**

Students should be able to pass exams demonstrating the political nature of global issues. The department uses fifteen (15) common questions that all sections of POLS 2401 administer to students as part of various quizzes and examinations. These questions assess students on, among other objectives, the acquisition of substantive knowledge. Student scores on these questions are compiled to show passing rate on these questions as a measure of learning outcomes for the course. In addition the department collects data involving the overall pass rate for these classes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Substantive Knowledge of Global Issues**

The department assesses student learning outcome in this area by two measures in 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report of learning outcomes in substantive knowledge in POLS 2401 FY 2012-2013.

**M 3: Measures of Analytic Skills (O: 3)**

The assessment of this goal is the same for both learning outcomes listed above (an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior, and an ability to assess evidence using principles of logical analysis and be able to apply that evidence when making conclusions).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Analytic Skills in Introductory Political Science**

For POLS 1101 student responses to the 10 common questions many of which involve use of analysis are used to measure analytic skills. The department aims at achieving a passing rate of 75% on the 10 common questions for assessment. For POLS 2401 student performance on various exercises designed to elicit use of analytic skills are used for assessment. Faculty are asked to assign a score ranging from 0 to 4 for each students performance on this exercise. 4= Excellent, 3= Very Good, 2= Satisfactory, 1= Passing and 0= Failing. A sample exercise used for this is attached below. The achievement target for the objective is an average score of 2.00 on the above scale.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report of learning outcomes in both POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 Analytic Skills FY 2012-2013.
The department seeks an average score of 2.5 or higher on the four point assessment of the written assignment.

**Mission / Purpose**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The Department of Political Science is committed to preparing undergraduate majors to think critically, to communicate ideas and arguments effectively, to make informed choices, and to engage in creative problem-solving. The Department's mission also includes grounding its students in the methodology of social science as well as preparing students for the practical and professional application of their course of study. Moreover, the Department strives to create an important experiential component to the BA program in Political Science, encouraging study abroad, discipline-oriented internships, and participation in competitive academic teams (Mock Trial, Model United Nations, Model Arab League). The Department of Political Science seeks to fulfill the above mission by offering undergraduate students education in the five major sub-fields of the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Administration/Policy. We offer specific concentrations in prelaw education and in International Relations. The BA program in Political Science endeavors to ensure that students get broad exposure to these fields. The Department is exceptionally well placed to help realize the University’s mission of producing responsible citizens who can contribute to the ideals of an open, democratic and global society. The Department seeks to enhance student participation outside the classroom, to stimulate and award academic excellence, and to stimulate general awareness throughout the University community of the nature and impact of the field of Political Science.

**Goals**

**G 1: Understanding of US and global political institutions and behavior**

All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate basic understanding of political institutions and behavior both in the United States and globally.

**G 3: Developing critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline**

All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline.

**G 4: Effective written and oral communications**

All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate effective writing and oral presentation skills.
G 2: Methodological and analytical skills
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate a competence in methodological and analytical skills

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Appropriate methodological and analytical skills (G: 2) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate methodological skills appropriate to the Major. Specifically students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the use of social statistics. Students will demonstrate an ability to understand data reported in various forms. Students will demonstrate an ability to conduct research using traditional and new technological resources. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the scientific method, including the formulation of hypotheses and the role of independent, control and dependent variables.

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

SLO 2: Critical thinking (G: 3) (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate competence in six critical thinking skills identified as central to the discipline of political science - identification of question or issue, consideration of assumptions and/or context, formulation of a testable hypothesis, collection and presentation of facts/data, analysis of facts and data, and integration and synthesis of other perspectives.

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

SLO 3: Effective Communication (G: 4) (M: 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to write a paper or make an oral presentation with a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner, and draw logical conclusions from findings.

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

SLO 4: Substantive Knowledge - US structures and processes (G: 1) (M: 4)
Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of the institutions of government and the behavior of governmental and non-governmental actors in the United States. Specifically, students will demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of constitutionalism, federalism, knowledge of the key institutions of government and the key actors as well as separation of powers, civil liberties, and the electoral process for American Government

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

SLO 5: Substantive knowledge - Global structures and processes (G: 1) (M: 5)
Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of international institutions and the government and the behavior of governmental and non-governmental actors in the international system. Students will demonstrate and understanding of political issues from a global perspective, and an appreciation of global issues from a political perspective. Specifically students will demonstrate an understanding of comparative perspectives and the international system.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Methodological Skills (O: 1)
The department uses assessments from a number of courses to assess learning outcomes for this objective. 1. Instructors for POLS 3800 - Introduction to political research (a required course for all majors) are asked to assess student learning in several methodological skills using a rubric (see attached rubric). Assessment scores from the first three items on the rubric are used to assess learning outcome for this objective. 2. Instructors in POLS 3200, POLS 3400 (required courses for International Affairs Concentration) and POLS 3140 (Required course for pre-law concentration) are asked to evaluate student learning outcomes in use of methodological skills in written assignments and papers submitted as part of the course. This measure uses a five (5) point scale to assess students. A score of five (5) representing the highest level of learning outcomes and one (1) the lowest. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates an absence of methodological skills 2. Demonstrates basic understanding and use of methodological skills 3. Demonstrates competency in methodological skills 4. Demonstrates mastery of methodological skills 5. Demonstrates sophistication in methodological skills

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Appropriate methodological and analytical skills
On the POLS 3800 rubric the department expects 80% of students to score 1 or better out of two on the three items of the rubric used to measure achievement of this objective. On the assessments from POLS 3200, POLS 3400 and POLS 3140 The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in methodological skills appropriate to the major.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
241 students completed POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2012-2013. 10 sections of the course were taught during the period. Three assessment scores were used to assess outcomes for this objective. The first three items on the
POLS 3800 Rubric). On the Identification of Research Question assignment 61.1% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 30.2% scored a 1 (Developing) 8.5% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 64.6% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 32.3% scored a 1 (Developing) 2.8% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 56.2% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 37.5% scored a 1 (Developing) 5.8% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off. Percentage figures are rounded off. 164 Students took POLS 3200 in Fall and Spring Semester 2012-2013. The Learning Outcome score on methodology for this score was 3.0. 187 Students took POLS 3400 in Fall and Spring Semester 2012-2013. The Learning Outcome score on methodology for this score was 3.0. 187 Students took POLS 3140 in Fall and Spring Semester 2012-2013. The Learning Outcome score on methodology for this score was 3.0

**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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

On the 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). Percentage figures are rounded off. Percentage figures are rounded off. 191 students completed POLS 4900 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2012-2013. 9 sections of the course were taught during the period. On the effective formulation of the research question portion of the rubric (items 1-3) the scores were as follows. Identification of question or issue - 44.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 47.1% scored 3-4 (Competent) 10% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 45.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 39.3% scored 3-4 (Competent) 15.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 41.4% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 38.6% scored 3-4 (Competent) 15.7% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric (items 4-5) the scores were as follows. Collection and presentation of facts/data - 44.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 45.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 5.7% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 48.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 41.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 10.0% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the effective presentation of Conclusions Skill - 62.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 36.0% scored 1 (Developing) 2.1% scored 0 (Absent) On the Presentation of conclusions skill on the POLS 4900 Assessment Rubric 35.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 41.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 12.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.

**M 3: Effective Communication (O: 3)**

Normal 0 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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill 62.6% of our students scored 2 (Competent), 36.0% scored 1 (Developing) and 2.1% scored 0 (Absent) On the Presentation of conclusions skill on the POLS 4900 Assessment Rubric 35.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 52.9% scored 3-4 (Competent) 11.4% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.

**M 4: Measure of substantive knowledge US structures and processes (O: 4)**

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Substantive Knowledge- US structures and processes**

The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in substantive knowledge of American political structures and processes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In the period Fall 2012 to Spring 2013 187 students took POLS 3140. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 3.8

**M 5: Measure substantive knowledge global structures and processes (O: 5)**

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 competeny 4. Demonstrates mastery 5. Demonstrates sophistication. See examples of attached projects and quizzes used in POLS 3200 and POLS 3400.

**Target for O5: Substantive knowledge -Global structures and processes**

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in substantive knowledge of global political structures and processes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In the period Fall 2012 to Spring 2013, 164 students took POLS 3200. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge of this course during the period was 3.50. 167 students took POLS 3400. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge of this course during the period was 3.80.

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

**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 of 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: $0.00 (no request)

**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 of 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: $0.00 (no request)

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Political Science MA**

*As of: 12/13/2016 05:59 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Political Science offers a series of comprehensive programs leading to the Master of Arts degree. Covering all of the discipline's major fields - American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Law - these 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, Public Law, or Professional Political Practices. The purpose of our MA program 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 of achievement, 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**

At least 75% of completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects will receive a score of of "high" or higher, and at least 10% will receive a score of "very high" in terms of mastery of the appropriate, relevant research skills and methods.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Five thesis projects and four non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2012 through summer 2013), down from eleven thesis projects and five 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 looks for at least 75% of students to receive a score of "high" or higher (i.e., a score of 4 or higher) and at least 10% to receive a score of "very high" (i.e., a score of 5) on the different learning outcomes. With respect to whether the project demonstrated research skills commensurate with the student's area of specialization, all of the thesis projects evaluated received at least a score of "high" on this outcome goal, and 40% received a score of "very high". Two non-thesis projects were evaluated. Both received a score of "high" on this outcome goal, and one (50% of those evaluated) received a score of "very high".

**Target for O2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature**

At least 75% of completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects will receive a score of of "high" or higher, and at least 10% will receive a score of "very high" in terms of knowledge of the relevant research literature in the student's area of specialization.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Five thesis projects and four non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2012 through summer 2013), down from eleven thesis projects and five 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 looks for at least 75% of students to receive a score of "high" or higher (i.e., a score of 4 or higher) and at least 10% to receive a score of "very high" (i.e., a score of 5) on the different learning outcomes. With respect to whether the project demonstrated a knowledge of the relevant research in the student's area of specialization, all of the thesis projects received at least a score of "high" on this outcome goal, and 40% received a score of "very high". Two non-thesis projects were evaluated. Both received a score of "high" on this outcome goal, and one (50% of those evaluated) received a score of "very high".

**Target for O3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings**

At least 75% of completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects will receive a score of of "high" or higher, and at least 10% will receive a score of "very high" in terms of 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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Five thesis projects and four non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2012 through summer 2013), down from eleven thesis projects and five 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 looks for at least 75% of students to receive a score of "high" or higher (i.e., a score of 4 or higher) and at least 10% to receive a score of "very high" (i.e., a score of 5) on the different learning outcomes. With respect to whether the project demonstrated the ability to write a professional research paper in the student's area of specialization, 80% of thesis projects evaluated received at least a score of "high" on this outcome goal, and 20% received a score of "very high". Two non-thesis projects were evaluated. Both received a score of "high" on this outcome goal, and one (50% of those evaluated) received a score of "very high".

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

### 2-draft requirement

Last year we implemented a two-draft requirement for all non-thesis papers, requiring the first draft to be turned in just after mid-semester, at the same time as the defense date for thesis papers. Based, admittedly, on a limited amount of data, we think this has helped improve the quality of the non-thesis papers and will continue this requirement.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Use of Appropriate Research Skills

**Implementation Description:** This is continued from last year.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director, non-thesis committee members
- **Additional Resources:** none

### Pre- and post-tests for methods sequence

For next year, we plan to strengthen our assessment capacity for the graduate programs by implementing a pre-test and post-test for students in our required methods sequence, POLS 8800 (fall) and POLS 8810 (spring). 8800 teaches research design, while 8810 is intermediate applied statistics. Because we must do this in order, the first pre-test will be given in Fall 2010, and the first results will not be reported until June 2011. The Graduate Director will work with the instructors of these two courses to come up with appropriate pre- and post-tests and ensure inter-coder reliability. Normally the same person teaches 8800 on a regular basis, and the same is true for 8810.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of Relevant Research Literature

**Implementation Description:** We will give the first pre-test in August 2010, the last post-test in April 2011, and report results in June 2011.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Grad director, graduate committee, instructors of 8800 and 8810.

### "C" grade minimum

The department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change.

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

**Implementation Description:** It has been added to the graduate catalog and will be enforced by the graduate director and the college graduate office.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director

### Admissions procedure reform

Last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship resources.

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

**Implementation Description:** The graduate director and graduate committee meet to decide admissions and assistantships.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director; graduate committee.

### Elimination of Public Policy and Administration

The department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Graduate director and college graduate office will enforce
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Elimination of Spring Intake
We have eliminated spring intake for our MA program. We were finding that students who entered our program in January were (1) having trouble following their courses because they had not yet taken POLS 8800, and (2) having trouble socially fitting into their cohorts.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Graduate office will stop accepting applications.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate office; graduate director

Faculty advisors
The department has decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Graduate director will assign advisors to incoming graduate students.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director; faculty.

Joint MA / JD
We are in the process of negotiating the creation of a joint MA / JD degree program with the law school. This joint agree will attract students that are interested in both law and politics.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: A sub-committee of the graduate committee is currently leading the discussions.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director; sub-committee of graduate committee.

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 began 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. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | Outcome/Objective: Effective Reporting of Research Findings
  Implementation Description: Curricular changes have been proposed and adopted; necessary changes to the Graduate Catalog for 2013-2014 have been submitted and are pending approval.
  Responsible Person/Group: Political Science Department; instructors for courses within required sequence
  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 began 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. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature
  Implementation Description: 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.
  Responsible Person/Group: Political Science Department; instructors for POLS 8800
  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 began 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 catalog changes were approved and included in the 2013-2014 Graduate Catalog. Faculty spent the summer designing the new introductory quantitative analysis course and stand-alone research design course and began teaching them in August.

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?

Based on feedback received on the 2011-2012 report, we revised our targets for this current report to make them more meaningful and better able to capture potential distinctions among students. We utilize a learning outcome assessment form that all committee members are asked to complete after a student successfully defends a thesis or non-thesis paper; committee members are asked to evaluate the thesis project or non-thesis paper on a number of different learning outcomes. We previously used a single, broad target to assess student performance, and the use of this target likely meant that we potentially lost important information about how our students have performed. The revised targets ask us to determine whether at least 75% of thesis projects and non-thesis papers received at least a score of “high” on the relevant learning objectives, and whether at least 10% of thesis projects and non-thesis papers received a score of “very high” on the relevant learning objectives.

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

We are unlikely to make any changes based on this year’s assessment data, particularly as all of our targets were met. We have, however, begun implementing this Fall a fairly dramatic overhaul of our required methods sequence to try and address long-standing concerns about student performance in terms of research design and execution. We used to require a 2-course sequence that combined research design and quantitative analysis. The new sequence for MA students is 3 courses: (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.

---
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### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

### Goals

**G 5: Teaching Effectiveness**  
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student's major field of expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (G: 4) (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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.
- 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 5: Teaching Effectiveness (G: 5) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students possess the ability to effectively teach courses in their primary fields and sub-fields of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive exam assessments (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the program's learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting. Comprehensive exams test students’ knowledge of, at minimum, two fields in the discipline.
**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Comprehensive exams are offered twice a year; they were previously offered in December and May but we began last year offering the exams in September and February. Beginning this academic year, due to a lack of space in the department, we switched from on-campus, closed note exams to take-home, open-note exams. This academic year, a total of 9 students took comprehensive exams, and 4 passed all three of their exams (44%). This represents a somewhat large decrease from last academic year’s pass rate of 80%, and the pass rate from two years ago, which was 64%. Of those passing their exams, two passed on their first try. The other two passed on their second tries. The two students who passed on their second tries both received at least one “high pass,” with the evaluation committees finding that the exam answers were “excellent” and/or “outstanding.” However, four students failed exams and the fifth was expelled for academic dishonesty as they were found to have plagiarized portions of the exams. One student failed for the third time after successfully petitioning the dean, and the three exams the student retook showed serious deficiencies; this student has since been terminated from the program. Another student failed for the second time and, again, the exams all showed serious deficiencies; this student has since been terminated. The other two students who failed exams have failed one time; one of the students only failed a single exam of the three required. They are both scheduled to retake these exams in a few weeks. Academic dishonesty is always of concern with take-home, open-note exams. That said, this particular case was quickly and easily identified as such, and the department successfully had the student expelled for plagiarism. We have since increased our efforts to educate students about academic dishonesty and the potential consequences. We also believe that we have sufficient controls in place to identify any future instances as well. Two years ago 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. Students now 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 orally as well as for the exam committee to closely question the student on this literature. Initial reports are that this system is working well. If anything, the move to this system has actually resulted in a higher threshold for passage as faculty now feel they can rate an exam as “inadequate” after a less-than-adequate oral examination.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Comprehensive exams are offered twice a year; they were previously offered in December and May but we began last year offering the exams in September and February. Beginning this academic year, due to a lack of space in the department, we switched from on-campus, closed note exams to take-home, open-note exams. This academic year, a total of 9 students took comprehensive exams, and 4 passed all three of their exams (44%). This represents a somewhat large decrease from last academic year’s pass rate of 80%, and the pass rate from two years ago, which was 64%. Of those passing their exams, two passed on their first try. The other two passed on their second tries. The two students who passed on their second tries both received at least one “high pass,” with the evaluation committees finding that the exam answers were “excellent” and/or “outstanding.” However, four students failed exams and the fifth was expelled for academic dishonesty as they were found to have plagiarized portions of the exams. One student failed for the third time after successfully petitioning the dean, and the three exams the student retook showed serious deficiencies; this student has since been terminated from the program. Another student failed for the second time and, again, the exams all showed serious deficiencies; this student has since been terminated. The other two students who failed exams have failed one time; one of the students only failed a single exam of the three required. They are both scheduled to retake these exams in a few weeks. Academic dishonesty is always of concern with take-home, open-note exams. That said, this particular case was quickly and easily identified as such, and the department successfully had the student expelled for plagiarism. We have since increased our efforts to educate students about academic dishonesty and the potential consequences. We also believe that we have sufficient controls in place to identify any future instances as well. Two years ago 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. Students now 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 orally as well as for the exam committee to closely question the student on this literature. Initial reports are that this system is working well. If anything, the move to this system has actually resulted in a higher threshold for passage as faculty now feel they can rate an exam as “inadequate” after a less-than-adequate oral examination.

**M 2: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations (O: 1, 3, 4)**

The members of each doctoral dissertation committee will individually provide to the Director of Graduate Studies a written assessment stating the degree to which the dissertation and its defense indicate success in achievement of the program’s stated learning outcomes. Members are asked to rate the dissertation on a series of learning goals and objectives. A 5-point scale is utilized, ranging from 1, “very little degree of achievement,” to 5, “very high degree of achievement” of the specific learning goal.

The assessment rubric also asks committee members for any additional thoughts or evaluations they wish to share about the specific learning outcomes. Members are asked to rate the dissertation on a series of learning goals and objectives. A 5-point scale is utilized, ranging from 1, “very little degree of achievement,” to 5, “very high degree of achievement” of the specific learning goal.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

At least 75% of successfully defended doctoral dissertations will receive a score of “high” or higher, and at least 10% will receive a score of “very high” in terms of a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major field.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Four doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2012 through summer 2013). Students are
assessed as to a number of different learning objectives; the scale ranges from 1, very little degree of achievement of the learning objective, to 5, very high degree of achievement of the learning objective. Based on averaging the assessments completed by each student's dissertation committee members, all of the students (100%) received a score of "very high" in terms of achieving a comprehensive understanding of their major field. All of the dissertations were described in the comments sections in a highly positive manner, with language such as "excellent," "a very strong account," and "creative." These dissertations thus far exceeded the department's goals in terms of the achievement of these learning objectives.

**Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods**

At least 75% of successfully defended doctoral dissertations will receive a score of "high" or higher, and at least 10% will receive a score of "very high" in terms of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Four doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2012 through summer 2013). Students are assessed as to a number of different learning objectives; the scale ranges from 1, very little degree of achievement of the learning objective, to 5, very high degree of achievement of the learning objective. Based on averaging the assessments completed by each student's dissertation committee members, all of the students (100%) received a score of "high" in terms of demonstrating a full understanding of the research enterprise, and three (75%) were evaluated as demonstrating this at a "very high" level. All of the dissertations were described in the comments sections in a highly positive manner, with language such as "excellent," "a very strong account," and "creative." These dissertations thus far exceeded the department's goals in terms of the achievement of these learning objectives.

**Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

At least 75% of successfully defended doctoral dissertations will receive a score of "high" or higher, and at least 10% will receive a score of "very high" in terms of demonstrating a full understanding of the research enterprise, including the ability to critique others' work and an ability to be a contributing scholar who produces original research.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Four doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2012 through summer 2013). Students are assessed as to a number of different learning objectives; the scale ranges from 1, very little degree of achievement of the learning objective, to 5, very high degree of achievement of the learning objective. Based on averaging the assessments completed by each student's dissertation committee members, all of the students (100%) received a score of "high" in terms of demonstrating a full understanding of the research enterprise, and three (75%) were evaluated as demonstrating this at a "very high" level. All of the dissertations were described in the comments sections in a highly positive manner, with language such as "excellent," "a very strong account," and "creative." These dissertations thus far exceeded the department's goals in terms of the achievement of these learning objectives.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

Doctoral students should present their work at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students regularly submit work for publication and or grant competitions.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

At least 15 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, three students presented at the 2012 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, a highly prestigious conference in the discipline. A number of our students were also accepted and/or invited to conferences hosted by entities such as the World Bank and the Latin American Studies Association Congress. In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized their fourth annual conference at Georgia State on building political institutions, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. Six of our PhD students were published this year, in a variety of outlets. Numerous other students also submitted their work for publication in peer-reviewed journals. We also had a number of our students apply for grants. Four students received an internal doctoral dissertation improvement award.

**Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students should regularly submit work for publication for and grant competitions.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

At least 15 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, three students presented at the 2012 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, a highly prestigious conference in the discipline. A number of our students were also accepted and/or invited to conferences hosted by entities such as the World Bank and the Latin American Studies Association Congress. In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized their fourth annual conference at Georgia State on building political institutions, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. Six of our PhD students were published this year, in a variety of outlets. Numerous other students also submitted their work for publication in peer-reviewed journals. We also had a number of our students apply for grants. Four students received an internal doctoral dissertation improvement award.

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

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

At least 15 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, three students presented at the 2012 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, a highly prestigious conference in the discipline. A number of our students were also accepted and/or invited to conferences hosted by entities such as the World Bank and the Latin American Studies Association Congress. In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized and attended their fourth annual conference at Georgia State on building political institutions, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. Six of our PhD students were published this year, in a variety of outlets. Numerous other students also submitted their work for publication in peer-reviewed journals. We also had a number of our students apply for grants. Four students received an internal doctoral dissertation improvement award.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Seventeen instructors taught a total of 37 sections in Fall, Spring and Summer of 2012-2013 (stable from last year, but up from 13 instructors teaching 21 sections in 2010-2011). This almost doubling of graduate student instructors in recent years 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 16 sections in fall 2012 (including four upper-division courses, one of which was a wholly new Model NATO course) while a fifteenth taught the first six weeks of two upper-division courses while a professor was on maternity leave; fourteen instructors taught 19 sections in spring 2013 (including two upper-division courses), and two instructors taught 2 sections in summer 2013. Six instructors taught 16 sections of POLS 1101 (Introduction to American Politics) and ten instructors taught 15 sections of POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Nine of these 31 sections were over-100 students, and none of the sections taught contained less than 48 students (two years ago, 9 sections were capped at 25 or less), and 15 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. This represents a 4.0 instructional design and course content. 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 fourteen of the 31 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 four instructors receiving evaluations under 4.0, one taught for the first time, and their score moved to a 4.2 the following semester, indicating that learning is happening. Another who received low marks taught 3 distinct sections of 1101 in the Fall with a total of almost 300 students; when this GTA taught a single section the following semester, the evaluations were easily above the 4.0 mark. The department 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 presenters, publications and grants
- Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
- High Level of Competency in Research Methods
- 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.

**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.

**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.

**Implementation Description:** Graduate director and graduate committee organizes a single meeting to discuss applicants and assistantships.

**Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director and graduate committee.

---

**Elimination of Public Policy and Administration**

The department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department.

**Implementation Description:** Added to the graduate catalog and enforced by the college graduate office and the department graduate director.

**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.

**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 need 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
The Department recently voted to require that all doctoral students present a paper at the GSU Political Science Graduate Student Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (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 Sean's multilevel modeling directed reading this semester, which was almost large enough to make as an actual class). As we all know, directed readings courses are time consuming for faculty and offer few rewards; implementing this proposal would likely reduce the demand for them while simultaneously expanding our coverage of methods. Our more specific methods courses could continue to be offered to allow students without foreign language skills to complete their fourth methods requirement and to prepare students for comping 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  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  - Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations  
  - Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

**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):**  
  - Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations  
  - Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field |
  - Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization

**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:** Political Science  
**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
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Conference presentations, publications and grants | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
- Measure: High Level of Competency in Research Methods | Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization

Implementation Description: Policy approved by Political Science Department in August 2012
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director; students
Additional Resources: none

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
- Measure: Conference presentations, publications and grants | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

Implementation Description: Each semester we hire 1-2 graduate students to hold office hours in the computer lab or hold training sessions on different topics.
Responsible Person/Group: Political science faculty teaching advanced graduate methods; advanced graduate students who have taken and received high scores in our advanced methods courses.
Additional Resources: None

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
- Measure: Conference presentations, publications and grants | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

Implementation Description: Committees now do not have to hold an oral exam; rather, oral exams are used when students are on the border between passage and failure.
Responsible Person/Group: Political Science faculty
Additional Resources: None

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 design course; (2) an introductory course on quantitative analysis; (3) an intermediate 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
- Measure: Conference presentations, publications and grants | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

Implementation Description: Course curriculum changes have been adopted; the necessary changes to the graduate catalog for 2013-2014 have been submitted and are awaiting approval.
Responsible Person/Group: Political Science faculty with ability to teach graduate research methods
Additional Resources: None

Comprehensive exam preparation
The department has further increased its efforts to prepare students for comprehensive exams. In particular, we started holding twice-yearly workshops on preparing and studying for comprehensive exams as well as having faculty include assignments in
graduate seminars that aid in comp preparations.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comprehensive exam assessments
  - Outcome/Objective: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
  - Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate 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?

Based on feedback received on the 2011-2012 report, we revised our targets for this current report to make them more meaningful and better able to capture potential distinctions among students. We utilize a learning outcome assessment form that all committee members are asked to complete after a student successfully defends a dissertation; committee members are asked to evaluate the dissertation on a number of different learning outcomes. We previously used a single, broad target to assess student performance, and the use of this target likely meant that we potentially lost important information about how our students have performed. The revised targets ask us to determine whether at least 75% of dissertations received at least a score of "high" on the relevant learning objectives, and whether at least 10% of dissertations received a score of "very high" on the relevant learning objectives. We recently revised the graduate catalog and program degree requirements to institute a formal first and second year review of all doctoral students. We are currently working on the format for these reviews, and we seek to create some additional measures and/or targets of doctoral student achievement from these reviews.

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.

Beginning this Fall, we are instituting a fairly dramatic overhaul of our doctoral program to try and address long-standing concerns about student performance in terms of research design and execution. First, we used to require a 2-course sequence that combined research design and quantitative analysis. The new sequence for PhD students is 4 courses: a single course on research design, a single course on basic statistical analysis, an intermediate statistics course, and then a choice of either an advanced statistics course or a qualitative methods course. We have also revised our comprehensive exam structure to require students to take two exams, each in a major field, rather than our previous three exams, either in three fields, or two fields and a sub-field. Students will now also write a Major Area Paper based on their proposed dissertation topic. Our hope is that this new structure will focus students more on their exams, and help them transition more smoothly from the comp stage to the dissertation stage. Finally, we have also increased the number of comprehensive exam workshops we offer each year to ensure students are prepared for exams; many professors have also introduced assignments targeted at aiding students in their long-term comp preparations.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Professional Accountancy-Financial Reporting & Assurance MPA
As of: 12/12/2016 05:59 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
For students to develop and integrate: (1) skills for analyzing organizational performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions, (2) skills in developing financial reporting systems, (3) skills in interpreting and predicting choices in financial reporting systems, (4) assurance skills, (5) skills for collaborative work in teams, (6) communication skills and, (7) technology skills.

Goals
G 1: Develop financial reporting systems
Develop financial reporting systems.

G 2: Interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems
Interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems.

G 3: Apply taxation law to business entities
Apply taxation law to business entities.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Financial reporting skills: Develop (M: 1)
To develop financial reporting systems for decision-making by applying professional standards, financial information tools, and professional judgment.
| SLO 2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (Final) (M: 2) |
| To interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems by applying economic, financial, and psychological theories. |

| SLO 3: Assurance Skills (M: 3, 4) |
| 0: Assurance skills (Final) To provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts. |

| SLO 4: Analytical Skills (M: 3, 4) |
| To present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions. |

| SLO 5: Collaboration Skills (M: 6) |
| To collaborate and contribute to achieve team results. |

| SLO 6: Communication Skills (M: 5, 6) |
| To demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant. |

| SLO 7: Assurance Skills (M: 7) |
| To provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts. |

| SLO 8: Tax Analytical skills (G: 3) (M: 8) |
| Tax analytical skills |

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

| M 1: Financial reporting skills: Develop (O: 1) |
| Performance on assignments in Acct 8130 |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O1: Financial reporting skills: Develop**

Exam mean score 80% on three questions: (1) inter-company transaction concepts in the equity method of accounting; (2) reporting subsidiary income in consolidated financial statements; (3) consolidated reporting rules for assets.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**

Mean score of 72% in question 1, 43% on question 2, and 63% on question 3.

| M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Interpret & Predict (O: 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

| M 3: Analytical Skills (O: 3, 4) |
| Performance on assignments in Acct 8410 and Acct 8700 |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**

Exam mean of 80% or better

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score of 75% for valuation implications from asset impairments and a mean score of 84% for analyzing profit margins and asset turnover.

| 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 outside research project of 85% in Tx 8120.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Since the implementation of the action plan in summer 2013, the results will be known later in the calendar year.

### M 7: Technology Skills (O: 7)

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.

### M 8: Apply tax law: Apply tax law to individuals and entities (O: 8)

Apply tax law to individuals and entities. Research project mean score of 85% or above for the class.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O8: Tax Analytical skills

Research project mean score of 85% or above for class.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Mean score of 94.21% in spring 2013.

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

#### Action plan for Financial Reporting - Develop

Test this objective using cases and financial accounting standards database.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Siva Nathan
- **Additional Resources:** Department subscription to FASB Accounting Standards Codification: Professional View. Annual subscription is $150 for department allowing free access to students and faculty. SOA Director has agreed to subscribe to this database.

Include tax research written assignment.

Include a tax research written assignment as one-fourth of the students' grades to permit the students to convey their knowledge through another means besides exam testing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Apply tax law: Apply tax law to individuals and entities | Outcome/Objective: Tax Analytical skills
- **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 writing website.  
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher  
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time  
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan  
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time  
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan  
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time  
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing 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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Lucia Smeal

Reconfigure last class meeting.
Give students a reason for being attetive 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: Bert Richards
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Redesign integration of class and testing time
Redesign class meetings to integrate class and test time, e.g., test content of last class meeting in a take-home exam.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher

Redesign integration of class and testing time
Redesign class meetings to integrate class and test time, e.g., test content of last class meeting in a take-home exam.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
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
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.
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: Apply tax law to individuals and entities | Outcome/Objective: Tax Analytical skills
Implementation Description: Include a new tax research written assignment.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
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
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

Assign homework problems for class participation credit.
The concepts under assessment are challenging and significant practice is required to master the concepts. Beginning fall 2013, questions will be assigned for homework and will be collected and reviewed in class for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Financial reporting skills: Develop | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills: Develop
Implementation Description: The concepts under assessment are challenging and significant practice is required to master the concepts. Beginning fall 2013, questions will be assigned for homework and will be collected and reviewed in class for class participation credit.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran
Additional Resources: Faculty Time
SLO 2: Knowledge Base of General Psychology (M: 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)

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Knowledge Base of Physiological Mechanisms of Behavior (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.

Standard Associations

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

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: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

On the post-course survey students reported significantly greater understanding of concepts generally (M=36.31, SD=5.65) than on the pre-course survey (M=21.32, SD=7.06). This difference was significant, t(64)=16.23, p<.001, with a very large effect size, Cohen's d=2.036

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

We sampled 211 students in PSYC1101 with a mastery test. Of these, 155 (73.45%) answered at least 70% of the questions correctly. 133 (54.29%) scored 80% or better.

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

Review Mastery Test Questions re CLEP exam.

As the department will soon accept CLEP scores for credit in Introduction to Psychology (PSYC1101), we intend to review the
Analysis Questions and 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 plan to reexamine the mastery test questions in the coming year to align them with the CLEP exam for introductory psychology, as we will be offering credit in PSYC1101 for those scores. Based on feedback from the Undergraduate Assessment Committee we have limited the number of APA outcomes for which we reported data this year.

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

We are using these learning outcomes data to confirm that students taking the CLEP exam reach the same goals as in our own PSYC1101 course. We are also sharing the mastery test questions with PSYC1101 instructors at Georgia Perimeter College (GPC) as part of a new degree qualifications profile program called project Lumina, funded by a grant to the Provost's office.

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: 3)
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: 4)
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: 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 5: Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
On the post-course survey students reported significantly greater understanding of concepts generally (M=36.31, SD=5.65) than on the pre-course survey (M=21.32, SD=7.06). This difference was significant, t(64)=16.23, p<.001, with a very large effect size, Cohen’s d=2.036

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
70% of students should pass the mastery test (70% or better).

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
We sampled 211 students in PSYC1101 with a mastery test. Of these, 155 (73.45%) answered at least 70% of the questions correctly. 133 (54.29%) scored 80% or better.

M 3: PSYC3530 Quantitative Methods Questions (O: 2)
PSYC3530 covers advanced statistical analysis as well as critical thinking through writing. A series of 14 questions testing knowledge, understanding and application of advanced statistics is administered to all students in all sections of PSYC3530.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O2: Research Methods in Psychology
Seventy percent of students should score 70% or better on the 14 question test.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 245 students sampled, 189 (77.14%) scored above 70, and 133 (54.29%) scored above 80.

M 4: CTW Writing Assignments, PSYC3530/4800 (O: 3, 5)
Students in PSYC3530 submit several writing assignments over the course of the semester. They are given at least a few opportunities to revise their writing according to detailed feedback from instructors. Two writing assignments, one early submission and one later, are compared on two metrics, one for the expression of critical thinking, one for writing mechanics. 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. Early and late writing samples are compared, as above. The rubric used to score these assignments appears in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology
Significant improvement from an earlier to a later writing sample, with a moderate or better effect size.
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students scored significant better on the later writing sample (M=13.81, SD=3.22) than on a later writing sample (M=10.09, SD=3.07), t(223)=14.83, p<.001. The effect size was large, Cohen’s d = -.99.

Target for O5: Communication Skills
Significant improvement in writing mechanics from an earlier to a later writing assignment, with a moderate or better effect size.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Students scored significant better on the later assignment (M=10.87, SD=2.42) than on the earlier assignment (M=9.2, SD=3.07), t(223)=10.66, p<.001.

M 5: PSYC3530 - PORT Quiz (O: 4)
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.

Target for O4: Information and Technological Literacy
Seventy-five percent passing with a grade of 75% or better.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 391 students sampled, 309 (79%) scored above 75% on the quiz. 250 (63.9%) scored above 85.

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

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

Use learning outcome data to compare online/hybrid/traditional classes
We intend to use learning outcomes collected in PSYC3530 to compare two methods of instruction: hybrid and traditional.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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 plan to reexamine the mastery test questions in the coming year to align them with the CLEP exam for introductory psychology, as we will be offering credit in PSYC1101 for those scores. Based on feedback from the Undergraduate Assessment Committee we have limited the number of APA outcomes for which we reported data this year.

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

We are using these learning outcomes data to confirm that students taking the CLEP exam reach the same goals as in our own PSYC1101 course. We are also sharing the mastery test questions with PSYC1101 instructors at Georgia Perimeter College (GPC) as part of a new degree qualifications profile program called project Lumina, funded by a grant to the Provost's office. We plan to use learning outcomes data from PSYC3530 to compare hybrid online/in-class and traditional sections of the course.
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.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)
Students will communicate and collaborate effectively in a variety of formats and settings.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate
comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

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

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

---

**SLO 4: Application (G: 3) (M: 4, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will apply psychological principles in professional activities.

**Relevant Associations:** American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

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.

**Relevant Associations:** American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

---

**SLO 6: Personal Development (G: 3) (M: 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will show insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.

**Relevant Associations:** American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

---

**SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16)**

Students will demonstrate information technology competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for relevant purposes.

**Relevant Associations:** American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

---

**SLO 8: Values in Psychology (G: 1, 3) (M: 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (G: 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16)**
Students will incorporate knowledge of sociocultural and international diversity in their work.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.50.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.38.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.46.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.43.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.43.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: MA Thesis Defense GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**
During the oral presentation of the Master’s defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations), or 3 (Exceeded expectations)
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.48.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.48.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.57.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.38.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average score was 2.71.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: MA Thesis (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
<th>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% of students should pass 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

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Target for O4: Application**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”) and at least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (“Met Expectations”) or 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.14 and 18 of 22 (82%) scores were either a 2 or 3.</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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.27 and 18 of 22 scores (82%) were a 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”) and at least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (“Met Expectations”) or 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.23 and 20 of 22 (91%) scores were a 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”) and at least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (“Met Expectations”) or 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.36 and 19 of 22 (86%) scores were a 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**

The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”) and at least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (“Met Expectations”) or 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.46 and 12 of 13 (92%) scores were a 2 or 3. 9 scores were NA suggesting that this target might not be appropriate and should be re-considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**

The average score should be between a 2 (“Met Expectations”) and 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”) and at least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (“Met Expectations”) or 3 (“Exceeded Expectations”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.68 and 19 of 19 (100%) scores were a 2 or 3. 3 scores were NA suggesting that this target should be re-considered.</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 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score was 2.68 and 19 of 19 (100%) scores were a 2 or 3. 3 scores were NA suggesting that this target should be re-considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average score was 2.14 and 44 of 47 (94%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score was 2.24 and 42 of 47 (89%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.48 and 46 of 46 (100%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score was 2.14 and 40 of 46 (87%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.40 and 45 of 45 (100%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.40 and 42 of 43 (98%) scores were a 2 or 3. 3 scores were listed as NA suggesting that this target should be reconsidered.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.59 and 17 of 17 (100%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.59 and 17 of 17 (100%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.59 and 16 of 16 (100%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.31 and 17 of 17 (100%) scores were a 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.31 and 16 of 16 (100%) scores were a 2 or 3. 1 score was NA suggesting that this target should be reconsidered.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The average score was 2.18 and 16 of 17 (94%) scores were a 2 or 3.

**M 8: PhD Dissertation (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**M 9: Performance in the ethics course (O: 8)**
Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology

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

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses knowledge of scientific and professional ethical issues.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.
### M 10: Performance in diversity courses (O: 9)

**Psyc 8050 or Psyc 8060: Diversity issues in clinical practice and psychological research, or Issues of human diversity in psychology**

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

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**

At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with issues of human diversity.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### M 11: Performance in methods courses (O: 2)

**Psyc 8010: Psychological Research Methods**

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

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on the selected assignments designated to assess expertise with data analysis.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### M 12: Performance in the history course (O: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9)

**Psyc 8500: History of Psychology - written assignment**

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

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**

At least 90% 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### M 13: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)

**Psyc 9900T: Teaching seminar**
### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### Target for O4: Application
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### Target for O6: Personal Development
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**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 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.
feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Psychology faculty members agree that the graduate students should be publishing and presenting, however based on feedback and self-reflection about the current measure, it will be re-evaluated so that it better measures graduate training.

**M 16: Annual evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**
Faculty members of each program review all students in their program annually to determine how many students are performing satisfactorily on each learning outcome.

**Source of Evidence: Evaluations**

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Application</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Personal Development</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
<th>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Based on feedback and self-assessment, Psychology decided to focus on fewer measures this cycle in an effort to better highlight potential areas for improvement in training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: 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
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
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

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

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

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

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

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
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

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

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

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

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

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

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
Revising Measures
Psychology is revising measures and this one will not be retained in its current format.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Revising Measures
Psychology is revising measures and this one will not be retained in its current format.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PhD Dissertation Proposal GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Revising Measures
Psychology is revising measures and this one will not be retained in its current format.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Revising Measures
Psychology is revising measures and this one will not be retained in its current format.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Revising Measures
Psychology is revising measures and this one will not be retained in its current format.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Revising Measures
Psychology is revising measures and this one will not be retained in its current format.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

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 Director or Graduate Studies along with the Graduate Program Committee (Chairs of each of the 5 concentrations in Psychology) discussed the Mission/Purpose, Goals, Outcomes/Objectives, and Measures/Findings to optimize the information that is most relevant to graduate training. The committee decided to retain the Mission/Purpose and Goals. However, there was a discussion of ways to collapse, combine, or remove some of the 10 Outcomes/Objectives. This is debatable because these 10 Outcomes/Objectives are endorsed by the American Psychological Association (APA) for undergraduate psychology training. Graduate training is more diverse (e.g., Clinical graduate training has different objectives than Developmental or Cognitive Sciences) and APA does not disseminate cross-cutting objectives. The committee did not wish to have separate Learning Outcomes and WEAVE reports for each of the 5 concentrations. This conversation is ongoing. It was determined that there are far too many measures, which makes it difficult to use the information. The committee decided to focus on 5 of the 16 areas (MA Thesis proposal and defense, PhD Dissertation proposal and defense, and General Exam). However, each of these areas have multiple targets resulting in 26 measures/targets. Although this is easier to digest than the 87 produced in prior years, this might still be too much information. This will be evaluated during this 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.

Unfortunately, the data do not have a significant impact given that each of the 5 concentrations (Clinical, Community, Cognitive Sciences, Developmental, and Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience) are run somewhat autonomously with unique training objectives. Given that the committee (Director of Graduate Studies and Chairs of the 5 programs) do now wish to have 5 separate Learning Outcomes/WEAVE reports, the committee is discussing which training objectives cut across all Psychology graduate programs. Psychology plans to fine-tune the assessment so that it has a more profound impact on training.

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies prepares students to become leaders as executives, managers, analysts, and policy specialists in public and nonprofit sectors.

### Goals

**G 1: Understanding disciplinary and conceptual foundations of public or nonprofit administration**

Students learn major disciplinary and conceptual foundations of public or nonprofit administration. This includes theories of organization and bureaucracy, administrative behavior and management, politics and administration, and public policy-making.

**G 2: Understanding of basic methods and statistics for applied research**

Students learn basic methods and statistics for research in the public and nonprofit sectors. These include the scientific method in applied research, elementary research design, measurement, qualitative research, computer-assisted data analysis, and beginning statistics including descriptive statistics, crosstabulation, introductory inferential statistics, and graphical presentations.

**G 3: Understanding intermediate methods and statistics**

Students understand intermediate methods and statistics in applied research in the public and nonprofit sectors. These include survey research, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, sampling, and intermediate statistical techniques including analysis of variance, correlation and regression, and time-series analysis.

**G 4: Understanding basic principles of microeconomics applied to public or nonprofit sectors**

Students will understand basic principles of microeconomics as applied to public and nonprofit sectors.

**G 5: Understanding practice and problems of budgeting and finance in public or nonprofit organizations**

Students understand the practice and problems of budgeting and finance in the public or nonprofit organizations. This includes fiscal management in government and nonprofits with special emphasis on budgetary procedures and the means of budgetary analysis.

**G 6: Understanding approaches to management systems and strategies in nonprofit and public organizations**

Students understand the approaches to the management of systems and strategies in public and nonprofit organizations, focusing primarily on problem-solving strategies and techniques for use at the executive and operating levels.

**G 7: Understanding legal issues relevant to public and nonprofit organizations**

Students understand basic legal issues relevant to the managers of public and nonprofit organizations.

**G 8: Understanding theories and practice of leadership and organizational behavior**

Students understand theories and practice of leadership and organizational behavior relevant to public and nonprofit organizations. This includes communication, motivation, group dynamics, organizational change, leadership and decision making in public organizations.

**G 9: Analyze problems, develop solutions, and communicate about policy and management issues**

Students understand how to critically assess public or nonprofit policy and management issues and to develop solutions through research and analysis. Students understand how to effectively communicate verbally and through writing about public or nonprofit policy and management issues, problems, and solutions.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate their understanding of key difference among the models of government and administrative reform 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.

**SLO 2: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public or nonprofit sector (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students must be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in the public or nonprofit sector.
SLO 3: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector (G: 1) (M: 3)
Students analyze the nature and function of the public service in the US, including the importance of public sector in modern societies or demonstrate an understanding of the scope and significance of the nonprofit sector in the U.S and abroad.

SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.

SLO 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.

SLO 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)
Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

SLO 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers (G: 2) (M: 7)
Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public and nonprofit managers.

SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)
Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public and nonprofit administration and policy.

SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)
Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.

SLO 10: Ability to demonstrate graduate-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (G: 3) (M: 10)
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.

SLO 11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles (G: 4) (M: 11)
Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics).

SLO 12: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public and nonprofit policy issues (G: 4) (M: 12)
Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to policy issues affecting the public and nonprofit sectors.

SLO 13: Demonstrate understanding of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors (G: 4) (M: 13)
Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors.

SLO 14: Describe the technical nature and process of public and nonprofit budgeting (G: 5) (M: 14)
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.

SLO 15: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or nonprofit organizations (G: 5) (M: 15)
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.

SLO 16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (G: 6) (M: 16)
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
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 84% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 36% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

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 this 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 84% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 34% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

M 3: Describe the nature and function of the public or nonprofit sector (O: 3)
On papers, policy memos, and the final exam students will describe the nature and function of the public sector or demonstrate an understanding of the scope and significance of the nonprofit sector in the U.S. and abroad (PMAP 8111 or PMAP 8210).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 and PMAP 8210 met at least partially meet this objective. On papers, policy memos, and the final exam students will describe the nature and function of the public or nonprofit sector.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 87% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 35% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

**M 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and using data sets (O: 4)**

Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 will at least partially meet this objective. Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 100% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 70% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.6.

**M 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 5)**

Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 97% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 68% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.6.

**M 6: Demonstrate ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 6)**

The students’ final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 94% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 53% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.3.

**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 8131 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 99% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 50% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.3.

**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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131, Applied Research Methods and Statistics II, will at least partially meet this objective. Students use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 25% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 93% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 45% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.2.

**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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective. Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 90% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 35% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.0.

**M 11: Demonstrated understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 11)**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.
Target for O11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 90% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 10% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.6.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 88% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 10% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.5.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 38% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 38% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

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.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 97% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 38% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 34% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

Target for O17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design

Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 34% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

Target for O18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law

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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 98% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 34% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.2.

Target for O19: Evaluated the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees

The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.
Target for 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 95% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.9.

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.

M 21: Demonstrated ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (O: 21)

On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O21: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill, 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill, 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill, 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill, and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8431, Leadership and Organizational Behavior, will at least partially meet the objective. On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 93% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 29% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.9.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 93% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 44% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.0.

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
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.
**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.

**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
understanding of core public health concepts relevant to 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

19 out of 20 students (95%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.30.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

19 out of 20 students (95%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.35.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

18 out of 20 students (90%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.45.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

19 out of 20 students (95%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.05.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

15 out of 20 students (75%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.10.
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

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 Public Policy BS**  
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

---

**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 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.

**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 as 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.

---

**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.
### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 41% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

**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...
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.

Target for O3: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in the Citizenship course will at least partially meet the objective. Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy. This is demonstrated through weekly policy memos and a final paper that meet the CTW requirements of the course.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 80% of students at least partially met this objective, and 37% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.3.

Students will demonstrate how leaders from all sectors lead organizational change. 80% of the students enrolled in the Citizenship course 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.

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 the students enrolled in the Citizenship course will at least partially meet this goal. Students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 87% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 53% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

Students answer test questions on midterm and final exams on leadership theory. 80% of the students enrolled in the Policy Leadership course will meet this objective. On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their 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. On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 80% of students at least partially met this objective, and 37% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.6.

Students compare theoretical approaches to practical applications of leadership. 80% of the students enrolled in the Policy Leadership course will meet this objective. Students write paragraphs after each class period describing practical applications of leadership with theoretical perspectives. This is also measured in the final application paper assignment.

Target for O6: Compare leadership theory and practice

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in the Policy Leadership course will meet this objective. Students write paragraphs each week showing their ability to apply theoretical perspectives on leadership to their roles as emerging leaders. This is also measured in the final application paper assignment.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 90% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 41% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.0.

**M 7: Demonstrate knowledge of main current policy issues (O: 7)**

Measure knowledge of main policy issues currently under debate using exams and classroom policy debates.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: Demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues, will meet this objective. Measure knowledge of main policy issues currently under debate using exams and classroom policy debates.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 97% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 57% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.4.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 95% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 47% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 91% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 50% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 4.1.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 90% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 15% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.7.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 4051, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 82% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 36% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O12: Apply scientific method to policy issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O12: Apply scientific method to policy issues**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in PMAP 4051, Evaluating Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through policy evaluation writing assignment. |

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 83% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 35% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 4051, Policy Data Analysis, 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 82% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 36% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research proposal as a CTW assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 students enrolled in PMAP 4051, Evaluating Public Policy, 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 83% of the students at least partially met this objective, and 36% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other**
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 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. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

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

**Basic Policy Analysis**

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content of 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.

**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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 91% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 26% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.

**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.

**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 the students will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured through a final written assignment.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 82% of the students at least partially met this goal, and 36% exceeded the objective by a substantial margin. On a five-point scale, the mean score on this objective was 3.8.
Basic Tools of Government Intervention

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities.

In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. 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  
Implementation Description: Plan has been implemented.

Market Economy & Policy Analysis

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities.

In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Plan has been implemented.
**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 evidence to support the observation that some PMAP students are weak in basic math skills. The rate of D, F, and W grades in the PMAP 4041 course (Policy Data Analysis) was 34% during the fall 2009 semester, compared to a 13% DFW rate for all the PMAP core courses. At present, students can take the upper division Policy Data Analysis course with only a grade of D in the lower division MATH courses 1101 or 1111. The two step Action Plan calls for changing the requirement to a minimum grade of C in either basis lower division MATH 1101 or 1111 course during the fall semester 2010. The second step of the Action Plan is to require all students to take and earn a minimum grade of C in MATH 1070, Elementary Statistics as a prerequisite for taking PMAP 4041. This prerequisite should improve the math skills of students taking PMAP 4041.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>Application of statistical techniques to analyze public issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>11/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>PMAP faculty approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 evidence to support the observation that some PMAP students are weak in basic math skills. The rate of D, F, and W grades in the PMAP 4041 course (Policy Data Analysis) was 34% during the fall 2009 semester, compared to a 13% DFW rate for all the PMAP core courses. At present, students can take the upper division Policy Data Analysis course with only a grade of D in the lower division MATH courses 1101 or 1111. The two step Action Plan calls for changing the requirement to a minimum grade of C in either basis lower division MATH 1101 or 1111 course during the fall semester 2010. The second step of the Action Plan is to require all students to take and earn a minimum grade of C in MATH 1070, Elementary Statistics as a prerequisite for taking PMAP 4041. This prerequisite should improve the math skills of students taking PMAP 4041.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>11/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>PMAP faculty approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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-term 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.

<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>Chair will appoint committee to discuss options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Greg Lewis</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?

Beginning in 2013, summer classes fill out WEAVE reports to assess student learning outcomes. The department has computerized all WEAVE data to track learning outcomes over time. One result of that tracking has been to clarify that learning outcomes tend to fluctuate rather than to trend in particular directions and that new faculty sometimes apply different standards in assessing those outcomes. Partly as a result of that and partly due to evolving accreditation standards for the MPA program, PMAP is working toward developing uniform rubrics for all faculty to use in assessing learning outcomes. This will begin in the MPA program and, if successful, expand to the MPP and BSPP programs. One likely outcome of this effort is cutting back on the number of learning outcomes and using multiple raters to assess a random sample of student products as a way to assess the department rather than individual students. At the undergraduate level, the key change has been assigning a faculty member as director of the undergraduate program. One of his responsibilities is to work with doctoral students and part-time instructors, to help them develop their syllabi and
improve their teaching methods. He holds discussions with them in advance of the semester and does at least one classroom observation with a follow-up discussion. One of the topics he covers before the semester is the course learning objectives and how to assess them. This should increase the validity of the 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.

We have done a good job of meeting our objectives, and the assessments have not turned up any particular weaknesses. The key issue has been quality control; the new undergraduate director is working with new doctoral student and part-time instructors to improve the quality of their teaching and classes. Last year we formed a committee, chaired by the undergraduate director, to examine the undergraduate curriculum. That effort is ongoing, so it is not clear what changes we are likely to make.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Public Policy MPP**

(As of 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Public Policy (MPP) is an interdisciplinary degree program designed to provide students with an understanding of policy analysis as well as methods of generating new knowledge about specific policy areas.

**Goals**

**G 2: Understanding 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**

Understand how to identify public policy problems, some of the characteristics of different policy alternatives, and how to choose among different policy options.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand different ways of categorizing policies (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies.

**SLO 2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students consider the influence of formal and informal actors on public policy.

**SLO 3: Understand different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 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.

**SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)**

Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.

**SLO 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)**
Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

**SLO 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts (G: 3) (M: 7)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing policy analysts.

**SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)**

Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

**SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.

**SLO 10: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 10)**

Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.

**SLO 11: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 11)**

Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues.

**SLO 12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (G: 4) (M: 12)**

Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public sector decision-making.

**SLO 13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (G: 5) (M: 13)**

Students will be able to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.

**SLO 14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (G: 5) (M: 14)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies.

**SLO 15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain (G: 5) (M: 15)**

Students will be able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 62% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.5.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students will at least partially meet this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 62% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.5.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Understand different models of policy-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students in PMAP 8011 will at least partially meet this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 83% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.8.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 83% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.8.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 70% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.6.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students' final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Overall, 97% at least partially met this objective and 68% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.6.

**M 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)**
The students' final paper and the midterm and final examinations in PMAP 8121 measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students' final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Overall, 94% at least partially met this objective and 53% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.3.

**M 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 8)**
Students in PMAP 8131 use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective. Students use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Overall, 92% at least partially met this objective and 25% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 3.8.

**M 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)**
Students skills in PMAP 8131 of interpreting 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% at least partially met this objective and 45% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.2.

**M 10: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sec (O: 10)**
Students enrolled in PMAP 8141 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 90% at least partially met this objective and 10% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 3.6.

M11: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 11)

Students enrolled in PMAP 8141 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 88% at least partially met this objective and 10% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 3.5.

M12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 12)

On the final examination and course paper in PMAP 8141 students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 90% at least partially met this objective and 11% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 3.6.

M13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (O: 13)

Students enrolled in PMAP 8521, Evaluation Research, will demonstrate the ability to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. On the two examinations, homework assignments and presentations students will demonstrate their understanding of the causes of bias in regression analysis.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 83% at least partially met this objective and 40% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 3.9.

M14: 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
O15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain

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

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 students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 92% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.9.

O16: Understand how to identify policy problems

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

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 students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 71% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.6.

O17: Understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives

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

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 students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 77% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 4.7.

O18: Understand how to construct a policy memo

Students enrolled in PMAP 8531 demonstrate how to construct a policy memo. This is done on several policy memo assignments and a final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Overall, 100% at least partially met this objective and 100% substantially exceeded expectations. The mean score on this item was 5.0.
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
Implementation Description: Plan was implemented successfully. The problem appears to have been temporary. 83% at least partially met the objective and 40% substantially exceeded it.
Responsible Person/Group: Greg Lewis and Jesse Lecy

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 2011-12, PMAP formed a faculty committee to examine the MPA learning objectives. It did not specifically address objectives for core MPP courses that do not overlap with those in the MPA core, but the programs do share three core course. The committee recommended minor modifications in the learning objectives of those three courses and two new learning objectives to be assessed in all MPA core classes [M 24: Demonstrate an ability to analyze problems and develop solutions using written, analytical or quantitative skills depending on the nature of the course; M 25: Demonstrate an ability to effectively communicate verbally or through writing (depending on the nature of the course) about public or nonprofit policy and management issues and problems]. PMAP also decided that summer courses should also submit WEAVE reports. The department has also computerized all WEAVE data to track learning outcomes over time. One result of that tracking was to clarify that learning outcomes tend to fluctuate rather than to trend in particular directions and that new faculty sometimes apply different standards in assessing those outcomes. Partly as a result of that and partly due to evolving accreditation standards for the MPA program, PMAP is working toward developing uniform rubrics for all faculty to use in assessing learning outcomes. PMAP is also considering cutting back substantially on the number of learning outcomes and using multiple raters to assess a random sample of student products as a way to assess the department rather than individual students. If this effort is successful in the MPA program, we will probably extend it to the MPP curriculum.

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

In the short run, the assessments have not led to major changes in the program. They did lead to a discussion of whether core courses were sufficiently rigorous and whether different sections of the same course were sufficiently comparable. Initial application of a new rubric to short research papers from the Applied Research Methods and Statistics II class revealed both consistency in general approach and divergence in priorities for a variety of topics. As a result, instructors have agreed to shift emphases on certain topics to yield more uniform coverage and stronger research papers. These changes will be implemented beginning in Spring 2014.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Public Policy PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 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.

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.

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.

**O/O 2: Students apply analytical methods to public policy (M: 2)**
Students demonstrate the ability to apply analytical methods to the study of public policy

**O/O 3: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field (M: 3)**
Students demonstrate their understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.

**O/O 4: Produce Original Public Policy Research (M: 4)**
Students will produce original public policy research to demonstrate understanding of theories and analytical methods of the field.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Comprehensive Examination (O: 1)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical framework section of the public policy section of the core comprehensive examination.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory**

The achievement target for the core portion of the comprehensive examination is 67% of students passing this portion of the exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

During the 2012-2013 academic year, 7 students attempted the core portion of the comprehensive examination. Five of these students (71.4%) passed the core portion of the comprehensive examination.

#### M 2: Analytical Methods Section of Comprehensive Exam (O: 2)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of analytical methods on the methods section of the core comprehensive examination.

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

**Target for O2: Students apply analytical methods to public policy**

The achievement target for the core portion of the comprehensive examination is 67% of students passing this portion of the exam.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Seven students took core comprehensives; six of them passed the quantitative methods section, for a passage rate of 86%.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Five students took field comprehensives in 2011-12; all five passed.

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 3 students received their doctorates. One student continued her position as a senior associate at Emory University; one student who is a Fulbright Scholar returned to the Philippines to further his studies, and one student is currently seeking employment. Records are incomplete, but among the students who did not graduate, at least 14 students presented conference papers and at least 9 students were authors or co-authors on articles that were submitted to academic journals or on book chapters (resulting in 6 students having articles that have been accepted or have appeared in print in journals and with 2 students with forthcoming book chapters).

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Revised methods courses and core comprehensive exam

In the 2007-08 WEAVE report this was among the stated objectives in the PhD Program in Public Policy: Students will demonstrate their understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy through the core comprehensive examination. 90% will pass the comprehensive exam. After seeing that we did not meet this objective, the doctoral program committee met to review the content of the two required methods courses and the procedures used to measure the students' performance which is the percentage who pass the methods section of the comprehensive examination. The content of the two course sequence was revised by the committee and the staffing changed. As a result of this process, the student performance improved during the 2008-09 academic year, but this turnaround is a long-term process since students take the courses in their first year in the PhD program and the comprehensive exams are taken in year three. The doctoral program committee is continuing to monitor the progress of students in the two research methods classes and their performance as measured by the methods section of the comprehensive examination.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Program Committee of the Joint PhD Program in Public Policy

Doctoral Program Committee developed 3-part action plan

The Doctoral Program Committee developed a three-part Action Plan to improve students' performance on the major field portion of the comprehensive examinations. First, faculty members will update the reading list for students in each major field. Next, the Doctoral Program Committee will review admission criteria against performance on the comprehensive examinations. Perhaps some students were admitted in the past who should not have been. Finally, each major field advisor will conduct tutorial sessions for those students preparing for the examination. A special focus will be placed on the students who failed this year’s field exams.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Major Field Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field
Implementation Description: Faculty will complete these action plan steps prior to the beginning of the new academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Program Committee

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

---
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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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrates knowledge of SBRR principles (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Incorporates a wide range of curricular materials (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: View professional development as a career long responsibility (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Incorporates a variety of assessment tools to plan effective instruction (G: 3) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction which have impact on students' literacy growth and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Evaluates self and others' teaching practices (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighty percent of students averaged a score of 5.0 (advanced) on the portfolio rating standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighty percent of students averaged 5.0, scoring a 5 (advanced) as measured by the rubric.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Demonstrates knowledge of SBRR principles**

Candidates 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

Students met target goal of scoring a 5 (advanced) as measured on the rubric.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students met target goals, scoring 5.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students met requirements in professional development scoring a 5 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students met overall goals of evaluation and teaching practices averaging 5.0 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Students met portfolio requirements that incorporates how they plan effective instruction. Students ranged in the proficient to advanced averages 4.0 and higher.

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

**Redesigned Portfolio**

Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lori Elliott
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Redesigned Portfolio**

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

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

**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:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MEd faculty in Reading, Language and Literacy Education

**Video Portfolio**

The MEd students currently submit video portfolios that are based on the IRA standards (2004). There are new standards (2010) that will be utilized in the future based on acceptance from the PSC. Candidates continue to refine their process and create video portfolios that demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the reading process, instructional practices, and assessments.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012

**video refinement**
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we are going to require candidates to demonstrate more synthesis across the standards so that it is clear to the viewer that the candidate has a deep knowledge of the reading/writing process, how to design and implement strategies based on this knowledge, and how to effectively assess children's literacy progress. Additionally, with future changes to the program to better reflect the trends in the field, the candidate will also add information related to home/community literacy practices and response to intervention information to their video presentation.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes

Implementation Description: Candidates will be instructed to synthesize across their coursework to complete the video portfolio
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012

**Best Practices**
For the 2013-2014, MEd Reading program faculty will continue to provide students with examples and instruction on best practices in areas of content knowledge, planning, and classroom instruction. In addition, collaboration with students to prepare them for submitting professional portfolio and graduation requirements will be provided. Students will continue to meet target goals of proficient to advanced levels as measured on the rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes

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?

This year, 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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) Online TEEMS MAT
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). 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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
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 in the TSLE 7250 SP 13 course work.

### M 2: Planning Performance (O: 2)
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored at 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). –administered in EDCI 7680 SP 13.

### M 3: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 2)
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an proficient (Score 4) level in the area of clinical practice as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument as administered in TSLE 7440 SP13.

### M 4: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Target for O4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at endpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level in the area of clinical practice as shown on their scores of the final Teaching Evaluation Instrument as administered in EDCI 7680 SP 13.

### M 5: Dispositions (O: 3)
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an proficient (Score 4) level in the area of clinical practice as shown on their scores of the unit wide dispositions rubric as administered in EDCI 7680 SP 13.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an exemplary (Score 5) level 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)-administered in EDCI 7680 SP 13.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

GACE Scores for 2012-2013 are still pending as of May 29, 2013. I am still waiting on our college data administrator'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.

<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>Time for complete implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Frances Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Portfolio Support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
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Strengthening Professional Standard
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility" has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
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 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; GACE II Scores | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Candidates’ content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Additional Resources: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving dispositions
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and their work is consistently monitored throughout the program.

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

Relationships (Measure (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

more rigorous lesson planning and implementation
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 and course instructors who teach practicum courses.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

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

No changes have been made to our assessment process since the last reporting year. We are in the process of using our data better to understand needs in the program 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.

We have streamlined our assessment system throughout the program by integrating key assessments in each of the courses. This has made much easier to collect data about students' performance in each of the key assessments. The data have shown that we need more discussion about teacher professional development and the impact of globalization in teaching. We have decided to address these specifically in the capstone practicum course, EDCI 7660, in which students typically complete their exit portfolios and acquire more field based experiences. We will document how this addition is reflected in their exit portfolio narratives in the upcoming year.
Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Content Knowledge in ESOL (O: 1)**
Content Knowledge in ESOL through coursework is assessed.  
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their TSLE course work.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 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 in their TSLE 7250 course work. See link for data: http://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/111066?key=2881d30203d4e0951b41c8092a9e39ca

**M 2: Content knowledge in Reading (O: 2)**
Content knowledge in Reading in coursework is assessed.  
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their EDRD course work.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored at an advanced level (Score 5) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their EDRD course work (EDRD 7600 SU12).

**M 3: Planning Performance (O: 3)**
Students’ ability to plan effectively is assessed in the course work and clinical practice.  
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an effectively proficient level (Score 4) level of knowledge in the area of planning as shown in their course work in EDRD 7650 in Fall Semester 2012.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an effectively proficient level (Score 4) level of knowledge in the area of clinical practice as shown in their course work in EDRD 7650 in Fall Semester 2012.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
85.6% of candidates in 2012-13 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) and 100% scored at an acceptable level in the area of dispositions, ESOL, as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric (which was administered in EDCI 7660 in summer 2012).  
100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 75% of candidates in 2012-2013 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 Fall Semester 2013 – EDRD7630 FA12)

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of candidates in 2012-13 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level and 75% of candidates in 2012-13 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) 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 7630 in fall 2012.

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

Embed

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Time for complementation
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Additional Resources: 0
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standard

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Additional Resources: Additional faculty
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standard

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Additional Resources: Additional faculty
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Time for complete implementation
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)
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)
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
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: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards for portfolio
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
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):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge in Reading
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: Expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving dispositions
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.

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

Relationships (Measure (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 2011-12 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 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 2011-12 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 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
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

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: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator and reading Faculty

closely monitoring students' progress in the TSLE 7260 course in terms of effects on K-12 student learning(advocacy)
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): 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

effectively implementing lessons in the classroom
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. Specifically, students will have many opportunities to write detailed lesson plans and receive feedback through the course. They will also be closely monitored when they implement lessons through video-recorded and -edited clips.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

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

No changes have been made to our assessment process since the last reporting year. We are in the process of using our data better to understand needs in the program 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.

We have streamlined our assessment system throughout the program by integrating key assessments in each of the courses. This has made much easier to collect data about students' performance in each of the key assessments. The data have shown that we need more discussion about teacher professional development and the impact of globalization in teaching. We have decided to address these specifically in the capstone practicum course, EDCI 7660, in which students typically complete their exit portfolios and acquire more field based experiences. We will document how this addition is reflected in their exit portfolio narratives in the upcoming year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Reading, Language, & Literacy (ESOL) TEEMS MAT

Mission / Purpose

The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Content knowledge
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

G 3: Impact on student learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum).

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (G: 2) (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 (G: 2) (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 (G: 3) (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.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge**

GACE Scores are still pending as of 5/10/2011.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

GACE Scores for 2012-2013 are still pending as of 6/01/2013. However, our passing rate for GACE tests has been 100% over the past four years (2007-2012), which indicates that our students are able to take and pass the content tests.

**M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)**

Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100 % of candidates in 2012-13 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 99 % and a maximum of 100 % of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4).

**M 3: Planning Performance (O: 2)**

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 58.3 % scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher), (2) Learning Goals: a minimum of 78.6 % scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher), (3) Assessment Plan: 92.8% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 69.31% 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 92.8% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 2)**
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument: (1) Knowledge of Students and Learning: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 40% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher), (2) Learning Environments: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 40 % scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher), (3) Assessment: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 80 % scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher), (4) Planning and Instruction: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 40% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 5: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 2)**
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
The following results are for each area on the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: (1) Knowledge of Students and Learning: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 90.9 % scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher), (2) Learning Environments: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 45.4% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher), (3) Assessment: 100% scored at the effective level or higher (Score 4 or higher), (4) Planning and Instruction: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 81.8% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher), (5) Professionalism: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 72.7% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 6: Dispositions (O: 3)**
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Among the five categories assessed for dispositions (Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful and Purposeful Vision), candidates scored 100% of candidates demonstrated an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and a minimum of 45.4% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).

**M 7: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 4)**
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning (EDCI 7680).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100 % scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 75% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
Increase Collaboration and Communication
The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts are being 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 candidates 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
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

Familiarize Candidates with edTPA
We will work diligently to ensure that candidates understand the implications of the edTPA for their preparation and future professional practice.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Endpoint | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Midpoint | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
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 major changes have been made in the previous year. We have been using the results of various the teacher work sample and evaluation rubrics to evaluate candidate ability in terms of planning, clinical practice and effects on student learning. However, over the next year we plan to begin utilizing the edTPA assessment measures to evaluate these components of our program. The edTPA is an externally-developed teacher assessment tool that will be used for teacher certification.

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 observed a high proportion of "exemplary" candidate performance on particular aspects of rubric measures of candidate performance during clinical practice. We plan to work with university supervisors to ensure slightly more stringency in these aspects of the clinical evaluations.
The student will formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1:</strong> Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations (O: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1: Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations. Criteria (and course location of assessment): 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will demonstrate creative decision-making skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1: BBA RE major students averaged 2.90; 100% met standard. C2: BBA RE major students averaged 2.70; 83% met standard on project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 (and course location of assessment) 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: Students will demonstrate creative decision-making skills** |
| Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion. |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met** |
| C1: Students averaged 1.44; 37% met standard as measured by exam question. C2: Students averaged 2.31; 94% met standard as measured by exam question. |

| **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 (and course location of assessment): 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: Students will demonstrate creative decision-making skills** |
| Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion. |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** |
| C1: BBA RE majors average 2.30; 96% meet standard. C2: BBA RE majors average 2.41; 89% meet standard. |

| **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 (and course location of assessment): 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 demonstrate effective business communication skills** |
| Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion. |
| **Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met** |
| C1: BBA RE major students averaged 2.51; 89% met standard on a project. C2: BBA RE major students averaged 2.67; 89% met standard on a project. |

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

**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:** Finished
**Priority:** High
Evaluate relative emphasis on concepts vs calculations in course
Instructors will evaluate the relative emphasis placed on mortgage finance concepts versus applications with calculations in the course. Students tend to spend time practicing the calculations while neglecting the conceptual content of the course.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances | Outcome/Objective: Students will demonstrate creative decision-making skills

Responsible Person/Group: Instructors

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Science in Real Estate degree is designed for individuals who are principally interested in careers in the real estate industry and those who will use real property in business decision making. It provides the student with both general and specialized real estate knowledge and analytical skills. The MSRE program is based on a synthesis of legal, physical, market and financial considerations that affect the real property decision process.

**Goals**

G 1: Graduates will possess integrated decision making, leadership, and interpersonal skills needed to succeed in real estate.

Graduates will possess integrated decision making, leadership, and interpersonal skills needed to succeed in the real estate industry.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand the real estate framework (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Outcome 1: Understand the framework within which real estate markets operate and the interaction of the components of that framework.

**SLO 2: Apply theoretical principles and skills (M: 4, 5, 6)**

Outcome 2: Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems.

**SLO 3: Organize and communicate effectively (M: 7, 8)**

Outcome 3. Organize and communicate effectively in all stages of the real estate problem solving process.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Real estate as a financial and operational asset (O: 1)**

M1 Understand real estate as a financial and operational asset and its market. Criteria (and course location of assessment):

- Appreciate the nature and working of real estate markets and the motivations of various participants (investor, developer, finance-provider, occupant etc). (RE8020) Understand the role of finance in real estate markets (RE8030) Recognize impact of regulatory and institutional frameworks upon markets and assets within markets and the role of real property law as a risk management process.
in the acquisition, management and disposition of built space (RE8040) Understand the processes and techniques used to analyze supply and demand for real estate (RE8060).

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework**

Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Averages on this Measure: C1 8020 2.87; 87% of MSRE students meet standard. C2 8030 2.75; 100% of MSRE students meet standard. C3 RE8040 2.80 ; 100% of MSRE students meet standard. C4 8060 2.00; 83% of MSRE students meet standard.

**M 2: The markets for capital (O: 1)**

M2 Understand the markets for capital and related financial assets Criteria (and course location of assessment): Understand the nature and working of markets for financial capital (RE 8030) Understand the dynamic inter-relationships between capital markets and real estate markets (RE8020) (in AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8030)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework**

Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

MSRE student averages on this measure: C1: 2.69; 94% of students meet standard in RE8030. C2: 2.87; 100% of MSRE students meet standard in RE8020.

**M 3: The real estate system and the production cycle (O: 1)**

M3 Understand the real estate system and the production cycle Criteria (and course location of assessment): Understand the key theories that describe and explain the functioning and evolution of real estate markets (RE8020) (in AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8060) Understand the economic forces that affect demand, supply, equilibrium and disequilibrium in real estate markets (RE8020) (in AY2012 course location of assessment was 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**

Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Averages on this measure: C1 and C2 combined: 2.87; 100% of MSRE students met standard on exam in RE8020. C3: 2.20; 87% of MSRE students met standard on exam in 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 (RE8020). Select and apply appropriate techniques/tools to investigate real estate investment decisions and issues (RE8020). (AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8090). Select and apply appropriate techniques/tools to support real estate market studies. (RE8060)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Averages on this Measure: C1 and C2 combined: 2.73; 93% of MSRE students met standard on case in RE8020 C3: 2.81; 86% of MSRE students met standard on project in 8060.

**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**

Student average of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale of 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard based on an exam question for each criterion.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

Average on this measure: C1 2.40; 93% of student meet standard (RE8030) C2 2.53; 100% of students meet standard (RE8030) C3 1.87; 67% of students meet standard (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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averages on this Measure C1: 2.50; 94% of students meet standard (RE8050) C2: 2.25; 75% of students meet standard (RE8050) C3: 2.06; 69% of students meet standard (RE8050)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors left the university and no replacements hired, so course in which outcome assessed was canceled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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

#### Evaluate whether final exam question appropriate measure

Evaluate whether final exam question appropriate measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Application to real estate financing problems | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply theoretical principles and skills
- **Implementation Description:** Instructor will evaluate whether a final exam question is the best measure of learning when the score may not affect final grade.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor
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?

Moved assessment on some measures to different courses. Faculty left and were not replaced so some data was unavailable last year. One measure for one outcome was not assessed this year. The instructors left and were not replaced and the course from which the measures came was canceled. Faculty will evaluate whether to remove this measure or move to another course if faculty are not hired to teach the 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.

No planned changes based on assessment.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Rehabilitation Counseling MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Rehabilitation Counseling program prepares students to help culturally diverse people with cognitive, physical, sensory, psychiatric and other disabilities to reach their life goals. Rehabilitation counselors assist people with disabilities to become more independent, increase their access to education and employment, and to ensure that they are respected members of our society. Our graduates work in a variety of settings including: Vocational Rehabilitation agencies, Veterans Administration programs, not-for-profit and Community Rehabilitation Programs, schools including colleges and universities, rehabilitation and psychiatric hospitals, correctional facilities, drug treatment programs, workers’ compensation and other insurance industries, private practice, and businesses and corporations. 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 identity, the rehabilitation practice setting, medical and psychological aspects of disabilities, barriers and enhancements to case management and job placement, and ethical and legal considerations.
Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

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.
Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

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

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students passed their comprehensive examinations on the first try this academic year. CRC pass rate remains 90% (national average is 70%)

Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice
90 % of students will pass the comprehensive exam and 85% will pass the CRC exam on the first attempt

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
90% of students passed the CRC examination.

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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students in the program participated in the DSM diagnosis class and obtained passing grades (B or better). Psychological diagnosis was included in Medical Aspects of Disability -II class, and 14 out of 15 students received a B or better on that component of the course.

Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities
All students will select an internship site that provides services to people with disabilities

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Every Internship site was selected to insure that students worked with people with disabilities. 18 out of 18 students passed internship and demonstrated skills working with people with disabilities.

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Ethical conduct foundation will be accomplished through coursework associated with the introductory class (6050). All student will pass this class.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Ethical foundations were taught in the Introductory class, and all students 16/16 passed the course with a B or better.

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 class 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 ongoing process.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed

#### Ethics class/DSM Training
The program evaluation from the past year has detected that the ethics training in infused in several classes and several areas of overlap exist. We have also noted that diagnostic training (DSM) could be enhanced. This issue was discussed with the rehabilitation advisory board and over the next year there are plans to enhance ethics training in the introductory class (8050), 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

### Annual Report Section Responses

**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 are currently conducting as review of our curriculum in preparation for our next review by our national certification board (CORE). We have conducted focus groups and interviews with current students, alums, and our advisory board.**

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.


**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). Faculty members provide pro bono vocational counseling assistance to community members.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Religious Studies BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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. Religious Studies uses methods from a wide range of fields including philosophy, ethics, history, anthropology, archaeology, comparative literature, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. The primary concern is to understand different religious practices, beliefs, texts, and communities from a scholarly perspective. Students who study religion learn skills such as effective communication, teamwork, and the ability to understand and appreciate multiple points of view.

Graduates use these skills in a wide variety of professions including but not limited to: education, law, non-profit administration, media, counseling and social work, humanitarian aid, ministry, healthcare and medicine, business.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge of the Academic Study of Religion**

It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate knowledge in the following areas: 1) Religious Traditions of the World (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam) 2) Foundational Thinkers in the World Religions (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) 3) Major Religious Thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.) 4) Major Theorists in the Study of Religion (Elaine, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, ZS Smith, etc) 5) Representative Critical Theories and Methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological, ethical, feminist, etc) 6) Fundamental Technical Categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.) 7) Common Comparative Themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc) 8) Historical Role in Religion in Culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, sycretism, art and music, etc)

**G 2: Technical Skills in the Academic Study of Religion**

It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate technical skills in the following areas: 1) Reading Critically (outlining arguments, identifying conclusions, contextualizing author and text, detecting vagueness/ambiguity, etc.) 2) Thinking and Writing Critically (establishing premises and reaching conclusion, avoiding fallacies, utilizing proper grammar/diction/usage, etc.) 3) Conducting Effective Research in Religious Studies (using libraries and on-line resources, evaluating scholarship, synthesizing, etc)

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of General Religious History (M: 1)**

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: 2)**

Ability to understand, contextualize, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers.

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression (M: 3)**

Ability to think critically and write persuasively within the academic study of religion.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Evaluating final exam for RELS 3270 (Historical) (O: 1)**
Survey of World Religions is a course required of all Religious Studies majors. It provides an introduction to the historic and comparative study of the world's major religious traditions, including their beliefs, practices, sacred texts, and moral codes. Religions to be examined may include Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Native American traditions, and African traditions. The final exam will include 20 multiple choice questions that will ask students to demonstrate their knowledge of religious history.

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

**Target for O1: Knowledge of General Religious History**
At least 80% of the students earn 75% or better on these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.9% of the students earned 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Evaluating final exam for RELS 3270 (Major Religious Thinkers) (O: 2)**
In addition to providing an introduction to World Religions, this course also provides an introduction to the work of major religious thinkers. Students' knowledge of major religious thinkers will be assessed through 10 multiple choice questions on the final exam which will ask students to identify religious thinkers in various world religions.

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

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers**
At least 80% of the students earn 75% or better on these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data was not collected as appropriate this year, hence an assessment of this objective is not possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Evaluation of RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies (Critical Thinking and Writing) (O: 3)**
In Rel 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), and write clearly and effectively (writing).

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

**Target for O3: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression**
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. The final papers will be evaluated using the rubric, with scores of up to 25 points for focus, organization, and accurate writing mechanics (appropriate grammar and syntax). Targets for final papers: at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Focus; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Organization; and at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In spring '13 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final responses essays written for Rel 4750 using the rubric. 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 68% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; and 65% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for writing. In order to address the low scores, the Rel 4750 instructor will incorporate a revision step in the writing process for the capstone paper in order to offer the students input on their writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Evaluating RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies papers (Research) (O: 4)**
In Rel 4750 students will demonstrate the ability to incorporate examples and data from primary texts in a final research paper. They will be able to understand and evaluate religious claims and scholarly arguments, identifying strengths, weaknesses, and implications of scholars' arguments. 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. The final papers will be evaluated using the following rubric with scores of up to 25 points for focus, organization, ideas/content (support for claims).

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

**Target for O4: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion**
At least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Ideas Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies papers (Research) | 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

Better training of instructor
Many sections of the course are taught by Teaching Assistants. Better training of the TAs will improve student performance.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluating final exam for RELS 3270 (Historical) | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of General Religious History

Inclusion of revision process
In order to address the low scores, the RELS 4750 instructor will incorporate a revision step in the writing process for the capstone paper in order to offer the students input on their writing.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluating RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies papers (Research) | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion
Measure: Evaluation of RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies (Critical Thinking and Writing) | Outcome/Objective: 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 were made in the assessment process since last year’s report. Learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc. were kept the same. In the coming year we plan to change the measures for various objectives so that they are not all linked to the same assignments; previously, all the assessment information has been drawn from CTW course final paper assignments. In addition, we will use measures from a wider variety of courses (e.g., Survey of World Religions assignments) in order to obtain more accurate results.

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

Given that our data from the last couple of years has been spotty and incomplete, we are not planning any changes to our educational degree program in light of the assessment findings. As we move forward, we anticipate having a more reliable pool of data from which to draw. The one change we will make is to ask more assessment involvement from the instructors of the courses in which the measures for the learning outcomes are embedded. We believe that this will help the instructors think of the individual courses (Relics 3270, 3750, and 4750) as part of an overall curriculum and not simply as individual, stand-alone courses.
**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 the history of religions**
75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data available.

**Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies**
75% of faculty evaluations of historical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 2: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 2)**
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a numerical grade (4.0 scale) on mastery of theoretical content. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of this content.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Knowledge of theories of Religion**
75% of faculty evaluations of theoretical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 3: Critical Reading/Writing Evaluation of M.A. Thesis (O: 5, 7)**
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee produces written comments detailing the extent to which the thesis demonstrates the student's ability to engage in critical reading, thinking, and writing in the academic study of religion. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of these skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts**
75% of faculty evaluations on critical skills scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression**
75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 4: Methodological Evaluation of M.A. Thesis (O: 3)**
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a numerical grade (4.0 scale) on the ability to apply different methodological approaches to the study of religion. Moreover, each faculty member...
makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of these skills. 

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Methodological approaches to Religion**

75% of faculty evaluations on methodological issues scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 5: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Each graduating MA student is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies masters degree with regard to specific learning outcomes, i.e., understanding the nature and varieties of religion, familiarity with critical theory and major theorists, ability to conduct research and write critically, etc. Students ranked goals on a five-point scale, with 1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest ranking. Moreover, students were asked to offer comments specifically addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the program, advise for future graduate students, and so forth.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads-program completers

**Target for O1: Knowledge of the history of religions**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of theories of Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

**Target for O3: Methodological approaches to Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

**Target for O4: Comparative Approaches to Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

**Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

**Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

**Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Findings 2012-2013** - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data available.

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

**Monitoring Thesis Research**

The Graduate Committee will implement changes in the process by which students conceptualize and research their theses,
mandating more familiarity with research techniques, library resources, and alternative methodologies.

**New Assessment Criteria**
The Assessment Committee will modify the existing Assessment procedure so that individual measures match more precisely with specific learning objectives.

**Scheduling Graduate Seminars**
The Department will develop a long-range plan for developing and staffing a diverse range of appropriately configured graduate-only seminars.

**Theory and Method**
Continue integrating theoretical and methodological components into graduate-only seminars, in addition to the required course in advance theory and method.

**Thesis Timeline**
Establish a prospectus/thesis timeline, with specific benchmarks, clarification of methodology, research plan, etc.

**Pro-Seminar Test**
Currently, data is collected from the MA thesis or a final research paper which is a requirement for the MA degree. These two sources of data are unable to provide measures for all the learning outcomes. One possible solution under consideration would be to administer a test to the students in the graduate pro-seminar at the beginning and then at the end of the semester. This test would ask students to link names of religious scholars with key elements of their contributions to the field. By comparing their responses at the beginning of the semester with their responses at the end of the semester, it would be possible to assess the extent to which the students' knowledge of key religious scholars and concepts improved over the course of the semester. This test would provide measures for the first two learning outcomes. The Department will discuss ways to measure the other outcomes, ensure that each outcome is linked to a single measure, as well as which outcomes are redundant.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes were made in the assessment process since last year’s report. Learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc. were kept the same. In the coming year we plan to change the measures for various objectives so that they are not all linked to the same 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.

Given that our data from the last couple of years has been spotty and incomplete, we are not planning any changes to our educational degree program in light of the assessment findings. As we move forward, we anticipate having a more reliable pool of data from which to draw.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to cultivate and develop future educational researchers who are capable of investigating complex problems of the 21st century.
This is in keeping with the university's overarching goal to be recognized as a dynamic academic community where teaching and research combine to produce leaders and create solutions to conquer the challenges of the 21st century.

Goals
G 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

SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Be able to write a review literature related to their field of study and the various methodological approaches.

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.

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 to report on the results of the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Master's project/thesis (O: 2, 3, 4)
The final project for master’s students is a major paper or a thesis. In this assessment, faculty will be able to evaluate a student’s overall understanding of research and the research process, thereby providing a summative assessment of the student’s research capabilities. Master’s projects/theses are assessed by the project advisor or the thesis committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature
90% of the students will achieve the goal

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
The two students who completed their final masters project achieved this goal 100% of the students achieved this goal

**Target for O3: Design a research study**
90% of the students will achieve the goal

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
2 students successfully completed the master's project 2 students met expectations and graduated from the RMS program

**Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results**
90% of the students will achieve the goal

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
Two students who completed did a master's project but not a thesis. They were able to demonstrate that they knew how they would analyze the data but did not actually perform the analysis

**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

**Locate a measure**
Because of the option students have to not do a thesis we should identify courses or be sure there are courses in which this is a requirement and use the outcomes of those courses as the measure to evaluate this objective

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Rubric and assessment**
Design use and reporting of the outcomes using a rubric

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** The faculty is still in the process of finalizing and becoming acquainted with the use of the rubric. It was decided that someone in the administrative section of the unit will be responsible for collecting the rubric data from the faculty and recording them to make for ease of retrieval if and when the officers are no longer in service or reporting officer changes.
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?

For the first time the entire faculty in the department was able during a retreat session to review proposed rubric for assessing students learning outcomes. This rubric was voted on and sanctioned with edits. It will be put in place in the upcoming year 2013-2014.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to cultivate and develop future educational researchers who are capable of investigating complex problems of the 21st century.

This is in keeping with the university's overarching goal to be 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)
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, 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, 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, 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 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 to 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. (see pdfs named LOA Form Degree Programs; EPS LOA Guide)

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

**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

**Reviewing of the GOML**

The unit is reviewing the data collection process and the program itself because of the low numbers. Last year a decision was made to include non GOML MS students in the online courses associated with the RMS GOMS (MS) to increase the numbers and make the courses more feasible in terms of faculty time. None of the students have completed the degree which only began one year ago. No data are available for measurement of outcomes

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2014

**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 faculty in the entire EPS department spent some time this year reviewing and trying to streamline the assessment process. This is still in progress

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

No data have been collected for this program which has not had any students complete the degree as yet
**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.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy (M: 3, 4)**
Students are to think logically and in meaningful ways so that their actions reflect their critical thinking.

**SLO 3: Registry Credential (G: 3)**
To prepare for leadership positions in healthcare settings, students will demonstrate mastery of advanced level respiratory care knowledge.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

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

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Case Presentation (O: 1)

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

During fall semester 2012, 15 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 80% to 100%. 70 is the highest score based on rubric used by faculty but is calibrated to 0 to 100% score for grading purposes. 13 out of 15 (87%) meeting the target score. For spring semester 2013, 18 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Using the same grading system 12 out of 18 (67%) achieved 90% or higher. Scores ranged from 71% to 98%.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

26 students were given 4 writing assignments 50 points each. Student initial scores ranged from 20 points to 50 points and passing is 37.5. After three revisions allowed lowest grades improved from 20 points to 46 points.

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.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

32 of 32 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 is 126%. RT students average score on this competency was 4.28 while the national average was 3.36. The highest possible scores was 5.0. 30 of 32 (94%) students scores were 80% or higher. GSU average score for this exam is 87%, national mean score is 77%.

### 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.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

31 of 32 or 97% passed the WRRT on the first attempt. From review of the score report, the average score on this competency was 3.07 with the national average at 2.71. For this competency, 5.0 was the highest possible score. Two students scored 1, 8 students score 2. All other students scored 3 or above. 22 of 32 (69%) students scored 80% or higher.

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

#### Capstone course

Will continue to monitor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Capstone Course | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** GTA as a CTW assistant for office hours and other assistence 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Excellent | 10 Points | 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 of the illustrations such as diagrams, tables, charts, x-rays or illustrations were inappropriate for content presentation. Some were inappropriate. Most illustrations such as diagrams, tables, charts, x-rays or illustrations were inappropriate for content presentation. Organization Score ___. Excellent flow and transition from topic to topic. Very organized and refers to slides or other notes appropriately. Does not read slides verbatim. Good flow and transition from one topic to topic. Organized and refers to slides or other notes appropriately. Does not read from slides most of the time. Some difficulty with flow and transition from topic to topic. Disorganized and refers to notes inappropriately. Reads verbatim from the slides most of the time. Poor flow from topic to topic. Very disorganized and reads constantly from notes or slides. Reads verbatim from the slides all the time. Content Knowledge Score ___. Demonstrates full understanding of the topic. Answers 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 ___. Professional in delivery; looks confident; establishes eye contact. Presents with clear voice and excellent pronunciation. Everyone can hear the presentation. Well dressed. Slightly nervous and less confident. Establishes eye contact. Presents with clear voice and good pronunciation and hearing presentation. Well dressed. Seems nervous. Establishes eye contact but not confident. Some difficulty with precise pronunciation and hearing presentation. Well dressed. Very nervous, does not make eye contact and lacks confidence. Difficult to understand presentation with imprecise pronunciation and cannot hear presentation. Inappropriate dress. Spelling/Abbreviations Score ___. No misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. Few misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. Several misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. Numerous misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. References Score ___. 7 total; 5 from refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; fewer than 1 approved website 6 total; 4 from refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; 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 ___.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
NBRC WRRT Exam
Will continue to refine analysis of competency. Since this is the first time we have been this specific with an item on the exam matrix, will follow for another year to determine any trends.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

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
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: Case Presentation | 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. Have students take computer WRRT exam and review these questions with the students in class.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

Implementation Description: Plan will be implemented inf Fall 2012 with seniors presenting case study.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty assigned students presenting case study.
Additional Resources: None

Case Study Grades
We will continue the 2011-2012 action plan. We will also begin to allow students the option of resubmitting their case study after revising based on the rubric. Assigned faculty member will review the rubric and case study and upon resubmission the student’s case study will be assigned a new grade which will be no more than half of the points in order to make an A grade.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

RRT Exam content area 3A
Emphasize this content area in the review course for the RRT exam. Will do a power point slide review of this section to point out areas of importance. Continue to emphasize computer RRT practice exams and have students test over this specific area on the practice exams. Also discuss with faculty about this section of the exam and emphasize in the appropriate course this content area.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** NBRC Written Registry Exam  
**Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

### 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?

Learning outcomes, measures and targets remained the same from last year. Comparing last year to this year for the NBRC written Exam more students scored below the threshold of 3 although we are above the national average. More emphasis will need to be placed on this section of the exam both in courses with this material and in the review course. Again students taking practice exams can identify this section of questions and just review these questions in order to get more confident. These changes were made to meet the measure. In the coming academic year we will emphasize this section in clinical rotations with instructors as well as prior to taking the national 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.

It is clear that our students are performing at a higher level than the national average. Both exam results show mastery of the material in all areas of the CRT exam and in most areas with the RRT exam. As content matrix from the NBRC changes we will revise curriculum. Sequencing will remain the same. We have in the past year reduced the hours of 2 course from 3 to 2 as emphasis over this subject matter was changed. We instituted a new course that dealt with death and dying as requested by many senior students. This accounted for the 2 hour change in the curriculum.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 Respiratory Therapy MS**  
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

In support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Brydine F. Lewis School of Nursing and Health Professions, the purpose of the Master of Science degree in Health Sciences with a concentration in Respiratory Therapy is to expand the knowledge of current and future respiratory therapists who will be the leaders and educators in the profession of respiratory care.

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical and ethical thinkers**

To develop a deep and broad understanding of respiratory care content based on sound clinical decision making.

**G 2: Knowledge of professional issues in respiratory care**

To be aware of and concerned about being well-informed regarding the issues and factors affecting the professional practice of respiratory care.

**G 3: Leadership and educational positions**

Students are prepared for leadership positions in health care settings or for educational positions in academic institutions.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Communication in respiratory care (M: 1, 2)**

In order to discern that our students are critical and ethical thinkers, our students will be able to: 1) communicate orally by presenting a patient case study to the faculty and their peers at least once while in the program which is logically organized and based on data found in medical records and/or oral interviews OR through debates on issues affecting the practice of respiratory care. 2) communicate in writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline through problem solving by addressing issues affecting the practice of respiratory care.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points.
of view when appropriate.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

Standard Associations
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
3. Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Critical thinking in the application of research (M: 2)
An entry-level understanding 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All current entry-level integrated master's students have completed oral presentations and written presentations as required in this course.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Six 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of a total of 6 MS students in 2012-2013 academic year, 2 completed thesis and 4 completed 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
Four students successfully completed HHS 8000 with at least a score of 80% or higher.

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

#### Rubric Development

Continue development of rubric for evaluation of thesis proposals.

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

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

- **Measure:** Demonstrate appreciation for the research process  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking in the application of research

**Projected Completion Date:** 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  
  | 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):**
Measurement and project rubric
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 rubric 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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

There were no changes to the assessment process in the last year and we do not anticipate any changes for this 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.

Students indicated that they would like a course concerning end of life issues. The professor that teaches this course needed 1 hour. After reviewing the curriculum we found that 1-3 hour course could be reduced to 1 hour and still have enough hours in the course to cover the material. A new 1 hour on line course, End of Life Issues, was developed. One course was dropped and replaced with a hybrid course. This was done due to less emphasis on the subject matter. Also students take a course that covers the basic elements of this course in another section so the course was repetitive.
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.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

*Institutional Priority Associations*

3 Timely graduation
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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The assessment plan through 2012 did not show any deficiencies in this area. We conclude that the objective (and the associated measures) is not ambitious enough. We will revise the new assessment plan accordingly.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The assessment plan through 2012 did not show any deficiencies in this area. We conclude that the objective (and the associated measures) is not ambitious enough. We will revise the new assessment plan accordingly.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
The previous assessment plan (through 2012) showed deficiencies in this area. Specifically, while regarding criteria 1, 3, and 4, the standard was met and no action was required, a considerable number of students failed to meet standard 2. According to the action plan, the instructor was going to “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.” To assess the success of this action plan, we re-measured all criteria for the 2013 MRM 8610 class. Criterion 3 (“Value Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is evaluated based on Question 1a and c of the Spring 2013 final project. The focus here is on valuing derivatives in complete securities markets managing exposures via Delta and Delta/FX-Hedging. 85% of the students met or exceed the standard. Criterion 4 (“Document Risks Associated with Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is based on Question 1b of the Spring 2013 final project. Here, students analyze the impact of exchange rate risk on the profit/loss distribution. 91% of the students met or exceeded the standard. The assessment of Criterion 1 (“Value Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is based on Question 2a of the Spring 2013 final project. The focus here is on valuing contingent claims in incomplete securities markets. 80% of the students met or exceeded the standard. The assessment of Criterion 2 (“Document Risks Associated with Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is based on Question 2b of the Spring 2013 final project. Thus, these results are used for evaluating Criterion 2 (“Document Risks Associated with Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities”). 49% of the students failed to meet the criteria. Confirming the findings from previous years, students generally perform well in view of criteria 1, 3, and 4. In view of criterion 3, if the assessment were solely based on number 1a, the assessment would be even higher. Therefore, we believe the concept was well understood and no action is required. However, 49% of students failing to meet standard 2 is (still) excessive – which is also congruent with the observation from previous assessments.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The assessment plan through 2012 did not show any deficiencies in this area. We conclude that the objective (and the associated measures) is not ambitious enough. We will revise the new assessment plan accordingly.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The assessment plan through 2012 did not show any deficiencies in this area. We conclude that the objective (and the associated measures) is not ambitious enough. We will revise the new assessment plan accordingly.

---

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

**Continue retention of exams/projects**

Continue to retain selected student exams and projects for four years. Aggregate increasing collection of annual data until achieve four-year data sample. Maintain rolling four-year data sample thereafter.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course Faculty and MRM Assessment Group
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Retain and evaluate student work**

Retain selected samples of applicable student work from 2009-2010 course offerings. Perform preliminary analysis of the same for 2009-2010 assessment report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course Faculty and MRM Assessment Group
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Increase instructor emphasis on certain topics**

The course instructor will provide an increased emphasis on the role of other risk factors in non-traded beyond market risk, starting in the Spring of 2013.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 | Objective/Objective: Economic and financial theory expertise
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSMRM Program Director(s)

**Develop new assessment plan**

Assessment plan does not seem rigorous enough. Not getting information from the plan to direct change and document improved student learning.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Bauer and MRM faculty

**Non-traded risks – add homework & adjust materials**

Non-traded risks – and the special characteristics they imply – need to be further emphasized in the lecture. The instructor will adjust the teaching material and include a homework assignment for non-traded risk.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 | Objective/Objective: Economic and financial theory expertise
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Bauer
Programming Bootcamp
Creation of programming bootcamp as discussed in 11-12 assessment analysis. Bootcamp will improve students skills, provide a basis on which courses can build throughout the curriculum. Faculty will have more time for content related instruction in courses and not provide programming instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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?

No changes were made to the assessment plan since we wanted to re-measure the weak areas in order to "close the loop." However, since the majority of criteria were met in previous assessments (with the sole exception being Criterion 2 on Measure M.3), we generally conclude that the current assessment plan is not sufficiently ambitious with regards to objectives and measures. We will revise the future MRM assessment plan accordingly (for 2014 onwards).

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Risk Management & Insurance (Risk & Insurance) MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
A substantially revise version of this program is in the midst of the approval process. An appropriate assessment plan will be prepared and implemented once the program revisions have been approved and implemented.

Goals
G 1: See Mission/Purpose

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: See Mission/Purpose (M: 1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: See Mission/Purpose (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: See Mission/Purpose
Complete approval of revisions to program. Revise assessment plan in light of revised program. Implement revised assessment plan.

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

Program Revision Approval
Achieve approval of program revisions. Revise assessment plan to match revised program. Begin implementation of revised plan.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: See Mission/Purpose | Outcome/Objective: See Mission/Purpose

Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Phillips and Marty Grace
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Mission / Purpose
BBA-RMI PROGRAM MISSION: The BBA in Risk Management and Insurance (RMI) is designed to prepare students to: (1) Apply quantitative models to the measurement of business risks, (2) Assess the hazard risks that are common to business organizations, (3) Apply the enterprise risk management process to managing risk in business organizations.

Goals
G 1: Quantify business risk using modeling tools
Students will be able to quantify business risk by applying appropriate modeling tools.

G 2: Assess common business risks
Students will be able to assess the common property, liability and personnel risks of a business organization.

G 3: Apply forecasting techniques to loss data
Students will be able to apply forecasting techniques to loss data to project the future impact of risks on a business organization.

G 4: Apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options
Students will be able to apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options as an aid in decision-making.

G 5: Explain and apply enterprise risk management process
Students will be able to explain the enterprise risk management process and apply it to actual business situations through case study.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Identification and structuring of risky situations (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
Students will be able to recognize risk and uncertainty and their impact on individual, business, and societal decision making. Pertinent risks include those related to the person and property, leverage, longevity, securing future consumption, and asset transfer. Students will be able to take an uncertain situation and determine the nature of the problem(s) to be solved.

SLO 2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)
Students will be able to take an uncertain situation, and: (1) recognize mathematical, financial and/or statistical tools to be used in solving; and (2) use quantitative tools to model risks and craft alternatives to address them.

SLO 3: Comprehension of the business risk management process (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)
Students will have technical comprehension of the business risk management process, including the identification and evaluation of loss exposures, the analysis of the various risk control and financing techniques available to manage the exposures, decision making under conditions of uncertainty, control mechanisms to monitor the results of the risk management program.

SLO 4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process (G: 1, 5) (M: 3)
Students will have theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. Students will be able to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Performance on selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in RMI 3750 Probability Theory and Simulation Analysis in Risk Management an understanding of the sources of uncertainty in a business application.
Source of Evidence: Performance (rectal, 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.
Target for **O3: Comprehension of the business risk management process**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**M 3: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 (O: 4)**

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 Enterprise Risk Management theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process and the ability to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

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

Target for **O4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

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

Assignments to include added focus on making recommendations and conclusions

RMI 4350 is a CTW course. Course assignments will be revised to focus more on providing the student with practice and feedback on making recommendations and conclusions.

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

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

- **Measure:** Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350
- **Outcome/Objective:** Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Martin Grace and Harold Weston

---

**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.

In the 2012-2013 cycle the Robinson College of Business established an Assistant Dean position for oversight of the undergraduate program. Consistent with the RCB strategic plan the undergraduate program will be significantly updated beginning in the 2013-2014 cycle. It is highly likely that this mission statement will be revised in the coming year.

**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).

## SLO 4: Effective Team Membership (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)

Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.

**Relevant Associations:**

## 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.

**Relevant Associations:**

## Other Outcomes/Objectives

### O/O 6: Ethics and Social Responsability (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.

**Relevant Associations:**

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Further Education – Self Report (O: 5)

This measure reports the number of students anticipating continuing formal education after completion of their BBA degree.

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

**Target for O5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning**

Over 60% of students show an interest in continuing their formal education in some form in the future. Measurement will be done by looking at self report data entered for the Educational Testing Service's Business Test, which is administered to graduating seniors in their final semester.

### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In the 2012-2013 student exit surveys 1273 of the 1325 graduating seniors self-reported their plans for further education. Of these 747 explicitly indicated that they intend to go on to graduate school. Another 24 indicated "other" continuing education, which most often indicated a professional school degree such as law. With 771 of 1273 students clearly indicating a desire to continue their education we just cleared the desired goal of 60% with a 60.54% rate. When, however, the 31 students who indicated that they will pursue an Associates degree and another 95 who indicated "undecided" are added in, the likely percentage of student that will continue formal education after their bachelors degree is higher.
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 requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and often exceeds group requirements. Occasionally 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 exemplary team behavior. Consistently displays good 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: Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently communicates relevant material for the project. Knowledge of project requirements is consistent with expectations. Consistently communicates relevant material for the project. Knowledge of project requirements is consistent with expectations. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. 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: Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. 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.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students in the capstone BUSA 4980 classes participated in the semester-long group project from which 39 peer review forms were randomly sampled. Of those 35 were deemed usable for this assessment. Each form reported evaluations for three to five students, including the evaluator, on nine measures. Each measure contained a possible score of 1 to 5. For this measure the “Involvement” score, the second on in the rubric, was used. A total of 137 evaluations were used. The mean was 4.26. The variation was 0.7503. The distribution showed a Skew of -1.374 and a Kurtosis of 2.20. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric; however it showed a modest peak. The mean score was above the target level of 4.00.

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. Meets minimum group or project requirements. 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: Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. 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.
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students in the capstone BUSA 4980 classes participated in the semester-long group project from which 39 peer review forms were randomly sampled. Of those 33 were deemed usable for this assessment. Each form reported evaluations for three to five students, including the evaluator, on nine measures. Each measure contained a possible score of 1 to 5. For this measure the “Interaction” score on the Team Assessment rubric was used. A total of 128 evaluations were used. The mean was 4.32. The variation was 0.7576. The distribution showed a Skew of -1.349 and a Kurtosis of 1.59. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric; however it showed a modest peak. The mean score was above the target level of 4.00.

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 sub-parts’ criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the final oral student presentations done as part of the BBA program's capstone course, BUSA 4980.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
In this cycle 86 students were observed across four different section of capstone BUSA 4980 class. There were two daytime and two evening classes in which observations were made. Students were rated according to the metrics on the Oral Communications Skill rubric. The percentage of students that were scoring 3.0 or higher were as follows: Effective use of voice, intonation and pacing: 38% Organization of supporting material for the presentation: 38% Physical linkage with the audience: 70% To look more closely are these results we calculated some descriptive statistics for each that hasn't been used before: Effective use of voice, intonation and pacing: Mean 2.756756757 Skew 0.487714691 Kurt -1.000678135 Var 0.466966967 Organization of supporting material for the presentation: Mean 2.851351351 Skew 0.163632644 Kurt - 0.783270399 Var 0.70345345 Physical linkage with the audience: Mean 2.941176471 Skew 0.588925261 Kurt -1.46774832 Var 0.558823529 These data explain a lot about the low percentage of students achieving the goal. Although the Mean is not that far from the goal of 3.0, the negative Kurtosis and the positive Skew indicate a relatively flat distribution across the skill ratings.

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 int he 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 2011in the RCB were selected. Of these papers 32 were assessable using the rubric developed for this and other questions in assessment. The results of that assessment with the names removed are included in the results matrix for the 2010-2011 cycle and are linked here from the Document Depository.

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
A total of 42 assignments were used in this assessment. 7 papers each were randomly drawn from 6 different senior-level CTW classes that were conducted in 5 different departments of the RCB in the spring semester of 2013. 5 of the papers were deemed usable for this purpose leaving 37 to be evaluated with the rubric. Of the remaining sample, were rated a 4, 22 papers, or 59.5% of the sample were rated 3. Thus, 81.1% of the papers were rated a 3.0 or higher. This is just above the target of 80% for this measure. The other 7 papers were rated a 2 and no papers 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 int he 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 2011in 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met
A total of 42 assignments were used in this assessment. 7 papers each were randomly drawn from 6 different senior-level CTW classes that were conducted in 5 different departments of the RCB in the spring semester of 2013. 5 of the papers were deemed not usable for this purpose leaving 37 to be evaluated with the rubric. Two dimensions are used in this rubric. The first looks at the student's ability to systematically and logically interpret data. On that dimension 4 students, or 10.8%, were rated a 4 and 20 students or, 54.1%, were rated a 3. Thus, 64.9% of the students were rated a 3.0 or higher. This is below the 80% target for this measure. 13 of the remaining students, 12 students, or 32.4%, were rated a 2, and 1 student, was 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, 8.1%, were rated a 4 and 19 students, or 51.5%, were rated a 3. Thus we had 59.6% of the students scoring at 3.0 or higher. This is below the target of 80%. Of the remaining students 13, or 35.1%, of the total scored a 2 and 2 students, or 5.4%, of the total scored a 1.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Law and Ethics
In the 2008-2009 AY the Undergraduate Steering Committee recommended the addition of a law and ethics component to the Learning Outcomes of the Undergraduate degree program and the Assessment process. In the next assessment cycle the following will be done: A Learning Outcome, Measurement Rubric, and Target Performance level will be established for the Undergraduate program. Elements of law and ethics will be infused in the material in the capstone strategic management course, BUSA 4980. A case with significant law and ethics issues will be woven into the materials in the capstone strategy course, BUSA 4980. An assessment of students’ performance on the law and ethics infused case will be made and based on the results the next set of steps will be taken to establish law and ethic orientations throughout the undergraduate curriculum.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Terminated
**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
**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 actives, written and oral, being assessed were not of a high enough quality in terms of their suitability for being assessment vehicles, and 2) the rubrics developed for the assessments were not adequate. In the recommendations to the RCB Executive Committee communications initiatives that would significantly change the development of communication skills in RCB were presented under the charge that RCB students are “ready to execute.” Specifically the sub-committee recommended curricular changes that would: Develop, use, receive feedback on, and be evaluated on their oral presentation skills across the entire curriculum, not just in selected and isolated classes. Develop, use, receive feedback on, and be evaluated on their prose writing (not outlining or bullet-pointing) skills across the entire curriculum, not just in selected and isolated classes.

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

**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: Terminated
- Priority: High

**Undergraduate Program Re-Design**

In the spring of 2013 the Robinson College created two new Assistant Dean positions. One of these was an Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs. This position had not existed before. The overarching goal of the new Assistant Dean is to engage in a major restructuring of the undergraduate program along the lines of the recommendations made in the undergraduate sub-committee report issued in 2011. The restructuring of the undergraduate program will first review and restate the programs' Goals and Objectives (student learning outcomes). In that light all aspects of the undergraduate experience, not just courses taken and their sequencing, will be addressed. Although the Goals and Objectives will be re-written in total, it is anticipated that Goals and Objectives very similar to those that currently exist and those highlights in the 2011 subcommittee report will emerge. Initiatives to be addressed include but are not limited to: Institution of critical thinking exercises in all RCB core classes Institution of writing requirements in all RCB core classes Institution of oral communications requirements in all RCB core classes Institution of ethics and social responsibility perspectives in all RCB core classes A tighter integration program content across all RCB core classes A team oriented, multi-functional experience early in the junior year A comprehensive, analysis and recommendation-oriented individual project late in the senior year Development of a culture of professionalism across the curriculum Institution of assessment and continual improvement processes for each core course in the curriculum These initiative include some of the RCB’s prior Action Plan items. These items were implemented in a "one off" approach that was not well integrated with the undergraduate program as a whole. This action plan incorporates those initiatives in the light of any changes that are made in the Goals and Objectives of the BBA program. However, in this redesign prior Action Plan focu of Law and Ethics, Communication, and Technical Skills will be restarted as part of the integrated program. These are not functional specific areas, but rather are skills that need to be integrated across the curriculum and with each other. Lessons learned in the prior Action Plan initiatives will be incorporated, learnt in the agenda items will no longer be seen as separable from the larger RCB BBA program. As a result the individual initiatives were terminated. The items are now part of this larger effort, as are the other items listed above and items yet to be listed.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
teaching in the undergraduate program.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2019
Responsible Person/Group: William Bogner
Additional Resources: A significant amount of resources has been set aside by the RCB Dean's office to create and sustain this new administrative position and its agenda.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Robinson College of Business Executive Doctorate in Business**

As of: 12/13/2016 06:00 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Executive Doctorate in Business program offered by the J. Mack Robinson College of Business of Georgia State University helps executives develop these capabilities by teaching them how to apply relevant knowledge and research skills to contemporary business problems. It also addresses the lifelong learning needs of intellectually active professional adults who already possess advanced degrees in their fields but wish to continue their education to the highest level.

**Goals**

**G 1: Executive Doctorate in Business Goals**

The Ph.D. program of J. Mack Robinson College of Business will develop in graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring: (1) education in theory; (2) education in general research techniques as well as research techniques specific to a discipline; (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues; and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Seeing the big picture (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The Executive Doctorate in Business will advance the knowledge and expertise required to identify, understand, and successfully tackle the interdisciplinary, big picture issues that characterize global business management today.

**O/O 2: Honing the skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The Executive Doctorate in Business will develop in the student the skills in formal social inquiry required to define and address complex issues and to disseminate knowledge related to their profession in a variety of professional and public outlets "to influence professional activity and public policy."

**O/O 3: Giving the global perspective (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The Executive Doctorate in Business will give an interdisciplinary, globally oriented perspective that is unavailable in traditional advanced degree programs.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Performance in coursework (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The program will have six content courses to provide students with knowledge about global business leadership and five courses on research practices, design and analysis to equip the students with the understanding required to undertake formal research. Students are expected to maintain a 3.0 average in coursework. Students must earn a C or better in all courses. Students who do not meet these requirements or who are struggling to meet them are counseled out of the program.

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

**M 2: Group projects (O: 1, 2, 3)**

During the second and third semesters, students participate in research projects in groups of two to three people, under the supervision of a senior researcher. Each project will address a contemporary business issue and be conducted with the objective of publishing the results.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 3: Independent research (O: 1, 2, 3)**

During the fourth, fifth and sixth semesters, each student engages in an independent research project under the supervision of a senior researcher. This project addresses a business issue affecting the student's firm. Each student will produce and defend a doctoral thesis with the expectation of publishing it.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Robinson College of Business MBA

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

**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, GMBA 8990, 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

For this cycle a random sample of twelve final exams, written as case analyses, were taken from each of seven different MBA 8820, PMBA 8820, GMBA 8990 and EMBA 8710 classes. These are the different designations for the capstone strategy class in the different formats of the MBA degree program. Two of the sections were in each of the three semesters, summer 2012, fall 2012 and spring 2013. Three of the sections were in the PMBA format with one from each of the three active PMBA locations, Alpharetta, Buckhead and Peachtree-Dunwoody. Two sections were in the Flex format with one from each of the active locations, Brookhaven and Downtown. The only section of the EMBA format was offered in the Buckhead location. One section on GMBA format was offered in the Buckhead location. Students continued to perform at historic levels on this set of items. The first item scores at about 68% for the top two categories, which is close to where it has been historically. The second item held much of the gain that was shown in the prior cycle. There may have been some regression to the mean here, but the number of students in the top two categories was 71%. While this remains below the goal of 80%, it showed that the 2011-2012 cycle’s performance was not a one-time event. The third item similarly showed the same performance as in the prior cycle, but this was at the disappointing level of only 57% of the students being ranked in the top two categories. A detailed breakdown of raw scores and percentages is in the Rubric Analysis document attached for the academic year 2012-2013.

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, GMBA 8990, 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 the course was offered the analysis 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met

For this cycle a random sample of twelve final exams, written as case analyses, were taken from each of seven different MBA 8820, PMBA 8820, GMBA 8990 and EMBA 8710 classes. These are the different designations for the capstone strategy class in the different formats of the MBA degree program. Two of the sections were in each of the three semesters, summer 2012, fall 2012 and spring 2013. Three of the sections were in the PMBA format with one from each of the three active PMBA locations, Alpharetta, Buckhead and Peachtree-Dunwoody. Two sections were in the Flex format with one from each of the active locations, Brookhaven and Downtown. The only section of the EMBA format was offered in the Buckhead location. One section on GMBA format was offered in the Buckhead location. Students showed results in this cycle comparable to the past on these measures. On the first item student performance was very similar to last year's with 69% of the sample in the top two classifications. The second measure continued to trend lower, however. This suggests an area for increased attention. Only 54% of students were 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, GMBA 8990, 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 the course was offered the analysis 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.
categories in 68% 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 43%, while still disappointing was much higher than in the prior year. Legal and ethical are not specifically cued in the questions asked. Independently, only a minority of students mention this issue and few address it well, 7% of the students addressed the potential legal issues well and 10% did the same with ethical issues. A detailed breakdown of raw scores and percentages is in the Rubric Analysis document attached for the academic year 2012-2013

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

**Law and Ethics**
The assessment process of 2008-2009 showed very low scores in the area of law and ethics. Two possible interpretations of this result are possible. One is that the measurement was flawed; the second is that the measurement was fine and the learning objective was not being attained. Upon review it seems that the answer is a mix of the two items. Some of the alternative exercises that students could choose from in the assessed assignment did not have clear legal or ethical issues for discussion. However, on the options that did have such concerns the level of discussion was below target levels. In the short term the assignments for the assessment will be more carefully vetted to see that opportunities for discussion of legal and/or ethical issues are clearly set out. In the longer term the leadership of the College will work with Department toward increased consideration of legal and ethical issues in decision making throughout the core curriculum, not just in the Legal Environment course.

**Leadership and Team Skill Measurement**
The assessment process on the measures of Leadership and Group Participation was not helpful in terms of providing results to the College that will enable them to target specific aspects of both skill sets for improvement. Analysis of the rubric used for these measurements indicated a sophisticated measure embedded in a good measurement devise for both measures. Analysis of the data collected from students indicates, however, that students were using the measurement instruments in a very elementary way. For the 09-10 assessment cycle it would be preferable if the assessment instrument can be retained. The challenge is to elicit more thoughtful and reflective responses from students in their completion of the assessment instrument. The College will work with the faculty members in the Strategic Management class to try to improve participation quality in this class.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Robinson College of Business PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The Ph.D. program of the College of Business Administration develops for graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring (1) training in theory; (2) training in general research techniques as well as research techniques specific to a discipline; (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues; and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

**Goals**

**G 1: Research**
Graduates are skilled and knowledgeable in conducting quality, relevant academic research.

**G 2: Engaged Professionals**
Graduates are engaged in the community of scholars.

**G 3: Effective Teachers**
Graduates are effective teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Creates new knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about an area of business in his/her major area of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Professional Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The candidate will be actively engaged with the community of scholars in the discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Comprehensive understanding of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research. Students should be able to conduct original research in collaboration with college faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Competency in research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research. Students should be able to conduct original research in collaboration with college faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Placement in research-oriented institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Rubric - Research Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Rubric - Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubric criteria #2 will be applied to student work at the time of the dissertation defense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Creates knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Knowledge of literate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Cognate knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Involvement in community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Rubric - Use of technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring student mastery of body of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. coordinators in each academic unit

Pedagogical training
All students who are slated to teach must take the Teaching Seminar course. Student evaluations from the courses taught by doctoral students are reviewed by the academic unit and discussed with the student. Each academic unit has a teaching mentor who works with students concerning all aspects of teaching, including course preparation and classroom management.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. unit coordinator and department chair

Placement of graduates in research institutions
Successful placement of graduates is contingent on many factors. Admissions committees in each academic unit must seek applicants who are interested in research (as well as academically qualified). Students must be actively engaged in research from the outset of their studies and should be actively mentored by a research-active faculty member. Students should attend conferences and present papers in order to gain recognition of faculty from other research universities. Students must produce a thoughtful and well-researched dissertation. Once placed, alumni should remain active researchers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. unit coordinator, Ph.D. Program Office

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 School Counseling EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose overarching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents, to evaluate school counseling programs, and to coordinate the resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, program evaluation, advocacy and the curriculum of the school.

Goals
G 1: P-12 Student Learning and Development
School counselors are committed to their students and to their learning, growth and development. To this end, school counselors use their skills to assist students in individual, small group, and classroom guidance settings. School counselors also monitor and evaluate student learning and development to provide the most effective school counseling programs.

G 2: Professional Practice/Experience
School counselors reflect on their practice and learn from that experience.

G 3: Learning Communities
School counselors are participating members of learning communities. This participation allows them to share their expertise and to gain valuable ideas from other practicing school counselors.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
School counselors understand and practice effective counseling skills that contribute to P-12 student learning and development.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 2: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev (G: 1) (M: 2)
In order to assist all P-12 students in school success, school counselors must monitor, manage, and evaluate student learning and development. Student learning and development as assisted by school counselors takes place through school counselors’ leadership in individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance activities, parent and teacher consultation, using community resources, and advocating for students.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 3: Professional Reflection and Learning (G: 2) (M: 3)
School counselors reflect continually on their professional practice. This reflection allows them to learn from their experiences, including those practices that are effective and those that need to be revised.

Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

**SLO 4: Participates in Learning Communities (G: 3) (M: 4)**

School counselors participate in learning communities, including classroom groups, mentoring relationships, feeder school groups, and other appropriate learning groups. In this way, school counselors can share their expertise with others, as well as learn from other school counselors.

Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills (O: 1)**

Students will provide direct services (demonstrate effective individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance and consultation skills) to students, parents and teachers in the school setting. An audio tape of one such session will be critiqued by the class to indicate effective counseling skills that will promote student/parent/teacher learning and development. Students must also complete a tape critique form that provides the purpose of the session, a summary of the session, their strengths and what they learned from the experience.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills**

At least 90% of the students will earn a Satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Development
- Measure: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Supervision Session Summary Form | Outcome/Objective: Professional Reflection and Learning

**Implementation Description:** The School Counseling faculty will monitor the outcomes/objectives.

**Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2013

**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 & Development
- Measure: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Supervision Session Summary Form | Outcome/Objective: Professional Reflection and Learning

**Implementation Description:** The School Counseling faculty will monitor the outcomes/objectives.

**Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2012

**Additional Resources:** At least one additional school counseling faculty member.

---

**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. 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.

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.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2012-2013 School Counseling MEd**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST*  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*
**Mission / Purpose**

The School Counseling program within the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University is dedicated to training professional school counselors who are prepared to use school data to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally appropriate school counseling programs that promote academic, vocational and personal/social success for all K-12 students. Student learning occurs in the following areas: student data collection in diverse K-12 schools, delivery of counseling and guidance services, collaboration and consultation with parents and other educators, and the design, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program. Our model for school counselor preparation is based on the American School Counselor Association’s (ASCA) National Model for School Counseling Programs and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards for School Counseling Programs.

**Goals**

**G 1: Foundations of School Counseling**

Foundations of school counseling include the history and philosophy of the school counseling profession, professional roles and credentialing, current models of school counseling programs (ASCA National Model) and ethical and legal standards related to the profession.

**G 2: Counseling Interventions**

Counseling interventions include individual, small and large group and school-wide approaches to intervention.

**G 3: Social Justice: Diversity, Leadership and Advocacy**

Diversity includes the cultural, ethical, economic, legal, and political issues surrounding community, environmental and institutional opportunities that enhance, as well as barriers that impede, the academic, career and personal/social development of all P-12 students. Diversity pertains to the effects of ability levels, stereotyping, family, socioeconomic status, gender and sexual identity and their effects on student achievement. Working as leaders, school counselors promote student success by closing existing achievement gaps, and influencing systemwide changes for school reform. School counselors advocate for students’ educational needs and work proactively to remove barriers to learning.

**G 4: Assessment**

Assessment includes selecting appropriate assessment strategies that can be used to evaluate the academic, career and personal/social development of all P-12 students and analyzing assessment information to determine needs as well as the effectiveness of educational programs.

**G 5: Research and Evaluation**

Research and evaluation includes knowing basic strategies for evaluating counseling outcomes and methods of using data to inform decision making and accountability. In addition it includes developing measurable outcomes for school counseling programs, activities, interventions and experiences.

**G 6: Academic Development**

To promote academic development, school counselors work to close achievement gaps and use differentiated instructional strategies to teach counseling and guidance related material to promote the achievement of all students.

**G 7: Consultation and Collaboration**

Consultation and collaboration includes empowering parents, guardians and families to act on behalf of their children, locating and 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, facilitating the establishment of group norms/clear ground rules and consequences, maintaining an open/relaxed atmosphere, reflecting content and feelings of group members, inviting and/or encouraging all group members to participate, using appropriate summary/closure techniques, and effectively terminating the group experience. Students use individual counseling and small group counseling to promote academic development, career development and personal/social development.

Relevant Associations: Council 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.
### 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 2012-2013 - 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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity (G: 3) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals. Towards this end, students enrolled in CPS 7340 will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend learning and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. Students must attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Students must observe verbal and non verbal behaviors and initiate social interactions. In addition, students will read journal articles or book chapters that relate to the cultural group identified in the field project. The experience will be described in a paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship (G: 3) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interns must demonstrate their ability to respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests. Interns must be sensitive to school, community and cultural norms, understand the counselor's role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution, and effectively use knowledge of culture, advocacy, and social justice to create academic, personal/social, and career development programs that meet the needs of diverse populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Knowledge of Indiv &amp; Group Approaches to Appraisal (G: 4) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and rationale for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrsp, Action Research (G: 3, 5, 6) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Students analyze the demographic data from their 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills (G: 6) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Knowledge of Consultation &amp; Collaboration (G: 7) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Demonstrates Consultation &amp; Collab. Skills (G: 7) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of the students earned a score above the cut-off score of 25.

M 4: Multicultural Experience Activity (O: 4)

Research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals. Towards this end, students enrolled in CPS 7340 will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend learning and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. Students must attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Students should observe verbal and non verbal behaviors and initiate social interactions. In addition, students will read journal articles or book chapters that relate to the cultural group identified in the field project. Students will write a 4-5 page paper that summarizes knowledge gained from the field experience and from the readings.

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

Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity

At least 80% of the students will earn a B or better on the multicultural experience activity.

Findings 2012-2013 - 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, Ldrship (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 for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership

M 6: Appraisal Case Study (O: 6)

In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and the rational for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations. Case studies are evaluated based on the previously stated issues as well as on organization, written expression, appropriate use of citations and references and on integration of course material.

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

Target for O6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal

At least 90% of the students will be a B or better on the case study.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.
### M 7: Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) (O: 7)

Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Students analyze the demographic data from their schools and determine where gaps exist between demographic groups in achievement or in access to classes and other activities and services, formulate a plan that is academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts. The grade is assigned based on the appropriateness of the plan, the type of analysis used, the outcome and the discussion of the findings.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrshp, Action Research**

At least 90% of the students will earn 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.

**Findings 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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
**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 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 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**

**G 2: Understands School Psychology Practice**  
Students will understand the foundations and practice of school psychology.

**G 1: Professionalism**  
To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work in a diverse society. In addition, our graduates are informed about and committed to legal and ethical practices.

**G 3: Scientific and Research Foundations for Professional Practice**  
To ensure that our graduates are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology and that they can use research findings to properly conduct research, particularly in educational settings.

**G 4: Professional Strategies Targeted to the Needs of Learners, Their Parents, and Their Schools**  
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing intervention, consultation, and psychoeducational assessments.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

| SLO 1: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will understand the development of socialization skills and life competencies in school-age children.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic skills in children.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 4: Implements Data Based Decision Making (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4) | Students will understand responsibilities related to professional, legal, and ethical duties.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 6: Effectively utilizes technological applications (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will understand and utilize technology effectively.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 7: Understand diversity, development, & learning (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| **Strategic Plan Associations**  
| 4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities). |
| SLO 8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.  
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |
| SLO 10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) | Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children’s mental health. |
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Student will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Internship Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</td>
<td>The Internship Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports consultation reports, assigned activities, the site-based supervisors' rating and university-based supervisors' rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.</td>
<td>Target: Met 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration</strong> 100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### M 2: Practicum Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

Practicum Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports, consultation reports, assigned activities, the site-based supervisors’ rating, and the university-based supervisors’ rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's acquisition of required skills and competency in targeted areas.

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

### Target for O1: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies

100% of MEd practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills

100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration

100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making

100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities

100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications

100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, & learning

100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings** 2012-2013 - Target: **Met**

100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.
### Target for O8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### M3: 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 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric 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 internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of MEd practicum students received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Administration of PEF Student Disposition Survey**

This survey is currently being finalized by the appropriate PEF committees.

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

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

Measure: PEF Disposition Survey | Outcome/Objective: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities

**Implementation Description:** We hope to implement this during Spring 2012.

**Responsible Person/Group:** School Psychology Faculty

**Additional Resources:** Administrative support for moving assessment materials and data to LiveText
Mission / Purpose

The goal of the PhD program in School Psychology is to train school psychologists to become skilled researchers, university trainers, and professional psychologists. By successfully completing the courses, practica, internships, and research projects in this program, the graduates are prepared to research, evaluate, and provide 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. They are eligible for licensure as professional psychologists and certification as school psychologists. 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

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
5 students completed predissertation research in 2012-2013

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
We have done well in dissertations. 5 students completed dissertations during 2012-2013, and 4 completed in late summer, early Fall 2013.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
We have done well in dissertations. 5 students completed dissertations during 2012-2013, (and, although they do not count here- 4 completed in late summer, early Fall 2013)

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We did not have any students take the comprehensive during the 2102/13 time frame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We did not have any students take the comprehensive examination during this cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we did not have any students take the comprehensive examination this cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Intervention**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective intervention practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we did not have any students take the comprehensive examination this cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Consultation**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective consultation practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we did not have any students take the comprehensive examination this cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of psychoeducational assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we did not have any students take the comprehensive examination this cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 6 2012-13 interns received a score of &quot;3&quot; or higher on supervisors rating for ethics and professional behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 6 2012-13 doctoral interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for understanding the practice of professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the 6 doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for understanding the principles of psychology and school psychology.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the 6 doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for readiness for entry into practice.

**Target for O6: Intervention**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the 6 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of the 6 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All 6 of the 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?

For several years we have worked to increase our timely completion of dissertations and predissertation research projects as this was an historical weakness in the program. We have been very successful over the past 2 years in having students complete the program in a more timely manner.

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?

For several years we have targeted increasing our percent of students who pursue academic and research careers post graduation. This effort has been successful in that we are placing more students in such positions. For example, last year we had 5 graduates who sought and obtained academic track employment and three of these were at Research 1 institutions (Emory, U of Connecticut, Illinois State 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 have need of a faculty member from an under-represented group to better represent our student body and to better represent the rapidly changing US population. We had a search last year that was unsuccessful. The search was not renewed this year. I hope we can approval for the line again in the not too distant future.

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

Our program is accredited by APA, NASP, and NCATE- so those processes drive changes 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?

We are trying to more accurately measure the impact of our efforts toward publication with students. We have not yet determined a 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.

As noted, these issues come primarily for external accreditation process, not this one.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

Placing numerous students in academic careers

Modifications in Intended Outcomes--If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

We will add a specific outcome goal for students who pursue academic/research careers

Publications and Presentations--Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

Many, many. Do we really have to list them here?

International Activities--Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

The faculty had excellent presence at the annual International School Psychology Conference in Porto, Portugal, with 6 papers presented. Drs. Varjas and Meyers have continued partnerships in Sweden. Dr. Varjas continues some work in Asia. Dr. Cadenhead continues some work in Mexico.

Contributions to Student Retention--Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

We have been working to hasten student progress though the program with good success. This has been a multistep effort. First, we are trying to be more careful about selecting students who have similar interests to our research. We have been working to keep better tabs of their progress with the research process. We have also instituted annual reviews of progress with feedback provided to monitor students who might fall though the cracks.

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 have been trying to get an OSEP training grant to provide service to urban school districts and will continue to seek that funding.
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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. 2. 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. 3. Content: Candidates will expand their content knowledge of the natural sciences by excelling in science courses that 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)
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)
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)
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)
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Sixty-six percent of the candidates scored at the “4” out of “5” and 33% scored at the “3” 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. This data indicate that the target was met.

M 2: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 2)
Candidates are expected 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. Students must achieve a rating of at least “2” out of a possible “3” for this measure.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
Candidates are expected 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. Students must achieve a rating of at least “2” out of a possible “3” for this measure.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Sixty-six percent of the candidates scored at the exceeds level (3) and 33.5 percent scored at the meets level (2) implying that candidates have a good understanding of how to choose assessment instruments, how to use the instruments to evaluate the performance of students, and how to use assessment data to modify their instructional strategies. This data indicate that the target was met.

**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. Candidates must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

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

**Target for O3: Content Knowledge**

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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Sixty-six percent of the students scored at the exceeds level (3) and 33 percent scored at the meets level (2) implying that the candidates have adequate knowledge to teach science as an interdisciplinary unit. This data indicate that the target was met.

**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 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, 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 a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure (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
Content Knowledge
Linked to Content Knowledge: Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 62.5% scored at the exceeds expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure (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 Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 12.5% at the exceeds level, and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure (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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure (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)

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?

Changes are occurring in the teacher preparation process at the state and national levels. The National Science Education Standards are being replaced by the Next Generation Science Standards. This means that modifications in the curriculum for the M.Ed. Online Program in Science Education must be made. The Next Generation Science Standards focus on eight components: asking questions, developing and using models, planning and carrying out investigations, analyzing and interpreting data, using mathematics and computational thinking, and constructing explanations. Assignments and assessments must be modified to make sure that the candidates meet these standards; therefore, faculty are adjusting course objectives and requirements for successful completion of courses to make sure that they are aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards. In addition, the exit portfolio and key assessment requirements for graduation will be modified and piloted this 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.

1. Content Knowledge: The principal findings from the data show that M.Ed. candidates are well prepared in the content, since they have a teaching certificate and they continue to take science coursework at the graduate level while in the program. The faculty has worked with the science departments to design science courses that meet both graduate level content and pedagogical considerations. We would like for the M.Ed. candidates to experience science taught through inquiry based methods. We continue to look for science professors with whom to collaborate and who are willing to teach in an online format. We have made several changes in the program as a result of the assessments. Most changes have been in the sequence in which courses are offered. 2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions: The principal findings from the data show that M.Ed. candidates do possess good pedagogical skills and knowledge of their profession in that they are already certified and are able to expand their professional and pedagogical knowledge while enrolled in the program. The program now includes a video observation so that faculty can assess students in a classroom setting. The instrument for measuring candidates’ dispositions has been changed and now a unit wide instrument is used. 3. Effects on student learning and on creating environments that support learning. The impact on student learning is assessed using an assessment plan that is developed by the candidates in which they teach a lesson from a Nine Week Curriculum Project. Candidates teach one of the lessons from the curriculum which allows them to analyze data and reflect on the impact that they had on students’ performance. At one time the students were required to analyze 5 research articles for this assessment, but the faculty worked together to develop a more suitable way of measuring the candidates’ performance and its effectiveness. The candidates through this assignment explore selected strategies and develop a deep understanding of issues that affect student learning in the classroom.
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**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 able to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design

**G 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Candidates will be able to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design

**Goals**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**

1. Candidates will be able to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design

**G 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Candidates will be able to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design

**G 3: Impact on student learning**

3. Candidates will be able to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design

**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 to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design

**SLO 3: Impact on student learning**

3. Candidates will be able to use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design
measures (key assessments), targets, and findings

**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2) (M: 5)**

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 on the Key Assessment 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

1. One hundred percent of the candidates made a passing score on the GACE exam which implies that they have adequate content knowledge to teach science. 2. Candidates were evaluated by the university supervisors during the field experience. Seventy-eight percent of the students received a rating of "4" and twenty-one percent received a rating of "3". The mean for this rating is 3.79 which exceeds the targeted expectation. The ratings for this target also exceeded the expected value. This indicates that the students have the content as well as the pedagogical knowledge necessary to teach science. 3. Candidates submitted an electronic portfolio, and the evaluation data for this document show that 11% of the candidates were rated "5"; 61% were rated "4"; 22% were rated "3" and 5% were rated "2". The mean for the third assessment for this target is 3.78 and only 5% of the candidates were rated below the targeted level. Implications for this target are that the candidates have adequate content knowledge and pedagogical skills which will allow them to experience success as classroom teachers in secondary schools. This target was met.

**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2)**

There will be three 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 the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments, and 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 4.5 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 4.5 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 ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 3.5, with more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 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 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

1. For the Learning Goals, students wrote learning goals that showed significance, rigor, variety, clarity, and appropriateness for students skills and levels. The average score for this target was 4.77 and none of the students scored below the acceptable level (3 on a 5 point scale). For the Design for Instruction assignment, students wrote/designed lessons that were aligned with the learning goals and objectives, inclusive of multiple modes/approaches. All of the candidates scored a 5 which is the exemplary level for this target. This segment of the target was met by all candidates. 2. For the Final Evaluation Key
Assessments, all of the students (100%) scored at the Effectively Demonstrated level (4). 3. For the Standard Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge section of the electronic portfolio, candidates had an average rating of 3.78 with the majority of the candidates scoring at the proficient level and none at the beginner or below level. All of the candidates met this segment of the target. Implications for this target are that candidates know how to write goals and objectives which are important for instructional planning.

**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 the Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

**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 4.00 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 4.00 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 Ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 3.5, with more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.25 rating, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving at rating of Beginner or below.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

1. For the Design of Instruction assignment, candidates had an average score of 4.46 with 57% of the candidates scoring at the exemplary level (5) and 6% at the Developing level (2). Candidates had an average score of 4.72 with 72% of the candidates scoring at the exemplary level (5) and 27% at the proficient level. None of the candidates scored at the developing or beginner levels. Data show that this segment of the target was met. 2. For the Final Evaluation Key Assessment, the average rating was 3.7 with the highest rating being 3.94 and the lowest being 3.47. Sixty-two percent of the candidates were rated at the Effectively Demonstrated level (4) and only 5% at the partially demonstrated level (2). None of the candidates scored 1 which means that this segment of the target was met. Candidates submitted an electronic portfolio and the mean rating for this standard was 3.75 with 22% of the candidates scoring at the advanced, 38% at the proficient, 33 at the basic, and 5% at the developing levels. Ninety-five percent of the students scored at the basic level or higher. Implications for this target are that candidates possess the pedagogical skills necessary to develop and implement rigorous and challenging learning experiences. Data indicate that this segment of the target was met.

**M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (O: 4)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluations of the Contextual Factors assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

**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 4.00 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 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 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

1. Contextual Factors domain was divided in to five subcategories which are: 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 and Assessment. The overall mean for this standard was 4.45; closer examination of the data revealed that the mean for each of the subcategories was between 4.53 and 4.35. The majority of the candidates scored at the Exemplary Level (51.4%) or at the Proficient Level (41.6%). The target for this segment of the measure was met. All of the candidates scored at the Effectively Demonstrated Level (4) which means that the target for this segment was met. 3. The Learning Environment of the Electronic Portfolio showed a mean of 3.72 on a 5 point rating scale. Most of the candidates scored at the Exemplary (11%) or Proficient (55%) levels. None of the candidates received a rating at the Beginner level which means that this segment of the target was met. Data imply that the candidates have the pedagogical skills that are necessary to develop a positive and supportive environment for diverse student populations.

**M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions (O: 5)**

The source of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective is ratings by the supervisor on the Dispositions Key Assessment.

**Target for O5: Professional Dispositions**

1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the target is for the candidates to average a rating of 3.00 on a 4.00 scale, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

The Disposition Key Assessment was subdivided into the following categories: Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful Purpose and Vision. The overall mean for this assessment is 3.9 with the highest rating of 3.95 for both Positive View of Self and Authenticity. The lowest mean was 3.81 for the variable Positive View of Others. None of the candidates scored at the Marginal (2) or Unacceptable (1) levels. This target was met. Data show that the candidates have the necessary dispositions to engage in reflective practice to work with secondary students.
M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (O: 6)

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments within the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

Sources of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Target for O6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

1. For the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 4.0 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 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 being rated at the Beginner level or below.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

1. On Student Learning is measured based on the ratings of two assignments: Assessment Plan and Analysis of Student Learning. The Assessment Plan assignment is divided into five subcategories, which are: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction, Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance, Multiple Modes and Approaches, Technical Soundness, and Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student. The overall mean for this assignment is 4.42 with the subcategory, Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning, receiving the highest rating (Mean = 4.58) and Technical Soundness receiving the lowest rating (Mean = 4.26). The majority of the candidates scored at either the Exemplary (58%) or the Proficient (29%) levels and only 3% scored at the Developing Level. The second half of the assignment, Analysis of Student Learning has four subcategories which are: Clarify and Accuracy of Report, Alignment with Learning Goals, Interpretation of Data, and Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning. The overall mean for Analysis of Student Learning is 4.74 with the subcategory, Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning, receiving the highest rating (Mean = 4.94) and Interpretation of Data receiving the lowest rating (Mean = 4.59). The majority of the candidates scored at the Exemplary (75%) or the Proficient (23%) levels. None of the candidates scored at the Developing (2) or Unacceptable (1) Levels. The segment of the target was met. 2. The Final Evaluation of candidates for the domain, Impact on Student Learning, revealed that the majority of the candidates were rated as Effectively Demonstrated (88%) or Adequately Demonstrated (11%). None of the candidates received a 1 or 2 rating. This segment of the target was met. 3. Data for the electronic portfolio for Impact on Students’ Learning, show that the mean rating is 3.67 on a 4 point scale. The majority of the candidates were rated at the Exemplary (16%) or Proficient (44%) levels with none of the candidates receiving a rating at the Beginner or Unacceptable level. This segment of the target was met. Implications for the target are that students know how to develop assessment instruments, use the data from the instruments to plan for instruction that is appropriate for diverse student populations.

M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (O: 7)

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of this section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

Sources 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 4.00 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 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 scoring at the Beginner level.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

1. Candidates were rated on the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment which was subdivided into five categories: Interpretation of Student Learning, Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment, Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment, Implications for Future Teaching, and Implications for Professional Development. The overall mean for this segment of the target was 4.6 on a 5 point scale and the highest rating (4.64) was received by all of the subcategories with the exception of Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment which had a rating of 4.57. The majority of the candidates scored at the Exemplary (67%) or Proficient (28%) levels and none of the candidates received a rating less than 3. This segment of the target was met. 2. The Final Evaluation rubric for this target showed that the majority of the candidates scored at the Effectively Demonstrated (88%) or Adequately Demonstrated (11%). None of the candidates scored a 1 or 2 on this portion of the target. This segment of the target was met. 3. The ratings of the Electronic Portfolio for this portion of the target revealed that the majority of the candidates were rated at the Advanced (22%) or Proficient (38%) Levels. Thirty-eight percent were rated at the Basic Level but none of the candidates were rated 1 or 2. This segment of the target was met. Implications for the target are that students know how to develop assessment instruments, use the data from the instruments to plan for instruction that is appropriate for diverse student populations.

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: Finished
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 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Extended Practicum**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

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

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

**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

---

**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:** Finished
- **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

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

**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

---

**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:** Finished
- **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

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

**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

---

**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:** Finished
- **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

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

**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

---

**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:** Finished
- **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

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

**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

---

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen
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 (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: 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 to use mostly traditional methods of formative assessment (e.g. whole-class discussion questions) in practice and 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 course 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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.
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?
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?
**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?

Curriculum changes are on-going which means that the assessment process must also be modified. In the Middle and Secondary Education (MSE) Department, one instrument is used throughout the department to assess dispositions. With students coming to the program with so many varied experiences and backgrounds, the instrument used in the past was not adequate. It did not provide enough details about the dispositions needed to teach in an urban environment. Currently, the Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals is used. The instrument measures dispositions in the following areas: Empathy, positive view of others, positive view of self, authenticity, and meaningful purpose and vision. Using this instrument allows the faculty to collect data which helps to determine candidates' readiness to teach in an urban setting. Changes are occurring in the teacher preparation process at the state and national levels. These changes impact the program curriculum and are causing the department to look carefully at the assessment instruments that are being used to measure the readiness of candidates to teach in middle and secondary schools. For example, plans are being made to change requirements for the practicum classes. In the past, candidates have completed the Teacher Work Sample Project; however, in the future, candidates will be required to complete the Educational Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). This is a national assessment instrument that is used to evaluate candidates readiness to teach. Currently, faculty are making sure that all required courses are aligned with the edTPA standards. Assignments are being developed to help candidates prepare the edTPA portfolio.

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

While the program assessments suggest that 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 to use mostly traditional methods of formative assessment (e.g. whole-class discussion questions) in practice and 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. It may also be helpful in the interactions between supervisors and mentor teachers to discuss this as a focus of the field experiences so that mentor teachers might work with candidates in designing and utilizing different forms of assessment. The National Science Education Standards are being replaced with the Next Generation Science Standards which implies that the curriculum for all science methods classes must be evaluated and reorganized to make sure that course content is aligned with the new standards. In addition, the Georgia Professional Standards Rules have changed and this also will cause changes in the curriculum. Practicum/field based courses will have to be modified to show that candidates have experiences at all of the levels in which they plan to teach. For example, candidates in secondary science must have both a middle and high school field placement because the area of certification is for grades 6-12. In the past, many candidates only had field experiences at the high school level. Program changes are being made in order to help the candidates meet the requirements for certification.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Social Foundations MS**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST)*

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

**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: 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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both thesis and project students met or exceeded all five criteria in the evaluation rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Project Evaluation Rubric**
  - The unit will consider developing an evaluation rubric specifically for MS projects.
  - **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
  - **Implementation Status:** Planned
  - **Priority:** Medium
  - **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
    - **Measure:** Thesis or Project Completed
    - **Outcome/Objective:** The student will complete a thesis or project
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** unit coordinator

**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?

- Does not apply.

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?

- Does not apply.

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?

- Does not apply.

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?

- Does not apply.

**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 MS thesis evaluation rubric is used as a direct observation for rating the student's oral defense. We will consider another rubric for the MS project as well. However, we experienced difficulties with faculty regularly using and completing the form. At a recent departmental retreat we discussed revisions to the data collection procedures that will be tied into an annual review of student's academic progress.

**Academic Program Question 2:**

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

Our master's-level core course offerings were reviewed and approved for continuation by the Dean's Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Affairs with no changes needed. Our curriculum in part consists of three core courses that are approved for non-majors in the professional studies section of a master's degree program of study. We offer three online course offerings as well--previously taught on campus.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Social Studies Education MEd**

(As of: 12/13/2016 06:00 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in 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
Goals

G 1: Goal: Leadership
1) Leaders in their Social Studies communities;

G 2: Goal: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
2) Creators of democratic, socioconstructivist learning environments for diverse students using appropriate pedagogical content knowledge and innovative technology; and,

G 3: Goal: Scholarship
3) Scholars of educational theory and research as applied to social studies education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
1) Content Knowledge Standards: Candidates demonstrate deep subject knowledge in a minimum of two social studies content areas: 1) multiculturalism (required) and 2) one of the following: history, world geography, economics, civics, sociology, and/or psychology (Goal 1, 2 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

SLO 2: Curriculum Standards (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)
2) Curriculum Standards: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major concepts, issues, and processes of inquiry relevant to social studies as well as articulates major theories, debates, and issues in social studies education (Goal 1, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

SLO 3: Learning Environment (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
3) Learning Environment: Candidates establish a positive and engaging learning environment for all students within the field of social studies education (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

SLO 4: Knowledge of Students (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
4) Knowledge of Students: Candidates possess deep knowledge of students and adaptations to their individual situations to provide for optimal learning (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

SLO 5: Assessment (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
5) Assessment: Candidates demonstrate use of efficacious and appropriate assessment tools (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: 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, coherent, and coherently. 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 UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
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)

Target for O2: Curriculum Standards
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Curriculum Exemplary (4.00 pts) Accomplished (3.00 pts) Advanced (2.00 pts) Basic (1.00 pts) No Evidence (0.00 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 4 2 1 0 0 3.429 4.000 0.728 Curriculum Resources 2 5 0 0 0 3.286 3.000 0.452
https://college.livetext.com/doc/6928490/39518368#6928490_39518368_1

Target for O3: Learning Environment
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
https://college.livetext.com/doc/6928490/39518368#6928490_39518368_1 Rubric: TEACHING PERFORMANCE: Learning Environment Exemplary (4.00 pts) Accomplished (3.00 pts) Advanced (2.00 pts) Basic (1.00 pts) No Evidence (0.00 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Responsive Practice 2 5 0 0 0 3.286 3.000 0.452 Communication & Technology 0 6 1 0 0 2.857 3.000 0.350 Community Resources 2 5 0 0 0 3.286 3.000 0.452 Classroom Management 1 6 0 0 0 3.143 3.000 0.350

Target for O4: Knowledge of Students
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
https://college.livetext.com/doc/6928490/39518368#6928490_39518368_1 IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Knowledge of Students Exemplary (4.00 pts) Accomplished (3.00 pts) Advanced (2.00 pts) Basic (1.00 pts) No Evidence (0.00 pts) Mean Mode Stdev High Expectations and Differentiation 2 5 0 0 0 3.286 3.000 0.452 Learning Theory 0 7 0 0 0 3.000 0.000 Family Communication 3 3 1 0 0 3.286 3.000 0.700

Target for O5: Assessment
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
https://college.livetext.com/doc/6928490/39518368#6928490_39518368_1 Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment Exemplary (4.00 pts) Accomplished (3.00 pts) Advanced (2.00 pts) Basic (1.00 pts) No Evidence (0.00 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Data-driven Assessment 1 6 0 0 0 3.143 3.000 0.350 Student Self-Assessment 0 7 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Grading Procedure 1 5 1 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.535

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students assessed received either a 4, or 3 on all portions of the dispositions rubric indicating a met target.
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)

Improved Performance - Action Plan
One student in several categories did not achieve the exemplary or accomplished level. After thorough review, this demonstrates that one student did not have teaching experience beyond student teaching, which severely limited her ability to achieve exemplary or accomplished. Thus, a new M.Ed. program will include field experience and require teaching experience to help ensure similar issues are resolved in the future. The new M.Ed. is expected to begin in fall 2014.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Assessment |
| Content Knowledge | Curriculum Standards | Knowledge of Students | Learning Environment |

Implementation Description: Implementation of new MED degree program.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2014
Responsible Person/Group: COE Program Faculty / Social Studies 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: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
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? 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?
At this point, no changes were made to the assessment process for this degree program because we are in the process of replacing this program with another MEd program with a practicum requirement.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will 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 highlight the importance of a practicum/field based experience for the MED program. One student scored basic on a number of the criteria because she was not a practicing teacher and had no evidence of achieving higher levels. Thus, the new MED program, which will ultimately replace this one, will provide/contain a field based experience.

## Annual Report Section Responses

**Most important accomplishments for year**—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

- Created the new MEd in Social Studies with a practicum requirement. We also graduated a record number of students in the old program.

**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.

- Enrolling students in the new MEd program and terminating the current MEd social studies program

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Social Studies Education—TEEMS MAT**

(As of 12/13/2016 06:00 PM EST)

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

#### 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.

**G 4: 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.

#### 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.
### 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-2013 target, 100% of the students scored at the level of adequately demonstrated and 96% of the students scored at the highest level of effectively demonstrated. The students performed well and met the target goals for content and curriculum knowledge. These findings indicate that program faculty are providing effective teacher training and assessment for all students.

#### 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 is responsible for a minimum of four weeks of work on the Teacher Work Sample assessment. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-2013 target, 100% of the students scored at the level of proficient and 88% of the students scored at the highest level of exemplary. The students performed well and met the target goals for planning. These findings indicate that program faculty are providing effective teacher training on planning, instructional implementation and assessment for all students.

#### 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, the students.
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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-2013 target, 100% of the students scored at the level of adequately demonstrated and 80% of the students scored at the highest level of effectively demonstrated. The students performed well and met the target goals for clinical practice. These findings indicate that program faculty are providing effective teacher training and supporting students' during the clinical practice to ensure classroom success and teacher preparation.

**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 land 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-2013 target, 100% of the students scored at the level of acceptable and 80% of the students scored at the highest level of exceptional. The students performed well and met the target goals for dispositions. These findings indicate that program faculty are providing effective teacher training and students attitudes and dispositions reflect those of the profession which include empathy, a positive view of self and others, and meaningful vision and purpose for teaching.

**M 5: Impact on Student Learning (O: 5)**

The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students’ course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

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

**Target for O5: Impact on Student Learning**

100% of students will score at the level of Proficient and 80% of students will score at the level of Exemplary on this standard.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For the 2012-2013 target, 100% of the students scored at the highest level of effectively demonstrated. The students performed well and met the target goals for impact on student learning. These findings indicate that program faculty are providing effective teacher training and for students, specifically in students’ abilities to plan effective lessons that engage students in valuable learning experiences.

**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.
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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Key Assessment)</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Content and Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure (Key Assessment): Content and Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Classroom Management**

The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming teacher candidate cohorts, MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program. Effective classroom management strategies will be integrated into the curriculum and field experiences.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Classroom Management**

The faculty members will continue to focus on classroom management and lesson planning. The students exit survey results indicated that students desired more training and resources on effective classroom management. Understanding that effective classroom management is connected to effective planning and instructional delivery, the faculty will infuse more planning and instructional delivery opportunities and activities within the program coursework.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl McBride
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**More Instruction on Best Practices**

For the 2013-2014, program faculty will continue to provide students with examples and instruction on best practices for classroom instruction. In addition, increased collaboration with secondary school administrative personnel to help prepare students for school and classroom climate and environments. Also, program faculty will include more presentations of best practices from highly effective K-12 classroom teachers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure (Key Assessment):** Clinical Practice
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Clinical Practice
- **Implementation Description:** Action plan implemented in all methods courses.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MAT Social Studies Program Faculty Program Coordinator: Dr. Chantee L. Earl
- **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?

To improve the assessment process for our program, we have included the EdTPA assessment. 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, program faculty will review current assessment trends to make necessary modifications to the overall curriculum and program course of study. 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 and new EdTPA assessment 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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Social Work BSW
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
To prepare students for generalist social work practice in a range of roles and services that deal with the existing and developing challenges that confront individuals, families, groups, and communities.

Goals
G 1: Professional Identity
Students will identify as a professional social worker, and conduct themselves accordingly with the standards of practice

G 2: Social Work Ethics
Students will apply social work ethical principles to guide their professional practice.

G 3: Critical Thinking
Students will apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

G 4: Research
Students will engage in research informed practice.

G 5: Human Behavior & the Social Environment
Students will critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Professional Identity: Boundaries (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will attend to professional roles and boundaries.

SLO 2: Ethics: Personal Values (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students will manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking (G: 3) (M: 3)
Students will appraise and integrate multiple sources of knowledge.

SLO 4: Research (G: 4) (M: 4)
Students will use research evidence to inform social work practice.

SLO 5: Human Behavior & Social Environment (M: 5)
Students will critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
### M 1: Student Log (O: 1)

Students will complete a log that integrates their understanding of professional boundaries with actual social work practice. Log requires conceptualization, assessment, intervention, and link to curriculum competencies.

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

#### Target for O1: Professional Identity: Boundaries

- 80% of students will earn 24 out of 30 points (B or better). [SW 4900]

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

93% of students earned a B or better on this assignment Spring 2013.

### M 2: Student Self-Reflection Paper (O: 2)

Students complete a self-reflection paper on their personal beliefs and values and address how they relate to social work values and ethics.

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

#### Target for O2: Ethics: Personal Values

- 80% of students will receive 20 out of 25 points for the paper. [SW 4100]

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

87% of students earned B or better Fall semester 2013.

### M 3: Legislative Brief (O: 3)

Students conduct an evaluation of a current bill during the state legislative session using multiple sources to comprehensively assess the impact of the bill.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

#### Target for O3: Critical Thinking

- 80% of students will receive 16 out of 20 points; section 2 [SW 3600]

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

81% of students earned B or better on the assignment for spring 2013 semester.

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

81% of students earned B or better on the assignment for spring 2013 semester.

### M 4: Research-based Library Assignment (O: 4)

Students conduct a scholarly review of journal articles to explore the evidence-based approach to social work practice.

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

#### Target for O4: Research

- 80% of students will earn 80 out of 100 points. [SW 3500]

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

97% of students earned a B or better for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.

### M 5: Student Portfolio (O: 5)

Students develop a portfolio about late adulthood that requires integration of knowledge related to person and environment.

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

#### Target for O5: Human Behavior & Social Environment

- 80% of students will receive 24 out of 30 points; section B,C [SW 3400]

#### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

87% of students earned a B or better for spring semester 2013.

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

#### Human Rights and Social/Economic Justice

The field experience will be modified to integrate hands-on experiences in understanding the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination, advocating for human rights, and practices that advance social and economic justice. Required field seminar will address these issues in the context of ethical issues and professional values.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2014

#### Social Policy

Social policy course assignments and outcomes will be better aligned to enhance students’ abilities to analyze, formulate, and
advocate for policies impacting client functioning. Lead faculty member to provide oversight to ensure consistency across sections.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2014

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 are required to collect annual outcome measures data to maintain accreditation. We have updated the measures and targets that reflect assignment modifications and subsequent outcomes for our core social work courses. As we modify instruction and course student assignments, we will have the BSW Program Committee assess the measures and targets that we are reporting (both for accreditation purposes and WEAVE) to insure alignment.

**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 BSW Program Committee will be meeting in November to review the assessment data and make recommendations to faculty for any changes and improvement to the curriculum and the program in general.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Social Work MSW**

(As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

**G 2: Diversity & Difference**

Students will engage diversity and difference in social work practice.

**G 3: Social and Economic Justice**

Students will apply theory to advance social and economic justice.

**G 4: Contexts that shape social work practice**

Students will analyze how macro contexts influence social work practice.

**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: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Evaluate and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge and practice-generated knowledge

**SLO 2: Diversity & Difference (M: 2)**

Engage in community partnerships that are responsive to diversity and difference.

**SLO 3: Justice: Power & Privilege (M: 3)**

Analyze how differential power and privilege shape communities and society.

**SLO 4: Contexts: Leadership in Community Change (M: 4)**

Provide leadership skills in promoting changes to improve community well-being.

**SLO 5: Intervention Skills (M: 5)**

Develop, monitor, and/or strengthen collaborative relationships that focus on building healthy communities.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Journal article critique (O: 1)
Students critique a journal article related to social work knowledge and show integration with practice.

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

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**
- Journal article critique (SW 7400), section C; 5 points. 80% will receive 4 or better.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- 80% earned 4 or better.

#### M 2: Community Analysis (O: 2)
Students choose a community in which to conduct a community analysis and are required to submit their findings as a written assignment.

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

**Target for O2: Diversity & Difference**
- Community Analysis Paper (SW 7100) - sections VI A & B; 10 points. 80% will receive 8 or better.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- 90% earned 8 or better.

#### M 3: Reflection Paper (O: 3)
Students write a reflection paper that analyzes how concepts of power and privilege impact community social work practice, SW 8300, 15 points

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

**Target for O3: Justice: Power & Privilege**
- Reflection paper - power & privilege (SW 8300), 15 points. 80% will receive 12 or better.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- 80% of students earned 12 or better.

#### M 4: Community Project (O: 4)
Students do presentation and associated final paper about their experience working with a community partner on a service learning project.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O4: Contexts: Leadership in Community Change**
- Final paper - leadership application in project (SW 8800), section II, G; 8 points. 80% will receive 6.4 or better.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- 100% of students earned 6.4 or better.

#### M 5: Skills Paper - Collaboration (O: 5)
Students will write a paper on collaboration skills to be applied in community social work practice.

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

**Target for O5: Intervention Skills**
- Skills Paper (SW 8100), section A; 15 points. 80% will receive 12 or better.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
- 100% of students earned 12 or better.

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

#### Human Rights, Justice, and Power/Privilege
A field education seminar session on human rights/justice issues will be added back to the 2nd-year field seminar where students can apply these concepts and skills in their specific field experiences. In reinforcing their use of the "community lens" to view practice, students will define their community related to the field setting and address issues of marginalization/exclusion and differential power/privilege.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Field faculty to add seminar session to their spring SW 8900 course.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2014
Integration - micro, mezzo, macro conceptual frameworks
Will integrate coursework from SW 7100 & 7200 into the two SW methods courses where students will be asked to apply differentially the micro, mezzo, and macro conceptual frameworks.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty teaching the methods courses will meet with 7100 & 7200 faculty to identify the conceptual frameworks introduced to students to ensure continuity of applying these frameworks through case studies in methods courses.
Projected Completion Date: 02/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MSW Program Committee

Prevention Interventions
Content on how prevention is conceptualized and prevention strategies will be presented in the 1st-year methods courses. 1st-year field education- students will be asked to develop a prevention strategy (macro focused, e.g., collaboratives) as part of their learning contract. Prevention as intervention will be addressed in the field seminar.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty teaching methods and field education will need to meet to co-ordinate material that is introduced in methods and applied in field education.
Projected Completion Date: 02/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MSW Program Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

We are required to collect annual outcome measures data to maintain accreditation. We have updated the measures and targets that reflect assignment modifications and subsequent outcomes for our core social work courses. As we modify instruction and course student assignments, we will have the MSW Program Committee assess the measures and targets that we are reporting (both for accreditation purposes and WEAVE) to insure alignment.

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 MSW Program Committee will be meeting in November to review the assessment data and make recommendations to faculty for any changes and improvement to the curriculum and the program in general.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

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 sections and to embed the questions in their final exams. Instructors were free to select more than one question as long there was at least one question to assess each of the three goals. The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 963 students from 9 sections of SOCI 1101 (418 students), and 11 sections of SOCI 1160 (545 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92% of students in SOCI 1101 and 93% of students in SOCI 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 78% of students in SOCI 1101 and 93% of those in SOCI 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues correctly," 91% of students in SOCI 1101 and 94% in SOCI 1160 answered questions correctly.

Target for O1: critical understanding

At least 80% of students should answer questions correctly.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

This goal was met for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Target for O2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems

At least 80% of students should answer embedded questions correctly.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

This goal was met for the 2012-2013 academic year.

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: In-Progress

Priority: High

Implementation Description: Continue as we have been doing.

Responsible Person/Group: Deirdre Oakley, Assessment Reporter/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?

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.

No changes will be made.
### Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the undergraduate program in sociology is to advance the knowledge of our students through exposing them to social behavior, social change, and societal inequality within an environment framed around critical thinking.

### 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.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Acquisition of Knowledge (G: 8) (M: 1, 2, 4)
Faculty assessments of students' abilities to:  
A. Articulate key sociological concepts and theories  
B. Apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems  
C. Utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings

#### O/O 5: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met**
Target not met. Only 28 percent of students scored excellent or very good in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in the paper/final exam.

#### 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. 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 demonstrating "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/exams 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 three) in this area; 23% were judged to be "good" (a score of 2) and 15% were judged to be poor (a score of 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their papers/exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target met: 82 percent of students scored excellent or very good in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their analysis of social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target met: 76 percent of students scored excellent or very good in their analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target met: 81 percent of students scored excellent or very good in their communication skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target met: 76 percent of the students scored excellent or very good in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 3: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance (O: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Data Collection and Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of analytic skills (appropriate computer skills) on their final exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This target was partially met with 60 percent of the students scoring excellent or very good in their demonstration of analytic skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This target was partially met with 60 percent of the students scoring excellent or very good in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their acquisition of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

63 percent of students scored 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

64 percent of students scored excellent or very good in their analysis of social problems.

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

**focus on students' abilities to demonstrate knowledge acquisition**

Professors will continue to focus on helping students to articulate their acquired knowledge and to their analyses. We are not far below our target, in these areas. The variation from year to year of professors’ assessments of student work may have more to do with changes in evaluators than with any significant change in quality of students.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Data Collection and Data Analysis
- **Measure:** SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of Knowledge  
  **Analysis of Social Problems
- **Measure:** Sociological Theory (SOCI 3303) 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 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam  
  **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 3030 (Sociological Theory) 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 3300 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Analysis of Social Problems

**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 3300 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Communication 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 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam | 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 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 (SOCI 3030) Final Exam or Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge

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

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.

**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 allows us to monitor students’ progress and make changes if necessary. We do not plan to make any changes based on this year’s review.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Sociology MA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The Department prepares students to practice sociology in both the public and private sectors by offering advanced training in research methodologies, social statistics, and sociological theory.

**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, 4)**
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, 3, 4)**
The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

**SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3, 4)**
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, 3, 4)**
The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)**
The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.

**SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)**
The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Masters Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. The remaining students were evaluated as "very good."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Research Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. The remaining students were evaluated as "very good."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "good" on this metric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "good" on this metric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: New Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "good" on this metric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on these items by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "very good" on this metric.

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "good" on this metric.

**Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "very good" on this metric.

**Target for O10: Facts and Information**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "very good" on this metric.

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "very good" on this metric.

**Target for O12: Social Problems**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "very good" on this metric.

**Target for O13: Global Questions**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "good" on this metric.

**M 3: Social Statistics Course (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11)**

The student's performance in the required M.A.-level Social Statistics course is used for assessment. The professor bases his/her assessment on the student's course paper or final exam grade.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

75% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O3: Research Reports**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

75% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

75% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Data Analysis</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>75% 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 O6: New Research Questions</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>75% 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 O7: Written Communication</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>75% 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 O8: Writing Conventions</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>75% 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 O11: Use of Data Sources</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>75% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &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 O1: Data Collection</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
<td>78% 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 O3: Research Reports</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
<td>78% 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 O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
<td>78% 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 O6: New Research Questions</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
<td>78% 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 O7: Written Communication</th>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
<td>78% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
78% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
78% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2012-2013 Sociology PhD**
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The Department prepares students to practice sociology in both the public and private sectors by offering advanced training in research methodologies, social statistics, and sociological theory.

**Goals**

**G 1: Analytical Skills**
Students are expected to master appropriate analytical skills.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Students are expected to possess appropriate critical thinking skills.

**G 3: Communication Skills**
Students are expected to evidence appropriate written communication skills.

**G 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**
Students are expected to appropriately use sociological concepts, theories, information, and data sources.

**G 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**
Students are required to possess the ability to appropriately analyze pressing social problems.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.

**SLO 2: Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.

**SLO 3: Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

**SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**
The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.

**SLO 5: Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**
The student is able to analyze and interpret data.

**SLO 6: New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1)**
The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1)**
The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.
| SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1) | The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats. |
| SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1, 2) | The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories. |
| SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1, 2) | The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems. |
| SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1) | The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings. |
| SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1, 2) | The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems. |
| SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1, 2) | The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions. |

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Doctoral Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**
The student's original Doctoral Dissertation and Dissertation Defense are used for assessment by the Dissertation Chair. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Data Collection**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.

**Target for O3: Research Reports**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" 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 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target:** Met
100% of students were rated as "excellent" or "very good" on this item, by the Dissertation 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Use of Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O12: Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O13: Global Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% of students passed the theory-focused questions on the doctoral exams.</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% of students passed the theory-focused questions on the doctoral exams.</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% of students passed the theory-focused questions on the doctoral exams.</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% of students passed the theory-focused questions on the doctoral exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The student's performance on the methodological question on the Doctoral Examination is used for assessment.

### Target for O1: Data Collection
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
88% of students passed the methods-focused questions on the doctoral exams.

### Target for O2: Analytical Techniques
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
88% of students passed the methods-focused questions on the doctoral exams.

### Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
88% of students passed the methods-focused questions on the doctoral exams.

### Target for O5: Data Analysis
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
88% of students passed the methods-focused questions on the doctoral exams.

### 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
  - **Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulating Hypotheses**
- **Implementation Description:** The new exams go into effect next month, in August. The increased instruction in methods/statistics (and the increased emphasis on these topics in other courses) went into effect this past academic year, 2010-2011.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dawn Baunach

#### Theory Instruction
The department decided last year (to go into effect August 2011) to change its doctoral examinations from qualifying examinations in statistics, methods, and theory to a specialty examination. This past year (2010-2011) we offered the last two exams in the old, qualifying exam, format. The new, specialty exam, format will go into effect in August 2011; it represents a major change in our doctoral instruction that will bring our requirements more in-line with our peer institutions. Although there were five attempts at the qualifying exam in theory, that represents just three students. Three students took the exam in January 2011. Of those three, two failed and one passed. The two students who failed the exam in January retook the exam in May. Of those two students, one failed the theory exam for a second time (and is being scholastically terminated from the program, per College rules) and the other is rewriting a conditional pass answer in August. Although the department decided last year to change the doctoral examinations, we continue to take very seriously our instruction in sociological theory. Just this week a group of faculty has decided to hold a working, discussion group to discuss our two theory courses. The department has also agreed and affirmed to all instructors that theoretical content should be increased in all substantive graduate courses, and not leave theory instruction to just two specific courses. Thus, we are also taking steps to improve our theory instruction in the two theory courses and in all substantive courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Theory Component of Doctoral Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Concepts and Theories
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.

Responsibility Person/Group: Dawn Baunach

---

**Georgia State University**
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---

**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 in light of a general historical and cultural context.

**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 analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

**Target for O6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures**

The student will achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

---

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

During this period, 5 courses of Spanish 3307 (Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts) were taught. Students majoring in Spanish achieved the results of 8.1, 8.8, 8.2, 8.4, and 8.8. All courses met their targeted score in their assessment for literature.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Spanish MA**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the Spanish language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Spanish speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department’s mission, with regard
to students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the literatures and cultures of Spanish speaking countries, and in linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University’s mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

**Goals**

**G 1: Goals for 2010-11**

In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research and Data Collecting Skills (M: 1)**

Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**SLO 3: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1)**

Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**SLO 4: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate communicative competence in written and oral Spanish.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Direct and indirect assessment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Direct Assessment: 1. M.A. Thesis: The thesis must be original work by the student. The proposal must be approved by faculty members. 2. M.A. Research paper: The aim of this project is for the candidate to apply theoretical concepts to her or his present or future professional practices (integration). Candidates will present the results of their research in a 12-20 page paper. Candidates have a choice to write the project in either their target language or in English, under the direction of their graduate advisor. 3. M.A. General Examination: After completing all course work for the degree, candidates are required to pass a written and an oral General Examination based on a reading list. Candidates in the literature concentration must be prepared to discuss all the works listed in their chosen areas both individually and in relation to each other and to the period in which they are written. The written exam requires candidates to choose three fields from Spanish reading list. 4. Oral Exam: For the oral examination Spanish candidates are responsible for one additional area of their choice from the reading list, one additional area based on course work taken in culture or literature, and the three areas covered in the written exam. This examination is scheduled 7 to 10 days following successful completion of the written exam. It lasts a minimum of one hour and is conducted by an M.A. Committee. Indirect Assessment: Student evaluations, annual reports, and teaching portfolios are evaluated by the Department's executive committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project.

**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 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 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 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
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.

**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**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 7: Research Process/Results Comprehension (G: 2)**

Students can appropriately critique the research process and arguments/conclusions presented in scholarly publications.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 8: Verbal/Nonverbal Presentation Skills (G: 3) (M: 4)**

Students demonstrate effective verbal and nonverbal delivery skills.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 9: Writing Skills (G: 3) (M: 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, 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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

### 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 cultural 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, students 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 assesses 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.

#### 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 assesses students on 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 Benchmark, 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.

#### 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.
### M 4: Persuasion Oral Presentation (O: 8)

Students in SPCH 3250 Persuasion analyzed a persuasive attempt to determine how source factors and message factors influenced whether the attempt was successful. As a capstone experience in the course, students gave formal presentations in class. In addition to receiving a grade for the presentation, students were assessed using a separate rubric (Oracl Communication Value Rubric) during their presentation. The Association of American College and Universities developed a rubric entitled "Oral Communication Value Rubric." This rubric scores each category from 1 (Benchmark) to 4 (Capstone), with 2 and 3 serving as delineated milestones. The rubric assesses 5 distinct skills: organization, language, delivery, supporting material, and central message. For additional information including definitions, please see the 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 3.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Verbal/Nonverbal Presentation Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 3 (out of 4) by the majority of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: Persuasion Final Paper (O: 9)

Students in SPCH 3250 Persuasion wrote a paper which analyzed source and message factors that influenced the persuasiveness of the persuasive attempt. A writing rubric was utilized with analyzed writing based on organization (intro, body, and conclusion elements) and style (grammar, spelling, and APA formatting). The rubric scores students from 1-3 with 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Satisfactory, and 3=Good. See attached rubric for more details. The students were given a score in each of the categories and then the scores were averaged to get a score out of 3.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Writing Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average 2 (out of 3) by majority of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 6: Targeted Health Message (O: 10)

Students studied a particular group all semester, and as part of their final assignment, they created a “targeted health message” for their group. This required identifying a specific health issue, explaining that health issue and articulating how that health issue was appropriate for their group; in addition, they were expected to identify the format of this health message (e.g., banner ad on website, print advertisement in paper, public service announcement on the radio, etc.), explain the details of the message format, and articulate how this message format was appropriate to their selected group. A rubric was created to measure these 6 items on a 1-5 Likert Type Scale. See attached rubric.

*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Adaptation to Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 4 (out of 5) by the majority of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 7: Persuasion Final Paper (O: 11)

Students in COMM 3250 Persuasion were asked to write a paper critiquing the source and message factors in a persuasive attempt. Students could choose any time they felt someone had attempted to persuade them (oral, written, or mediated message). Then, they were asked to identify source factors (credibility, authority, social attractiveness) and message factors (language use, refutations, explicit vs. implicit conclusions) to determine how the message was perceived. A rubric from the American Association of Colleges and Universities was utilized to score papers independent from the grading rubric. The rubric entitled Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric judged students on five separate criteria: Explanation of Issues, Evidence, Influence of Context and Assumptions, Student’s Position, and Conclusions and Related Outcomes. Student received marks ranging from 1 to 4 with 1 being the Benchmark, 4 being the Capstone, and 2 and 3 serving as milestones. 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: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Message Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 3 (out of 4) for majority of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Discuss with Speech Faculty courses in which "power" is taught. Identify assignments that can be used for data and develop plan for gathering that data.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty

### Develop Measure for Objective #5: Research Paradigm Identification

One of our objectives is to teach students to identify different research paradigms in the field of communication. For this cycle, we did not collect data to measure this objective. For the next cycle, we need to identify specific courses and assignments that could give us the necessary data to measure this objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **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.
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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comm & Diversity Annotated Bibliography | Outcome/Objective: Scholarly Publication Summarization
  Implementation Description: Have discussion with faculty teaching upper division, especially research courses, which assignments best assess ability to summarize research and make a plan to gather student work to analyze for next year's assessment. Also have discussion about assigning annotated bibliographies as first-round assignments in classes that require a term paper.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty

Writing Rubric Design

I would like to revise the writing rubric scale. The current scale ranges from 1 to 3. Revising the scale will allow it to more accurately reflect the range of students' current ability levels. Also, this will allow the assessor to understand in which areas students need further training. Further, the rubric should also assess the content of the paper to see that the content is accurately and thoroughly explained. The current rubric does not assess content.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Persuasion Oral Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Verbal/Nonverbal Presentation Skills
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
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**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 that emphasizes 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: 1, 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)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**SLO 2: Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze a sport organization's problems (G: 1, 2) (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)

**SLO 3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing. (G: 2) (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: 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**

2 Outcomes of administrative support services (3.3.1.2)

**SLO 5: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport (G: 2) (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.

**SLO 6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process (G: 2) (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 (G: 1, 2) (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.
# 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop an organization manual and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 out of 70 students met the target goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze a sport organization's problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 out of 65 students met the target goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will create an investment portfolio and perform a financial analysis of a sport organization; students will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 out of 77 students met the target goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop legal briefs and perform at an acceptable level or higher as stated on the rubric associated with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 out of 54 students met the stated criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will score at least 70 points on the project using a rubric established for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 out of 44 met the specified target level of performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 out of 55 students met the specified target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will score 19 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation of the mock trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2012-2013</strong> - Target: <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 out of 52 students met the identified target level of performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## M 5: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Students will complete a culminating essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

43 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 7; 28 students scored 8; 14 students scored 9.

**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 each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

45 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher.

**Target for O3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing.**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

35 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 7 students scored 8; 16 students scored 9; 12 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 each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

33 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 2 students scored 7; 16 students scored 8; 15 students scored 9.

**Target for O5: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

16 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 3 students scored 8; 9 students scored 9; 4 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 each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

19 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 5 students scored 7; 9 students scored 8; 5 students scored 9.

**Target for O7: Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and apply sport business concepts**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

43 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 7; 28 students scored 8; 14 students scored 9.

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

Program goals to improve writing skills and personal accountability when working with others

The program is addressing two major concerns: 1. Placing more emphasis on research-supported writing. To address this concern, the program revised the comprehensive exam rubric to specifically state the number of references required to complete each comprehensive exam question. The rubric informs students about the level of quality needed to pass the question and thus improves the overall quality of the student responses. 2. Incorporating more accountability on individuals when doing group projects. Some of the projects do not have accountability built into the assessment. The accountability for individual performance will be added to the assessment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **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.
- **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.
Application of legal knowledge
Increase emphasis on the application of legal issues rather than a focus on the conceptual knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished

Implementation Description: Change the 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: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Changes to KH 7610: Dr. Brison

Sport organization financial analysis
This is a time management based project for students. Instructor will revise the rubric to reflect the point allocation for each portion of the assignment and will emphasize the importance of meeting the requirements for the project to achieve a 70 or higher on the project.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Major Projects | Outcome/Objective: Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance

Implementation Description: Revise rubric
Projected Completion Date: 08/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Changes to KH6560: Dr. Brison

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Faculty were advised and guided to write student learning outcomes (SLOs) for each course taught. The changes were made because faculty was relying on course objectives to assess student learning rather than outcomes. After implementing SLOs, faculty found that it was easier to measure student achievement in each course. Faculty consistently has found that students are able to identify what they should learn from each course and how each assignment or project directly relates to the student learning outcomes. Faculty developed a rubric that serves as a guide for students to verify that all parts of the exam are addressed. This change was implemented to ensure that students were aware of the grading process for Comprehensive Exams. Faculty also changed the minimum number of citations required for the Exam; this was to make certain that students had an adequate amount of supporting evidence for the Exam. There were also some concerns that students were not reading all of the directions for the Exam; as a result, students are required to sign and date the directions and return a copy to the department prior to receiving the Exam questions. During Spring 2013, two sections of KH 7100 (Administration of Sport Programs) were taught. The Myers Briggs test was used in the class to teach about management style and personality traits. After administering the Myers Briggs test to both classes, it was determined that classes reflected two different cohorts of students. One class consisted of introverts and the other extroverts. These data were used to change the approach for teaching the class. Faculty also developed full versions of various assessments used in the course rather than only abbreviated versions as were previously used. This change was in response to data obtained through student comments. Improvements have also been made outside of the courses which could be considered part of the curriculum because of the nature of the program. A job fair in partnership with University Career Services takes place every Spring semester. Approximately 20 local sport businesses participate every year. Efforts have also been made to have program alumni serve as guest speakers in each of the classes.

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 program has only 3 faculty with over 100 graduate students. We have been charged with increasing enrollment and have not received any additional resources such as new faculty lines. This has consistently been a challenge for the program, and more importantly, the lack of resources has decreased faculty morale.
**G 3:** Clinician that is able to develop, conduct, analyze, and disseminate research related to the practice of athletic training.

**G 4:** Clinician that conducts themselves with the highest manner of professionalism.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Demonstrate professionalism in their practice as an athletic trainer (G: 4) (M: 3)

Students will dress appropriately and act ethically while serving as a certified athletic trainer at their particular clinical site. Students will interact in a respectful manner with student athletes, peers, parents, coaches, physicians, and administrators.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

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

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

### Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

### Standard Associations

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

5.0 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

### Strategic Plan Associations

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

3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

#### SLO 2: Demonstrate the ability to search for and analyze peer-reviewed research. (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)

Students will search electronic databases for pertinent peer-reviewed research, will critique peer-reviewed research, will analyze peer-reviewed research, and will present peer-reviewed research to their peers.

### 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

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

4.0 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

### Strategic Plan Associations

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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

#### SLO 3: Provide opportunities to practice administration and management in athletic training. (G: 4) (M: 3)

Experiences of record keeping, attending physician visits, and communication with coaches and administrators at various clinical sites.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
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. Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3. Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 5: Conduct scientific research study related to athletic training. (G: 3) (M: 2)**

Completion of projects include: topic development, literature review, methodology, statistical analysis, interpretation, and dissemination

**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 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. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2. Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3. Enhance a research culture.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Explain pathomechanics and treatment of injuries related to physical activity. (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)**

Students will learn advanced topics related to tissue healing, injury evaluation, injury rehabilitation, and injury biomechanics.

**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.
3. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2. Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3. Enhance a research culture.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Presentations (O: 2)**

All students will present twice annually to their peers on a research article related to an athletic training concept.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target for O2: Demonstrate the ability to search for and analyze peer-reviewed research.

All students will receive at least a score of 3 out of 4 on research article presentations.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students received at least a score of 3 out of 4 on their research article presentations.

M 2: Thesis or Research Project (O: 2, 5)

Students must develop and write a thesis or research project prior to graduation

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Demonstrate the ability to search for and analyze peer-reviewed research.

All students receive a score of at least 3 out of 4 on the literature review and discussion portions of their research project.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students received a score of at least 3 out of 4 on the literature review and discussion portions of their research project.

Target for O5: Conduct scientific research study related to athletic training.

All students receive a score of at least a 3 out of 4 on topic development, data collection, and data analysis sections of their research projects.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
All students received a score of at least a 3 out of 4 on topic development, data collection, and data analysis sections of their research projects.

M 3: Clinical Site Evaluation (O: 1, 4)

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: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Demonstrate professionalism in their practice as an athletic trainer

Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
100% of students received at least 3.5/5 on their end of semester evaluations by their clinical supervisor.

M 4: Course exams (O: 3)

Students will be given at least 2 exams in KH 7580 and KH 8300 courses. Exams will be comprised of a mixture of multiple choice, short answer, and essay. Students will receive a score of 1-4.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Explain pathomechanics and treatment of injuries related to physical activity.

All students will earn at least a 3 out of 4 on all exams in both KH 7580 and KH 8300.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
14 out of 15 students received at least a 3 out of 4 on all exams in KH 7580. 11 out of 12 students received at least a 3 out of 4 on all exams in KH 8300.

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

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: Finished
Priority: High
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 program's mission, goals, objectives, and measures have all been revised since last year's assessment report. The program's mission has been streamlined and become more focused on learning expectations. The program's goals are now focused on what we want students to BE rather than on what they will DO. The program's outcomes have been rewritten as to be better linked to our revised goals. The program's measures have been rewritten to be measurable. These changes were made when the previous faculty
member responsible for this report was removed from teaching within the program and therefore could not influence the report. In the upcoming academic year all syllabus will be reviewed to make sure student learning outcomes are written appropriately and measurable.

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

The impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on our educational degree program is large. The largest changes and improvements in the assessment process we will make in the coming academic year is the addition of a new faculty member with a terminal degree that will now be teaching our rehabilitation and evaluation courses. The new faculty member has restructured the rehabilitation course to include material which will prepare our students to take the Corrective Exercise Specialist and Performance Enhancement Specialist certifications provided through the National Academy of Sports Medicine. This new material clearly falls in-line with our rehabilitation course but enhances student learning with new concepts rather than reviewing material previously learned in their undergraduate programs. The new faculty member will also restructure the evaluation course to include more evidence based research and is considering a new textbook. The new faculty member has also suggested a revision of the thesis/research project as to better prepare the results for publication. The thesis/research project paper format will now remove the literature review and include some of this information within a longer introduction section. Students’ research papers will now be easier to submit as journal manuscripts. Also, due to the change in faculty, the student evaluations completed by clinical supervisors will be revised to better assess our program's revised mission, goals and objectives.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Sports Science PhD**

*(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 Ph.D. major in Kinesiology is designed to prepare students for research and teaching careers at colleges and universities and for physiological performance, rehabilitative science, health and physical education, and related fields. Four concentration areas, Biomechanics and Physical Rehabilitation, Exercise Physiology, Exercise Psychology, and Physical Education Teacher Education are available within this program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain knowledge in Kinesiology and advanced knowledge in their area of research focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 2: Problem solving</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will become better problem-solvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 3: Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in research, scholarship, and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 4: Cultural Sensitivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates are prepared to work and interact with individuals who are culturally and individually different themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare graduates for careers as professors and researchers in higher education and research institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Understanding of research (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates understand the concepts and applications of exercise physiology, biomechanics, exercise psychology, and physical education research methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Specialization (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the program will have a subspecialty that strengthens their skills in their major concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Grant writing and management (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates are prepared for careers that involve grant writing and management skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Comprehensive exams and dissertation (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students pass comprehensive exams and write dissertations that contribute to the body of research literature in the exercise physiology and biomechanics fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All eligible students (n=2) passed their comprehensive exams. No students graduated during the review period. Therefore, target goal was achieved.

**M2: Research presentations (O: 1, 2)**

Students must present papers at professional conferences before they are allowed to sit for comprehensive exams

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**

100% of students complete this requirement

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

75% of students met this requirement in the previous year. However, one student was in his first year and appears to not have presented research himself. A second student, different from the student last year, was on medical leave. All of the other students conducted research but did not present their findings. Therefore, it appears that 80% of the students met this target last year.

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**

100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

80% of enrolled students met this goal (one student did not meet the goal because she was on medical leave).

**M3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)**

Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**

100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

80% of enrolled students met this goal (one student did not meet this requirement because she was on medical leave).

**M4: Cognate (O: 3)**

Successful completion of the cognate portion of their doctoral program

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Specialization**

100% of students that successfully complete the program will develop skills in areas of specialization within their respective fields

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

30% of students have successfully completed their cognate. The remaining 70% of students are on track to complete their cognate.

**M5: Seminar and professional development (O: 4)**

Successful completion of seminars and dissertation grant proposals

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Grant writing and management**

95% of students will meet this requirement

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

60% of the eligible students have completed seminars addressing grant writing/management and/or have written grant proposals. The remaining 40% of students have completed this requirement in previous years.

**M6: Cultural and individual sensitivity**

Cultural and individual sensitivity will be emphasized in coursework

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**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
Implementation Description: Task is performed during annual review of doctoral students in summer/late spring
Projected Completion Date: 04/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Kinesiology faculty

**Research presentations**
Kinesiology faculty need to review research programs to insure that doctoral students are participating and presenting research prior to dissertation.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Task is performed during annual review of doctoral students in summer/late spring
Projected Completion Date: 04/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Kinesiology faculty

**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
Implementation Description: Will meet to discuss how to integrate outcome assessments for the new PETE concentration with that of the existing Kinesiology program
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Kinesiology faculty

**Revision of Assessment Program based on Annual Report**
Faculty need to discuss revising program assessment to develop hard measures of student learning outcomes. Program coordinator has met with Department Chair to discuss assessment revision and the development of evaluation rubrics for comprehensive exams and dissertations. Faculty will meet to discuss assessment program once drafts of the rubrics are developed. Program coordinator will need to meet with Marti Singer to discuss implementation of assessment with the addition of a distinct concentration major (Physical Education Teacher Education).

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Coordinator develops rubrics and faculty reviews and approves
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator and individual concentration directors
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?

There have been no significant changes made in the Student Learning Outcomes assessment over the last year. However, based on feedback from the Annual Assessment Report (received for the first time this summer), we are making changes in Mission, Goals, Outcomes, and Assignment/Measures. We anticipate that the creation of evaluation rubrics for the comprehensive exams and dissertation projects will yield the most informative data regarding 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 review of the Student Learning Outcomes assessment consistently indicated a high degree of success in the program. However, there are deficiencies in the hard measures associated with the assessment program. Nonetheless, program changes were implemented that should improve the PhD program. College of Education core requirements were changed and an additional option was created to satisfy the comprehensive exam policy. The changes in college core and comprehensive exam policy addressed three of our major Student Learning Outcome Outcomes and Measures. The faculty believed that in addition to an option of traditional comprehensive exams (i.e., sequestered and non-sequestered written exams and oral exams), that certain students would benefit from an alternative approach that allows for a semester long intensive research literature review writing assignment coupled with an oral exam that resembles the traditional comprehensive oral exam. The change in College core allows for a greater number of credit hours to be taken in the area of research before students take their comprehensive exams. Therefore, these changes address Student Learning Outcomes related to “Preparing students for careers as professors and researchers”, “Understanding Research” and “Specialization”.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Taxation MTX
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Fall 2012: 74.69 Spring 2013: 76.18

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2012: 88.62 average on Final Research Exam Spring 2013: 84.76 average 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Fall 2012: 81.52 Spring 2013: 89.86

M 4: Knowledge of Corporate Tax Law (O: 2)
Performance is measured by class average on multiple examinations covering detailed elements of forming, operating, and liquidating a corporation.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge
Class average of 85%.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2012, 86; Spring 2013, 83

M 5: Knowledge of Partnership Taxation (O: 2)
Performance is measured by class average on several exams which test the rules for creating a partnership entity, determining outside basis of partners, and applying the distribution rules to determine proper tax treatment.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge
Class average of 85%.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Spring 2013, Buckhead Program: 86.9 Spring 2013, Downtown Program: 86.8

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

Tx 8120
Since there is insufficient time to cover all current topics, consider eliminating the corporate tax return project or providing it as an additional exercise for students desiring the compliance experience.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Planned
Priority: High
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
Devising New Measurement for Professional Communications Skills
The course that measures communications skills, BCOM, was not offered after Spring 2011, because the curriculum changed. Thus, measurement of communications skills was suspended until a new measure could be developed. The new measure being developed is an assignment packet of various forms of professional communications, including a research memo, client letter, and case brief. The measurement will consist of the students’ average grades on this assignment.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Teaching & Learning PhD -- Teacher Education
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 field of teacher 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 teacher 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 teacher education.

Goals
G 1: Possess expert knowledge of teacher education theory and research
Candidates have expert knowledge of teacher education theory and research

G 2: Possess expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of teacher education
Candidates have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of teacher 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 international, national, and local levels in teacher education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and theories of teacher education, as well as methodologies specific to teacher 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 (M: 2)
Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars.

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Service and Engagement (M: 3)
Candidates participate in and contribute to professional organizations in teacher education through 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 (M: 4)
Candidates access, develop, and promote the use of technology in their research, teaching, and service contributions to the field of teacher education.

Strategic Plan Associations
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

M 1: Research Knowledge (O: 1)
Candidates are assessed using a teacher education 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) needed 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
There are no program completers in this program as of 2012-13.

M 2: Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (O: 2)
Candidates are assessed using a teacher education 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) needed 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
There are no program completers in this program as of 2012-13.

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: Demonstrate Professional Service and Engagement
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) needed 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
There are no program completers in this program as of 2012-13.

M 4: Engagement with Technology (O: 4)
Candidates are assessed using a teacher education 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) needed 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 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
There are no program completers in this program as of 2012-13.

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

Action Plan Pending Data
To date, no students have completed the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning with a concentration in Teacher Education.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Once data are collected on completers, an appropriate action plan will be established.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

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

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

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

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
This is a new concentration for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning. We created program learning outcomes, 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.
We do not yet have any data for this program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Teaching & Learning PhD–Language & Literacy
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

### 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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

#### 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 2012-2013 - Target:** Met

All 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

All students have met this target.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### 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 | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Engagement with Technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology
- Measure: 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 | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: 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 nine students into our program; three of whom are full-time students into our program. We continue to recruit international students, one of whom was admitted this past year. Based upon last year's identified achievements, we admitted more students into our program, and continue to increase the number of international students. Faculty have invited students to participate in international research, teaching, and service projects. Students have begun to have more visibility at international conferences, and have co-authored and/or authored articles for international journals. Students also serve in service capacities in which they have direct access to international scholars and scholarships.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

As a highly engaged and academic program, students are prepared to go on international and national searches. Critical thinking is essential and expected within and across courses in the program. Not only are students prepared to discuss and extend solutions for literacy issues, they also present their critical thinking through national and international peer-reviewed journal publications and presentations. Students are nominated for dissertation awards, and one student was selected as the Southern Regional Education Board dissertation scholar, a $20,000 award to complete the dissertation.

**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.

All students who completed the program successfully attained the required 4 or 5 in all areas assessed. The program will continue to prepare junior scholars who will effect change through their research and impact the field of literacy, and will be highly competitive in national and international searches. In conjunction with the College of Education changes in the PhD program, students now can take a complete suite of qualitative or quantitative research courses, or a mix of both focused on the questions they pursue in their dissertation study. They also can take a research course as part of this 15 hour core that is specific to language and literacy PhD students and designed to meet the interests and methods for literacy research. Students will be highly prepared to conduct research studies and write up their findings to larger audiences.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Teaching & Learning PhD--Mathematics Education
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers demonstrated an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% demonstrated a level of exceptional 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.

**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 2012-2013 - 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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% demonstrated a level of exceptional 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.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 20% demonstrated a level of exceptional 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

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?
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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Teaching & Learning PhD--Music Education
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
One student completed a formal internship in 2012-13 (signified by taking EDCI 9660). The score was 3.8 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Three students taught undergraduate courses in 2012-13 (signified by serving as instructors, under faculty supervision, in either MUS 3310 or MUS 3350). Score #1 was 3.7, Score #2 was 3.8, and Score #3 was 4.0 (all 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
No student presented a prospectus or dissertation during the 2012-13 academic year.
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.

Details:
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The curriculum change has been submitted and approved.
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 (pp. 10-11): *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 seminars 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”).*

Details:
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
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

Additional Redefinition of Comprehensive Examination
In addition to the changes made in the fall of 2012, we will be adding two elements to the comprehensive examination. Details will be determined during the 2013-14 year, with implementation in the fall of 2014. The two elements to be added will be prerequisites to the written and oral portions of the exam and will need to be completed prior to scheduling of those portions: a. presentation at a conference; b. submission of an article to a peer-reviewed journal, with completion of at least one round of review.

Details:
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Changes to be effective with the fall 2014 semester.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Freer

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 teach similar content. We are accomplishing this in two ways: MET – 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. IN PROGRESS – 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: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The curriculum change becomes effective in SPRING 2014.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Frerer

Redefinition of Comprehensive Examination

The following was accomplished, effective with the Fall 2013 semester: 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 (pp. 10-11): "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. o 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: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: See above
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Frerer

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?

As described in the action plans section, we continue to revise our comprehensive examination to reflect increased levels of expectation for student scholarship. Moving forward, we will also adjust the comprehensive examination to reflect the expectations of potential employers at the time of application for faculty positions in higher education (i.e. presentations and publications).

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 changes noted in Academic Program Question #1 have prompted changes in our two EDCI courses. In our section of EDCI 9900 (Critique of Educational Research), students now prepare their manuscript for eventual journal submission. In our section of EDCI 9850 (Research Seminar), students now prepare a conference presentation for eventual juried submission.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2012-2013 Teaching & Learning PhD--Science Education**

(As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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**

3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**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.

**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).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**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)

**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)

**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)

**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: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**

Measure (Key Assessment): Research Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research Knowledge of Science Education

**Responsible Person/Group:** All tenured and tenure track science 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: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**

Measure (Key Assessment): Demonstrates Engagement with Technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology in Science Education

**Responsible Person/Group:** All tenured and tenure track science 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: 2012-2013
- 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 Science Teacher Education

**Responsible Person/Group:** All tenured and tenure track science 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: 2012-2013
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 in Science Education

Responsible Person/Group: All tenured and tenure track science education faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We admitted four students into our program; one of whom is a full-time students into our program. We continue to recruit international students, one of whom was admitted this past year. Based upon last year’s identified achievements, we admitted more students into our program, and continue to increase the number of international 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?
As a highly engaged and academic program, students are prepared to go on international and national searches. Critical thinking is essential and expected within and across courses in the program. Not only are students prepared to discuss and extend solutions for science issues, new generation science standards, and common core standards, they also present their critical thinking through national and international peer-reviewed journal publications and presentations.

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.

All students who completed the program successfully attained the required 4 or 5 in all areas assessed. The program will continue to prepare junior scholars who will effect change through their research and impact the field of science education, and will be highly competitive in national and international searches. In conjunction with the College of Education changes in the PhD program, students now can take a complete suite of qualitative or quantitative research courses, or a mix of both focused on the questions they pursue in their dissertation study. They also can take a research course as part of this 15 hour core that is specific to science education PhD students and designed to meet the interests and methods for science research. Students will be highly prepared to conduct research studies and write up their findings to larger audiences.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Teaching & Learning PhD--Social Studies Education
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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 1: Competent Researchers in Social Studies Education
G-1: have expert knowledge of social studies education theory and research.
**G 2: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars in social studies education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and methodologies of social studies education research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement (G: 3) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

**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).

#### 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).

**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.

### 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?
Several doctoral students have improved their level of critical thinking and as evidence of this improvement have published articles in leading social studies research journals.

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 support for students to travel to academic conferences in order to present their research findings.

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Urban Accelerated Certification and Master's Program MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The UACM is a rigorous program that seeks to serve the needs and aspirations of elementary students schooled in urban contexts by eradicating deficit perspectives through the development of pedagogically competent, equity-oriented, empowered teachers who are change agents inside and outside the classroom.

The UACM believes:

- We believe that teachers have the ability and power to provide experiences in which children succeed. This success provides the confidence and competence for children to continue to succeed.

- We believe that in order to foster these successful experiences, teachers must engage and connect with students. This connection is demonstrated by treating children with respect, by having high standards and by helping children to believe that they can achieve.

- We believe that in order to foster successful experiences, teachers must be knowledgeable about the child’s culture and must actively integrate this into the best practices of teaching and learning.

- We believe that from structure comes freedom. The teacher must create a purposeful, structured environment in which
children are free to explore, experiment, and learn.

- We believe that teachers need to establish an environment in their classrooms where children are respectful of each other, their environment and the adults in their lives.

- We believe that teachers should respect the language of their children and have knowledge of its background and principles. We also believe that teachers should model and expect mastery of mainstream American English for their students.

Goals

G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions
Master’s candidates will have the content and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions to be able to plan and implement effective, culturally responsive instruction.

G 2: Teaching as a Profession
Master’s candidates will develop as reflective and collaborative professionals.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Shows commitment to student learning & development (G: 1) (M: 1)
Educator is committed to students and their learning and/or development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 2: Applies expertise for learning and development (G: 1) (M: 2)
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (G: 1) (M: 3)
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning (G: 2) (M: 4)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities (G: 2) (M: 5)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning (O: 1)
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met
94% of UACM Master’s candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.35 on a 4.0 scale. Although most candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on any element of the assessment were required to redo that element of the assessment to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. The one candidate that did not meet expectations was put on an action plan requiring her to retake a course in classroom management, videotape herself teaching after the course, and present her growth to her advisor in order to show she meets this standard. 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 LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 2: Field Experience Observation Assessment.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Add MEd Orientation to Summer Semester

The program faculty will add a MEd Orientation to the summer semester prior to starting ECE course work in the Master's year of the Program of Study. The orientation will focus on the program schedule and major activities/projects. The major activities/projects include: the mentorship experience and the capstone project. Candidates will also be introduced to the program text (The New Teacher), which will be read across all of their ECE courses. This orientation will allow candidates to grasp the Master's program scope and sequence prior to starting their career as teachers. As currently implemented, when the orientation is done on the first day during the fall semester, candidates become overwhelmed with all of the information they receive as they negotiate being a first-year teacher.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

94% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.76 on a 4.0 scale. Although most candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on any element of the assessment were required to redo that element of the assessment to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. The one candidate that did not meet expectations was put on an action plan requiring her to retake a course in classroom management, videotape herself teaching after the course and present her growth to her advisor in order to show she meets this standard. 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 LiveText and/or 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.56 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 project to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. Candidates did score lower on their Teaching and Learning Project in the areas of Literacy Integration. 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 LiveText and/or 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.94 mean score on a 4.0 scale. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates did score lower on their Action Research Project in the areas of literature review as well as analysis and findings. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See attached detailed aggregated data).

M 5: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities (O: 5)

Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 5:Capstone Project, which Cross Career Learning Community is a part of the score.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through active engagement as a member of the teaching profession.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.71 mean score on a 4.0 scale. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates did score lower on their Capston Project in the areas of use of communication modes and materials. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See attached detailed aggregated data).
Once a Week Classes

We have adjusted the program schedule to better meet the needs of our student. All of our students are first year teachers, and previously our program required them to come to GSU twice a week for classes. Our students now only come to GSU on Mondays for longer period of time relieving them some of their burden. We will interview students on the effectiveness of this new schedule.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 2 - Expertise for Learning & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities

Implementation Description: Faculty coordinated the program schedule to ensure that students could receive all of their contact time on Monday evening.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty

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

Implementation Description: The MEd. Orientation will be scheduled in July of each year.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 GSU classes. Based on the 2012-2013 cohort, this seems to be an effective approach. We added more professional development to the 2013-2014 year, and will analyze the results.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 2 - Expertise for Learning & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | Outcome/Objective: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
- Measure: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities

Implementation Description: Target date is the first week students (PreK-5) report back to GSU classes.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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
Implementation Description: The program director in coordination with appropriate faculty members will review and revise each rubric to be on a five-point scale.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director and UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Implement New Assessment System
In the 2011-2012 academic year, the UACM MEEd (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
Implementation Description: Faculty were trained on the Livetext system. Key assessment rubrics were reviewed and revised. Key assessment and rubrics were loaded into Livetext, and faculty will score these assessments in Livetext at designated benchmarks in the program.
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Program Director and Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Restructure ECE 6415 Literacy/Social Studies Integration
The UACM MEd (GATAPP) program is an unique approach to teacher certification and graduate school. After an accelerated certification process, candidates continue their graduate studies into their first year as a teacher of record. In order to meet the demands of a first-year teacher who is also attending graduate school, courses need to be structured to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Currently, ECE 6415 is a traditional graduate course with many of its requirements not related to the lived experiences of our candidates. The UACM faculty is committed to analyzing and restructuring this course to facilitate candidates' critical thinking in order to improve their pedagogy.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty will meet to discuss and restructure ECE 6415 to meet the goals of the program.
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 Assessment for Urban Education I and II. The Master's year of the UACM program serves, in part, as a new teacher induction support system. Students in this phase of the program are first-year teachers completing their Master's degree work. As such, broadening the scope of ECE 6415 and ECE 6416 allows us to be more responsive to the needs of our students in the lived context of their teaching career. We received positive feedback from the 2012-2013 candidates, but are adjusting assignments for more effective impact.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development
  Measure: Faculty Rating 2 - Expertise for Learning & Development | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
  Measure: Faculty Rating 3 - Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
  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

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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development
Measure: Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning & Development | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
Measure: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
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

Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: None

Align Observation Rubric
In order to prepare our candidates for state policy, we have aligned our field observation process with the state mandated observation system (TAP).

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: This will go into affect Fall 2013, and it will be on going if found effective.
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 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, and the field observation rubric has been aligned with the state mandated teacher observation rubric (TAP).

**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: a.) focusing on the long range, visionary approach to the professional; b.) using varied assessment strategies; c) analyzing and synthesizing research, and d.) communicating using various modes. The UACM faculty feel 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 participate in 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. Program faculty will make improvements to the structure of the program in bridging the gap between theory and practice, including: a.) faculty adjusting the program schedule to better meet the candidates’ need to concentrate on practice; b.) faculty examining and testing different approaches to ECE 6415/ECE 6416 Curriculum and Assessment courses; c.) program giving the candidates the opportunity to participate in a summer GRA position to improve research knowledge and ability; and d.) faculty focusing more attention on writing in the research course.
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**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: Exhibiting Exemplary Content Practice**

Graduates of the Urban Teacher Leader program will be teacher leaders who exhibit exemplary practice in a content concentration area.

**G 2: Serving as Effective Mentors**

Graduates of the Urban Teacher Leader program will be teacher leaders who are effective mentors of colleagues across the P-12 levels.

**G 3: Serving as Urban Education Advocates**

Graduates of the Urban Teacher Leader program will be teacher leaders who are advocates of excellence in urban education.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module

Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module Description of how the assessment is used in the program: The Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module assignment is part of EDCI 7680, a field-based practicum course. This assignment engages teacher leaders in the creation of a professional development event based upon feedback from building administrators or other practicing or preservice teachers. Teacher leaders design the PD event, implement it, and reflect on the overall success of the event. The PD must include some form of teacher engagement in analysis of curriculum or student work, a discussion of resources and/or strategies with others, and some discussions of activities related to student diversity, equity issues, and technology use in the classroom. Copy of the assessment as given to students: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module(20%) Using feedback you collect from building administrators, teachers at your school, student teachers, and/or students in your M.Ed. course, you will propose and enact a significant content-based professional development event for teachers. This professional development event could be created for and delivered to teachers in your school, to a group of student teachers, or to teachers in your M.Ed. program. The following must be included in your PD proposal, but you are encouraged to include other details as appropriate: Focus of PD and Overall Rationale (For example, you might design your PD around specific topic based on the feedback you get from content teachers at your school. Alternatively, you might base your PD on new curriculum materials and/or content-based teaching strategies based on feedback from administrators.) Content standards to be covered(GPS and/or CCSS) Detailed plan for the PD(day(s), time(s), detailed description of activities planned) Rationale for individual activities(For example, your activity might be based on research-based best practices in your content area. Alternatively, it might be based on your evaluation of what is needed by the content teachers in your school.) Reflection (a 2-page reflection on the enactment of your PD) Additional requirements for the PD event:Some form of teacher engagement in analysis of curriculum and/or student work; discussion of new resources and/or strategies for teachers to consider; some discussion or activities related to issues of equity and diversity and technology use in the classroom Professional Development Rubric Evident (3 pts) Emerging (2 pts) Not Apparent (1 pt) Goals (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.1 Program goals stated clearly. They focus on the needs of the teachers and the rationales of them are explanation. Objectives included but are vague. Objectives need to be clear and specific. The teacher leader's classroom. The purpose of this TWS project is to provide opportunities for student teachers to show how they use the information about the learning-teaching context and students' individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. The teacher leader's TWS 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 students across levels of expertise 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 and assessment. 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 components of your leader work sample are as follows: Learning goals: 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 define what 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 and evaluate your student teacher's progress towards your learning goal(s). You should describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning. Design for mentoring:Describe your mentor plan for your student teacher, which will include things such as mentor/mentee meeting dates, your feedback plan, your discussion of adult learning theories, etc. Meeting agendas and reflection on mentor/mentee meetings:Throughout the semester, as your student teacher works on their TWS, you will be planning and enacting at least 3 meetings to help your student teacher do the following: select assessments for the TWS; identify resources and support services for students; and help your student teacher in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of assessment data. For this component, you will submit your meeting agendas and your reflections on those meetings. Written feedback to student teacher: You will provide written feedback on your student teacher's final TWS project. You should focus on identifying multiple sources of evidence to evaluation 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 Teacher Leader Work Sample. Planning Rubric Teacher Leader Work Sample. Planning Rubric Unacceptable (1 pt) Acceptable (3 pts) Ineffective (4 pts) Proficient (5 pts) Clarity of Learning Goal (5 pts) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.3 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 assessed and evaluated through the evaluation plan All learning goals are assessed by the evaluation plan and provide students with constructive feedback on their learning. Mentoring Plan Structure (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.2 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, assessments, 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

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 3: Impact on Students: Teacher Leader Work Sample

Impact on Students: Teacher Leader Work Sample Description of how the assessment is used in the program: The Teacher Leader Work Sample described below includes a specific section of the rubric related to Impact on Students. The Teacher Leader Work Sample is part of a year-long, field-based course where the MGEd students (MGEd students) 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 and assessment. 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 components of your leader work sample are as follows: .1. POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learner’s capacity for change; believes that others can and will rather than can’t or won’t (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.1. .2. AUTHENTICITY: Able to be open and honest with others; engaged in the process of change; has a positive self-regard; demonstrates a positive view of others (1 pt) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.2. .3. REFLECTION: Demonstrates deep reflection on and evaluation of the mentoring meetings and includes good detail about meeting learning goals or supporting student teachers on the TWS Demonstrates very little reflection and evaluation of the mentoring meetings and only includes one or two details about meeting learning goals or supporting student teachers on the TWS Demonstrates some reflection on and evaluation of the mentoring meetings and includes good detail about meeting learning goals or supporting student teachers on the TWS Demonstrates deep reflection on and evaluation of the mentoring meetings and includes good detail about meeting learning goals or supporting student teachers on the TWS

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 4: Dispositions

Dispositions Description of the Assessment The assessment for Dispositions is entitled “Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals” and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. A brief description of how the assessment is used in this program Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Teacher Leader Certification program, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university faculty prior to the residency experience when the candidates are enrolled in EDCI 7980. The dispositions survey is completed again at the end of the residency/end of program in the advanced practicum (EDCI 7680). Rubric Rubric Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Marginal (2 pts) Unacceptable (1 pt) EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others’ points of view; bases communication on learner’s point of view; believes in establishing rapport with students’ perspectives respecting learners’ perspectives (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.2. EMPOWERMENT: Demonstrates the learner’s ability to learn independently (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.3. DEMONSTRATES: Demonstrates a positive view of self at a level that is appropriate for the context and far higher than expected Demonstrates empathy at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of empathy but needs improvement Demonstrates little or no evidence of empathy in practice

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 (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.1. Demonstrates a positive view of others at a level that is appropriate for the context and far higher than expected Demonstrates a positive view of others at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of a positive view of others but needs improvement Demonstrates little or no evidence of a positive view of others 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 (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.3. Demonstrates a positive view of self at a level that is appropriate for the context and maintains unusually high expectations of self Demonstrates a positive view of self at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of a positive view of self and demonstrates Demos a positive view of self at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates authenticity at a level far higher than expected

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
M 5: Reflection Journal

Reflection Journal How this assignment is used in the program This assignment is used during the residency experience in EPEL 7680. The reflection log provides an opportunity for candidates to draw on their work in previous courses and to examine their work in the residency and then analyze how these experiences demonstrate their growth as a teacher leader. Assignment directions as given to the students For each of your assignments in EPEL 7680B, you are to validate your mastery of the Learning Outcomes by making entries into a reflection log and submitting them for approval to the course instructor. Your entries are threefold. First, you are to describe insights, new learning, and experiences you have had in the course. Second, you are to describe the impact of these experiences on your growth as an educator and scholar including describing any changes that have taken place as a result of this learning experience. Lastly, you are to outline a plan/goal by which you will take this new insight into the schools to improve your teaching, in turn improving student learning. This plan/goal should include a method of evaluation toward the goal. This log is to be kept in electronic format and should be maintained by the student and uploaded to the LiveText portfolio. EPEL 7680B Reflection Journal Rubric Exceeds Expectations (4 pts) Meets Expectations (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Does Not Meet Expectations (1 pt) Demonstrated reflective practice through written linkage of assignments to practice (Teacher Leader 1) (1, 10%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.4 GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.3 Very detailed reflection linking strongly to practice and future goals Somewhat detailed reflection linking somewhat to practice and future goals Lacking reflection linking little or no evidence of meaningful purpose and vision Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

EPY 8250

Because of transitioning of program faculty, this course (psychology of the inner city child) is no longer offered. As a result, students in the program are encouraged to take sociology of the inner city child in order to have experiences related to the challenges faced by inner city children.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

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 have been modified to better support the roles required of school leaders and teacher leaders. EPEL 7680A now focuses on preparing students better understand data. EPEL 7680B now focuses on action research and specifically, research designed to give educators a stronger understanding of their own cultural proficiency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this
Over the last academic year, the newly designed UTL program was approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. As a result of this approval, the program began accepting students, and while the first students accepted into the newly designed program began in Summer 2013, none of the major assessments were administered during the reporting period.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
The answer to this question is not clear given the recent start of the newly designed program.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The major area of the program that needs continuous development is the communication of the program design to faculty members within the various concentrations. Because the redesign includes several departments across the College of Education, it is important to provide ongoing opportunities to explain and discuss the program design and certification ramifications of each of the concentrations. Doing so will enable faculty who are advising current and prospective students to adequately describe how the program can help them gain higher levels of certification.

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 have not been major changes associated with the program because it was recently approved.

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2012-2013 Women’s Studies Assessment of Core
(As of: 12/12/2016 06:00 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: 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: 2)
Shows the ability to develop a clear and coherent thesis that directs the entire paper or exam response.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 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.

SLO 5: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)

Apply feminist/womanist perspectives to contemporary sociocultural issues

SLO 6: Connect theory to lived experience (M: 4)

For the personal narrative papers, we have decided (as it has been part of our action plan) to substitute one that focuses on demonstrating an ability to connect theoretical perspectives to lived experience for the one that focuses on demonstrating feminist theoretical perspectives, in order to get a fuller picture for assessment.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 4: 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, 3, 4)

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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met

For this academic year, we continued to focus only on the final reading response. This year we found that 85% received at least a 3, and 43% received at least a 4. We met our target for general competence, but we did not quite meet it for excellence.

Target for O3: Evidence

In terms of evidence, as with other writing skills, we hope that most of the students, 75% will achieve basic competence, and that 50% will exceed basic competence through scoring a 4 or 5. Since evidence is one of the most challenging skills for college students, we hope that separating it out as a category will clarify the assessment process.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For this particular batch of papers, we found that all students received at least a 3, and 57% received a 4 or 5, so that we met our target.

Target for O4: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For this particular finding, we dropped the evidence out, and focused more on the writing itself (syntax, etc.) Here we found that all students scored at least a 3, and that 71% received a 4 or 5.

### M 2: Analysis Papers (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)

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 student's knowledge of and ability to apply feminist/womanist knowledge and perspectives to their chosen topic.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

#### Target for O2: Thesis Development

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2. 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

We are happy to report that this year, students were able to meet our targets on their drafts, and exceed our targets in the final versions. On their drafts, 80% received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5, and on their final versions, 100% received at least a 3, and 80% received at least a 4. This suggests that the revision process is continuing to help students improve, and that it is most effective in terms of moving students from competence to excellence.

#### Target for O3: Evidence

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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

For this year, on their drafts, we found that 80% of students received at least a 3, and 20% of students received a 4 or 5. On their final papers, we found that 100% of students received at least a 3, and 90% of students received a 4 or 5, suggesting that, once again, students success is greatly aided by the revision process.

### Target for O4: 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 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In terms of writing skills, we found that 70% of students received at least a 3, and 50% of students received a 4 or 5 on their drafts. For their final, 100% received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4 or 5, suggesting that the revision process is once again essential in helping us meet our targets.

### Target for O5: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Met

In terms of their drafts, 80% received at least a 3, and 70% scored a 4 or 5. For their final papers, 100% of students scored at least a 3, and 90% scored a 4 or 5. The high numbers on this aspect of the rubric suggest that, once again, students are learning and applying women's studies perspectives extremely well, and that our area of focus should remain on the critical writing skills. Once again, though, this finding does suggest the significance of the revision component.

### M 3: Final Exams (O: 4, 5)

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 O4: 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.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Add additional rubric
After we have completed our collection of personal narrative papers, we will include an additional rubric: Students connect what they learn to lived experience.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Collect additional measures
We intend to collect personal narratives in addition to the analysis papers for our evaluation.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: We have done so for the last year.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2010

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
In terms of writing skills, we found that 80% received at least a 3, and that 40% received a 4 or 5. While we came close, we did not meet our targets here, suggesting that students still have difficulty focusing on their writing when they are completing exams.

Target for O4: 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met
In terms of utilizing feminist perspectives, we found that 100% of students demonstrated basic competence, by receiving a score of at least a 3, and that only 40% received a 4 or 5, suggesting that students are able to basically utilize these perspectives, but that they are not excelling.

M 4: Personal Narrative Paper (O: 4, 6)
Dr. Julie Kubala WST 2010 First Paper Assignment Summer 2011 This handout will outline not only the requirements for the paper, but also give you some guidelines for peer review. 1) Your paper assignment is to write a personal narrative exploring your relationship with gender and/or feminism (identity and/or politics). 2) Although it is a personal narrative, it is important that you include analysis. 3) In order to facilitate the inclusion of sufficient analysis, be sure you can find a clear and focused main point (thesis statement) in your own and others' papers. 4) One way to accomplish this goal is to choose a specific experience to describe and then analyze in the context of its relationship to your identity. 5) One thing to be careful of is to avoid being too broad – you cannot cover your entire life or identity in a relatively short paper!!! 6) Even though the assignment is to write narrative, storytelling should not take up more than half the paper. 7) As with any other essay, it should be concise, organized, and well-written. 8) Because it is a personal narrative, you might not adhere strictly to grammar rules; one way to check whether your writing is sufficiently clear is to ask your peer group to pay particular attention to your sentence structure. 9) In the peer group process, be sure to offer constructive criticism – while it is nice to begin with emphasizing the positive aspects of the paper, simply telling the writer that "this is good" does not really help them. 10) Part of the benefit of peer review involves increasing your own reading skills; ideally, this process should help the reviewer as well as the author of the paper. 11) The paper should be approximately 4-6 pp. long, typed, double-spaced, 12 point font. You do not need a title page (although you do need a title) – simply put your name and course time at the top. 12) You should bring enough copies of your paper to class for your group on June 27. Rubric: 1) 2 3 4 5 Clear, focused, analytic main point 1 2 3 4 5 Engaging and significant narrative; relevant to important class topics 1 2 3 4 5 Sufficient and specific evidence; well developed 1 2 3 4 5 Organization -- in this, the narrative and analytic sections should be nicely integrated 1 2 3 4 5 Clearly written
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
In terms of writing skills, we found that averaging the 2 rubrics together, 75% received at least a 3, and 62% received a 4 or 5, so that we were able to meet our targets here, suggesting that students can often write well when they are writing personal narratives.

Target for O6: connect theory to lived experience
Given that this finding scores the ability to connect experience to theory in a personal narrative paper, we hope that 80% of students will receive at least a 3, and 60% of students will receive a 4 or 5 on this aspect of the rubric.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
On this aspect of our rubric, we found that 100% of students received at least a 3, and 80% of students received a 4 or 5, suggesting that changing the outcome/objective in this case more accurately measured what it was we were asking students to do in these papers.
Develop materials to enhance writing instruction

I am presently in the process of collecting materials to enhance writing instruction in the classroom. I have a draft of these materials that I piloted in 2 courses last semester, but given the small sample size, it is unclear whether these materials have actually improved student performance. We are hoping that by increasing writing instruction in the classroom, we will help students develop their writing skills, particularly in terms of the collection of evidence.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

Rework targets

Since the only target that was not met involved the baseline papers, I think the important thing here is to focus on the improvement, rather than having targets for the baselines themselves, as we don’t actually have any control over students abilities when they join our classes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Reading Response papers | Outcome/Objective: Thesis Development
  - Projected Completion Date: 06/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Increased writing instruction

Given that the two areas in which we did not completely meet our targets were thesis and sentence-level writing skills, we will try to increase our writing instruction in the classroom. While we traditionally have spent a great deal of time focusing on thesis statements, we 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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final Exams | Outcome/Objective: Writing skills
- Measure: Reading Response papers | Outcome/Objective: Writing skills

Increased writing instruction

Since we have found extremely similar results on both of these measures, it seems clear that the action plan that is mentioned for the reading response papers should also be established for the analytical papers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Analysis Papers | Outcome/Objective: Writing skills

Pilot program with WAC consultants

In the academic year 2011-2012, we are planning to utilize Writing Across the Curriculum Graduate Consultants in two of our courses in order to see if the availability of more intensive one-on-one tutoring can aid with the persistence of writing problems that we continue to identify. Since students are generally stronger in terms of demonstrating their ability to comprehend and use key feminist/womanist concepts, we are continuing to work on strengthening the writing components of our introductory courses. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Julie Kubala
Additional Resources: WAC consultants

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?

Much of our shift in assessment continues what we began last year. In particular, we are assessing the effectiveness of the revision process, which is possible with the help of Writing Across the Curriculum consultants in some of our classes. Furthermore, we are collecting reading responses from the end of the semester, so that we can see how much students have learned throughout the semester. Yet again, we are finding that students’ ability to organize, develop, and provide sufficient evidence increases over the course of the semester. Last year, we decided to also work on the revision process in terms of students’ ability to demonstrate knowledge of appropriate feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives, and this year, we met our targets for this aspect, which suggests that our implementation of this strategy is somewhat effective, although it is difficult to tell from a single year how effective
any intervention is. We did, however, decide to eliminate the objective about formulating a thesis statement and add the objective the emphasizes evidence for the reading response papers. We decided to do that since the nature of reading responses does not really lend itself to the creation of thesis statements, but the assignment does require that students support their interpretation of the text. Because of the assignment, we thought that what we really should measure is how well students support their claims, since that aspect is more emphasized in the nature of this assignment. Similarly, in terms of assessing the exams, we found that we wanted to drop the objective that focuses on thesis statements and add the outcome that emphasizes evidence. In general, we have found that what we want from exams are for students to show that they understand the readings, and to be able to provide sufficient evidence for their interpretations of these texts. We found that they do not necessarily have a focused and coherent thesis statement; instead, they often reiterate the question, which is actually appropriate in the context of an exam. Therefore, we decided to remove the thesis objective from the exams, but to keep it in the analysis paper measure. Next year, we may add the "development of a clear thesis" into the assessment of the measure, "Personal Narratives," since at least some of the personal narrative assignments emphasize the significance of a thesis statement, even in a non-traditional paper. Also, this year we added the "connecting theory to lived experience" rubric that we proposed last year, especially on the measure that relies on personal narrative. In general, we find that students excel in terms of this finding; they do a really good job in personal writing applying what they have learned to real-world situations. Next year, we would like to try to find more kinds of personal narrative writing in order to strengthen our analysis of this aspect of the writing 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.

In general, our assessment findings suggest that we are on the right track in terms of our emphasis on revision as helping strengthen both students' writing ability and their skills in terms of demonstrating their knowledge of feminist theoretical perspectives. We therefore do not see the need for any significant changes in the upcoming year. We are pleased that so many of our targets were met for this year, especially those targets that related directly to the revision process. In fact, the two areas where we did not meet our targets took place in the context of final exams. There were two outcomes, demonstrating knowledge of theoretical perspectives and basic writing skills, in which we met the targets in terms of basic competence but not in terms of exceeding the level of basic competence. Obviously, we will not be including a revision aspect for exams, so we will have to continually discuss how to improve student performance on these aspects. In terms of demonstrating knowledge, we generally do meet our targets for this aspect, so we will wait to see if this year's findings are anomalous, or if there is a pattern developing that we should intervene in. In terms of writing skills, the main change we can make is to including writing skills as one aspect of their grade. It seems that students are more likely to pay attention to their sentence structure skills when they are required to do so. In other words, if the writing itself is not part of the grade, students are less likely to focus on it, especially when they have deadlines, and it is the end of the semester. Again, though, I would like to say that we are pleased with the results of this year's assessment, and we hope that we will continue to be successful in terms of achieving our targets.
their arguments clearly and carefully.

**SLO 3: Organization (G: 2) (M: 2, 5)**

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, 4, 5)**

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)**

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, 4, 5)**

This outcome measures general writing skills, syntax, grammar, punctuation; it focuses on the clear and coherent expression of ideas.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Final Exam (O: 4, 5, 6)**

In this final exam, students should demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives. Furthermore, we scored sample exams on their ability to develop and argue their responses, as well as their ability to express ideas clearly and coherently.

**Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other**

**Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives**

We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 1/2 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

For this academic year, we found that 87% scored at least a 3, and 63% scored a 4 or 5, which shows that we almost met our target in terms of basic competence and did meet our target in terms of excellence.

**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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of application of skills, we found that all students received at least a 3, and 63% received a 4 or 5, so that we did meet our target here.

**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.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

For the writing aspect of exams, we found that all students received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5. In terms of writing, we then found that students did better in terms of achieving basic competence than they did in terms of achieving excellence. In part, this may be because we focused our assessment on providing evidence for their conclusions, as that is the main reason for having exams, but our target may be high for that part.

**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 4: interview/film critique (O: 2, 4, 6)**

I'm not sure if I should even include this assignment, because I didn't get a copy of the actual assignment. I'll try to fix this as soon as I can.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Evidence**

We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 4 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as poor and 5 as excellent).

**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).

**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).

**M 5: Research Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 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. Here, I will distinguish between those papers which require revision, and those that do not, so that we can more clearly assess the revision aspect of the papers.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Research Questions**

For this measure, we would like 75% of students to receive at least a 3, and 50% of students to receive a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

For students whose papers did not undergo substantial revision: 82% received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5. For those who did: Draft: 75% received at least a 3, and 13% received a 4 or 5. Revised Paper: 100% received at least a 3, and 75% received a 4 or 5. The results here suggest that revision allows us to exceed our targets, but students do not do as well on drafts when they know they will be required to revise than they do when they are turning in their final paper without the draft.

**Target for O2: Evidence**

For this measure, we would like 75% of students to receive at least a 3, and 50% of students to receive a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

For those papers which did not have a revision component: 82% received at least a 3, and 57% received a 4 or 5. For those papers which did have a revision component: Draft: 100% received at least a 3, and 13% received a 4 or 5. Final: 100% received at least a 3, and 67% received a 4 or 5. Here, we find that we pretty much met our targets, but it is striking that the revision component allowed for a significant improvement from competence to excellence, although, once again, the improvement is less striking from the final revised to the final unrevised.

**Target for O3: Organization**

For this measure, we would like 75% of students to receive at least a 3, and 50% of students to receive a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

For those papers which did not have a substantial revision required: 75% received at least a 3, and 25% received a 4 or 5. For those that did: Drafts: 25% received at least a 3, and 0% received a 4 or 5. Final: 100% received at least a 3, and 67% received a 4 or 5. The results here suggest that students really wait to work on organization until their papers are being revised! The results suggest that revision is especially helpful in terms of students improving the organization of their papers.

**Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives**

For this measure, we would like 75% of students to receive at least a 3, and 50% of students to receive a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

In terms of the papers that did not require a substantial revision component: 94% received at least a 3, and 68% received a 4 or 5. For those papers that were revised: Drafts: 100% received at least a 3, and 75% received a 4 or 5. Final: 100% received at least a 3, and 100% received a 4 or 5. Students exceed the targets in this respect, showing that, as has been consistent
with previous years, their ability to utilize feminist theoretical perspectives is strong.

**Target for O6: Critical thinking through writing skills**

For this measure, we would like 75% of students to receive at least a 3, and 50% of students to receive a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

For those papers that did not undergo substantial assessed revision: 87% received at least a 3, and 43% received a 4 or 5. For those papers that were revised: Draft: 100% received at least a 3, and 67% received a 4 or 5. Final: 100% received at least a 3, and 75% received a 4 or 5. In these papers, the revision component does not seem to have helped as much as it has on other objectives, although the scores on the revised papers were quite a bit higher than those that did not undergo revision.

**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:** Finished
- **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. We are continuing to hold these conversations and to think about the targets at this point.

- **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: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Evidence
- **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: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking through writing skills
- **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. In 2012-2013, some professors are doing this, and others are collecting drafts of papers. We are still working on implementing this action plan.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Evidence | Organization
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. In 2012-2013, we did that, and we will discuss the findings in the question section.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Question: We are beginning this semester to collect rough drafts and compare them to final drafts.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
Additional Resources: More time

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process 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 substantially revised our assessment process, but we have revised who performs the assessment. We used to have the undergraduate committee look at the papers, along with the Director of Undergraduate Studies, but we have decided to move to having individual instructors assess student performance by utilizing the rubric to score the papers alongside their grading. The process used to be incredibly labor intensive, especially for faculty who are not in the department, and so we are streamlining it. Furthermore, we decided to drop the outcome, Application of Skills, from the research paper, since it continually mapped exactly on the “Demonstrates appropriate feminist theoretical perspectives” outcome, so we dropped it due to redundancy. We decided not to drop it altogether, and so we are still using it in the assessment of final exams. We want to drop the measure, Interview/Film Critique, as the professor who used that is no longer with us. We will continue to assess the major assignments from the upper level courses, but, as of now, most professors assign either seminar papers, exams, or both.

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 most significant improvement that we analyzed this year involves the requirement, in some upper level courses, that students revise their papers. While we always encourage students to thoughtfully revise, we have instituted a pilot program where some faculty require students to submit a rough draft that can be evaluated by the professor before the student submits the final draft. While the results from this program have not been quite as straightforward as we might have expected, they have been clear. The general conclusion we have reached is that revision significantly helps students with the writerly aspects of writing, particularly in terms of such factors as strengthening the structure and organization of the paper. This conclusion suggests that organization is often one of the later elements of writing, in other words, that students sometimes put off organizational questions until the last minute. It also suggests that students have difficulty organizing their papers because they are not quite sure what they are arguing yet, and having revision build into the timeline really allows students the space to work on it. In terms of some of the other findings, we found that in terms of providing sufficient evidence, those papers that were revised were far more likely to move from basic competence to excellence. This finding suggests that students are acquiring basic skills in terms of arguing their points, but the extra help of evaluating a draft can really help them move beyond that basic competence to thoroughly support their claims. In terms of two of the other objectives, demonstrating theoretical perspectives and demonstrating basic sentence level writing skills, the revision process was not as significant as we had hoped. In terms of demonstrating theoretical perspectives, it is probably because students generally learn those throughout the program, and they tend to have less difficulty with this aspect overall. In terms of sentence level writing, this finding suggests that revision does help, but again, it suggests that students’ writing skills are fairly set by the time they enter the upper level courses. We also noted that the scores were, at times, lower on student drafts than on papers that did not have the revision component. This finding suggests that students do not always take the rough draft seriously, which means that the instructor is doing part of the students’ work for them. This finding is particularly important, given that the main reason we have not instituted formal revision in all our upper-level courses is that it is too work intensive for the instructor.
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Mission / Purpose
The Master of Arts (M.A.) degree in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies prepares students for doctoral work in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies or in a related discipline and enhances careers relating to women's or gender issues. As the interdisciplinary practice of feminist scholarship, Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies interrogates and envisions alternatives to social structures, institutions, ideologies, relationships, and perceptions of gender in traditional academic disciplines.

Goals
G1: Interdisciplinarity
WSW 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.

G2: Knowledgeable in the field of WGSS
WSW 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 academically prepared to be 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 (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist and/or womanist 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.

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.

**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 2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing (G: 2, 3) (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.

**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 3: Theoretical Frameworks (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of key feminist and/or womanist theoretical perspectives and apply them in their own work.

**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 4: Feminist Epistemology (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**

Students will demonstrate their knowledge of 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).

**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 5: Placements (G: 3) (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. This will serve as an indirect measure of whether they are academically prepared to successfully enter the field.

**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.

### 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Our students received an average of 3.95 on this measure, with the lowest score being 2 and the highest being 5 (1 was in the 3 range and 2 in the four range).

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Our students received an average of 3.6 on this measure, with one receiving a 1.5, one in the 3 range, two in the four range, and 1 receiving 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Our students received an average score of 4.1 on this measure, with one of them falling below the target (at 2.5), one in the 3 range, one in the four range, and the remaining two 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 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Our students received an average score of 3.79, with one falling below the target (2.83), one in the 3 range, and two in the 4 range.

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Our students received an average score of 4.09 on this measure, with all students achieving the target (two in the 3 range, and 2 in the 4 range).

**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 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
Our students received an average score of 3.98 on this measure, with all students achieving the target (2 in the 3 range, and two in the 4 range).

**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 7% will have a publication accepted.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
Our students delivered seventeen total conference presentations in 2012-2013. For the overall student body (22), this averages to .77 conference papers per student. The actual number of students presenting at conferences was 10, which is half of our student body. Our students had one article submitted for publication during the 2012-2013 year. In terms of percentages, that means that 5% of our students submitted an article for publication.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One out of five graduating students last year went on to pursue a PhD in Communications with a focus in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Another has been placed in a job relevant to their degree. Therefore, 40% of our students went on to pursue a PhD or work in a related field. The remaining three plan to apply to PhD programs in the future. We also had three students, however, who left with a Graduate Certificate in Women’s Studies without completing the MA requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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): | Overall Critical Thinking through Writing |
| Measure: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing |
| Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing |
| Research Questions |
| Implementation Description: We will identify students who have particular problems with grammar in the first year, and preferably the first semester of the program, and refer them to the Writing Studio in the first semester. |
| Responsible Person/Group: core faculty in Women’s Studies |
| Additional Resources: none |
| Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request) |

**increased focus in proseminar on RQ**

Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar spent a lot of time on the literature review and on writing abstracts, but not as much time on defining a research question.

| Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 |
| Implementation Status: Finished |
| Priority: High |
| Implementation Description: We will incorporate more training and workshops on writing a research question in the proseminar. |
| Responsible Person/Group: the instructor for the Proseminar in consultation with women’s studies core faculty. |
| Additional Resources: none |
| Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request) |

**more focus on writing skills**

Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar focused more on the basics of putting a proposal together than on the mechanics of writing.

| Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 |
| Implementation Status: In-Progress |
| Priority: High |
| 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): | Feminist Epistemology |
| Measure: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Feminist Epistemology |
| | Theoretical Frameworks |
| Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Research Questions |
| | Theoretical Frameworks |
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):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive exams</td>
<td>Feminist Epistemology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Frameworks</td>
<td>Theoretical Frameworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 core course instructors.
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>

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 are now using comprehensive exams as part of our assessment process. The comprehensive exams require students to synthesize material from all their core WGSS classes, and are thus a good measure of their overall achievement of learning outcomes. In our assessment process, we also evaluate final theses, annual student reports, and exit interviews.

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.

TheWGSSproseminarcontinuestobeamajortoolinpreparingstudents tocomplete the thesis process. For example, they must produce research statements by the first semester, and a full proposal by the second semester. Exit interviews confirm that this change to our curriculum has had a positive impact on our students. Students have reported that the proseminar has helped them prepare for comprehensive exams, put together a thesis committee, and write their thesis proposal. We will review the format of our comprehensive exams and the question structure to improve the use of the exams as a measure of student learning.