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**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Bachelors of Business Administration, Accountancy Major is to provide the technical, analytical, technology, communication, and ethics expertise to become a professional in accounting and to pursue a fifth (graduate) year of professional study.

**Goals**

**G 1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
Students demonstrate technical accounting knowledge

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

**G 3: Technology Skills**
Students demonstrate information technology skills in financial accounting and accounting information systems

**G 4: Communication Skills**
Students demonstrate communication skills in the auditing and assurance area

**G 5: Ethical Decision Making**
Students demonstrate an understanding of ethical decision making in the audit and assurance area.

**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: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**
Students display knowledge of financial accounting

**SLO 3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210) (G: 1) (M: 11, 12)**
Students demonstrate technical and analytical accounting knowledge in cost and managerial accounting

**SLO 4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310) (G: 2, 3) (M: 13, 14)**
Students demonstrate technical and analytical accounting knowledge in accounting information systems

**SLO 5: Taxation (ACCT 4510) (G: 1) (M: 15)**
Students demonstrate technical and analytical accounting knowledge in personal and corporate taxation

**SLO 6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610) (G: 2, 4, 5) (M: 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)**
Students display knowledge of Audit and Assurance

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Translate Business Activities into Accounting Information (ACCT 2101 and ACCT 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)**
### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 70.38%. (Fall 2013 72.66% Spring 2014 67.82%). Although the learning objective target was met, there was a 2.17%/7.01% decrease in fall 2013/spring 2014 from the previous year. The first year using LearnSmart technology fell short in two areas: (1) the ebook was hard to read and lacked features such as highlighting, note taking, etc. and (2) the adaptive self-study technology concentrated only on the most basic learning objectives from each chapter. Few questions were developed by the publisher for higher level learning outcomes. The technology received a score of 5.8 out of 10 from the students.

### M 2: Solve operating problems using accounting information (ACCT 2101 and ACCT 2102). (O: 1)

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

Mean score of 70% or higher

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

The mean score for five final exam assessment questions was average 66.49% (2101 & 2012 avg of 66.47% & 66.51%). The percentage for this learning objective decreased by average 11.99% from the previous year. In addition to the LearnSmart issues mentioned above, the two January snowstorms dramatically influenced the spring 2014 results. Not only was there less time available to spend on the material but compensation for the missed class periods resulted in more discrepancies between the three exam means. The problem solving operating decisions are primarily covered on the first exam. Last year, the previous 2102 instructor changed the exam chapter groupings so the first exam covered the first 2 chapters on time value topics. I changed the exam structure to cover 3 chapters in both exams 1 and the final and 4 chapters in exam 2. The final exam also contains a cumulative component. Despite the disruption created by the 2 January snowstorms, the spring sections were a much more engaged group compared to the fall sections with 10% greater class attendance and greater discussion board participation.

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

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

Mean 70% on higher exam questions.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

The mean score for five final exam assessment questions was avg 65.80%. The percentage for this learning objective decreased by average 2.945% (1.18%-2101 & 4.71%-2102). Students tended to focus on the mathematical problem solving portion of the course, and struggled with making the leap in understanding the usefulness of the information in decision making. The lower level learning questions in LearnSmart did not assist in improving this outcome. In addition to the impact of the issues addressed with learning objectives 1 and 2, students rely heavily on the accounting lab for learning objective 3 topics. Due to the snowstorm implications during the spring semester, 28% fewer students visited the accounting lab and of those who did go to the lab, visits were down by 23%.

### M 4: Perform the steps in the accounting cycle (ACCT 4111). (O: 2)

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

75% or higher scores on exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Students mean score was 81.0%. Some students taken introductory accounting outside GSU are very weak in understanding accounting system

### M 5: Analyze, value, and record operating activities (ACCT 4111). (O: 2)

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

75% or higher scores on exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Students mean score was 80.2%. Weekly quizzes work quite well to request students to study on-time

### M 6: Analyze, value, and record investing activities (ACCT 4112). (O: 2)

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

Exam Scores for questions about LT Assets and Investments (Questions 4-12) over 80%
Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
The mean student score of 75%. The results from the exam scores associated with investing activities were that 75% of the questions were answered correctly. Though this is below the 80% target we are not far from our objective. We will compare this result with future periods to determine if any changes need to be made with regard to this objective.

M 7: Analyze, value, and record financing activities (ACCT 4112). (O: 2)
Analyze, value and record the financing activities of a firm
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)
Exam Scores for questions about Liabilities and Leases (Questions 13-22) over 80%.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
The mean student score of 70%. The results from the exam scores associated with financing activities were that 70% of the questions were answered correctly.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Ignore

M 8: Analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)
Manipulate and analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)
N/A

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
N/A. We need a measurement tool for this in ACCT4112

M 9: Analyze, value, and record financial information for advanced reporting issues (ACCT 4113). (O: 2)
Analyze, value and record financial statement information associated with deferred tax and earnings per share.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)
75% or higher scores on exam questions related to this measure.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students mean score was 81.1%. Students reasonably understand these issues, showing good performance.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Ignore

M 10: Apply financial accounting theory and professional standards and judgment (ACCT 4113). (O: 2)
Apply financial accounting theory and professional standards and judgment.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)
75% or higher scores on exam questions related to this measure.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Students mean score was 73.8%. Some students had hard time in analyzing multi-period consequences of different accounting choices of a firm.

M 11: Evaluate costing methods, budgeting practices, and decision-making alternatives for planning organizations operations (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)
Evaluate costing methods, budgeting practices, and decision-making alternatives for planning organizations' operations.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)
Evaluate performance on 12 multiple-choice questions (questions 3-14) for all students during the fall and spring semesters. Targeted average of averages = 73%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
- Trend is improving over time o Avg. AY 2011 = .68 o Avg. AY 2012 = .70 o Avg. AY 2013 = .68 o Avg. AY 2014 = .72 - The minimum scores were: o Q14, materials purchases budget (avg = .60). o Q3, misapplied MOH (avg = .64) o Q12, constrained resource (avg = .64) Scores are typically lower in spring than in fall, but they were lower than average relative to prior AYs. - Controlling for GPA, instructor, semester hours, scores on assessment questions improved, presumably due to the Excel assignment.
M 12: Develop performance measures and analyze variances for controlling organizations' operations. (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)

Develop performance measures and analyze variances for controlling organizations' operations.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)

Evaluate performance on multiple-choice questions (questions 1, 2, 15-20) during the fall and spring semesters.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

- Trend is improving over time: Avg. AY 2011 = .59, Avg. AY 2012 = .61, Avg. AY 2013 = .64, Avg. AY 2014 = .66. The minimum scores were: Q2, absorption costing (avg. = .58), Q15, DM quantity var (avg = .62), Q17, flex budget (avg = .62). Scores are typically higher in spring than in fall, but they were much lower in AY 2014. - Controlling for GPA, Instructor, semester hours, scores on assessment questions improved, presumably due to the Excel assignment.

M 13: Analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance. (ACCT 4310), (O: 4)

Analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)

Exam score for WheelsNow case: 65.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The least-squares mean adjusted for GPA was 67.2, a 5.5% increase over the prior year (p=0.15). Even with practice quizzes, students struggle with analyzing data, through querying databases of transaction data and use of spreadsheet models. They enter the course not satisfying the RCB Computer Skills Prerequisites for spreadsheet use. Thus, the course needs a competency certification for spreadsheet skills, which would be a learning experience that both develops spreadsheet modeling skill and attests to students' skill level.

M 14: Evaluate internal control in information systems and design controls to mitigate risks in information systems (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)

Evaluate internal control in information systems and design controls to mitigate risks in information systems.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)

Exam score for 24-Seven part 2 questions: 62.3.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The least-squares mean adjusted for GPA was 62.7, a 6.8% decrease from the prior year (p=0.01). Performance on this objective has fluctuated in prior years. In 2013-14, students seemed to lose interest in continuing their work at a high level throughout the course.

M 15: Identify tax issues and apply tax laws to minimize tax liability (ACCT 4510), (O: 5)

Identify tax issues and apply tax laws to minimize tax liability.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)

To achieve exam scores of 70% or higher for all topical learning objectives.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

Topical learning objectives with exam scores below 70% decreased from three to two (out of 21 total topical learning objectives). PROGRESS TOWARD OBJECTIVE: Emphasis of real-world applications of tax law improved learning outcomes. OBJECTIVES REQUIRING CONTINUED ATTENTION: Emphasis in the areas of (1) corporate formation; and (2) partnership distributions requires continued attention.

M 16: Apply the auditing responsibility, performance, and reporting principles to fin. stmt. and internal control audits (ACCT 4610), (O: 6)

Understand and evaluate the auditor's responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled. Understand materiality; evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified; and differentiate among the various types of audit procedures used to gather sufficient appropriate audit. Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)

Avg Score of 75% or higher.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The level achieved exceeded target in 2 of the 3 assessment sub-objectives. The only sub-objective where performance lagged the target related to applying the reporting principle; although the level achieved improved from 61% to 70%, it still was below the target of 75%. The assessments show that students are meeting targets in the areas of applying the responsibility and performance principles, but are still lagging in applying the reporting principle despite the assessment improving from 61% to 70%. New in-class materials were covered with students which helped with identifying appropriate reports; these
lecture materials may account for the improvement in the reporting principle assessment.

**M 17: Understand and evaluate the auditor’s responsibility on the audit engagement. (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)**
Understand and evaluate the auditor’s responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
75% Or higher.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Multiple choice questions on exams in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014; 74% of students and 6 out 8 sections offered are taught by 5th year Ph.D. candidates. The remaining students and sections are taught by a full-time instructor. The coverage of auditing classes was necessitated by the departure of two full-time Ph. D. instructors. Fall 2014 classes are taught a 5th year Ph. D. candidate. Spring 2015 will be taught by a full-time Ph. D instructor and a 5th year Ph.D. candidate. Objective 1 is the same as Objective 4 in 2012/2013; however the assessment questions have been changed to better address the objective. Therefore, there is no comparison to the prior academic year.

**M 18: Understand materiality and differentiate among the various types of audit procedures. (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)**
Understand materiality; evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified; and differentiate among the various types of audit procedures used to gather sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
75% Or higher.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Multiple choice questions on exams in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014; 74% of students and 6 out 8 sections offered are taught by 5th year Ph.D. candidates. The remaining students and sections are taught by a full-time instructor. The coverage of auditing classes was necessitated by the departure of two full-time Ph. D. instructors. Fall 2014 classes are taught a 5th year Ph. D. candidate. Spring 2015 will be taught by a full-time Ph. D instructor and a 5th year Ph.D. candidate. Although Objective 2 is similar to Objectives 1 & 2 in 2012/2013, the assessment questions have been changed to better address the new objective. Therefore, there is no comparison to the prior academic year.

**M 19: Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results. (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)**
Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
75% Or Higher.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Multiple choice questions on exams in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014; 74% of students and 6 out 8 sections offered are taught by 5th year Ph.D. candidates. The remaining students and sections are taught by a full-time instructor. The coverage of auditing classes was necessitated by the departure of two full-time Ph. D. instructors. Fall 2014 classes are taught a 5th year Ph. D. candidate. Spring 2015 will be taught by a full-time Ph. D instructor and a 5th year Ph.D. candidate. Objective 3 is the same objective as in the prior year and the assessment questions are the same. The prior rate was 61%, therefore there was a 9 percentage point increase or 15% improvement. The mean is below the target.

**M 20: Develop effective written and oral comm. of audit judgments based on auditing principles and relevant evidence(ACCT4610) - CTW (O: 6)**
Develop and communicate in writing professional audit judgment by applying key auditing concepts to facts and evidence presented in audit problems.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
Alchemy Assignment: Scoring at least 75% on the memorandum.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Alchemy Assignment: Percentage of student scoring at least 75% on the memorandum. The prior rate was 99%. The mean is well above the target.

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

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

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 Partridge

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

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

ACCT4210
See Action Plan for Measure 8.

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

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn
ACCT4510

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

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
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

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

Add in-class instructional materials
We note significant improvement in achievement of this objective; however, we recognize that substantial improvement on this
objective is still required. To facilitate improvement on this objective, we added in-class instructional materials to model problem solving on this objective.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results. (ACCT 4610)  
  Outcome/Objective: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)  

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015  
Responsible Person/Group: Smith/Fuller

Create Excel Assignment
Create an excel assignment that requires students to manipulate and analyze data. Create multiple choice questions for the final exam that will test the student’s ability to use excel functions.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance (ACCT 4112)  
  Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Blunck

Create Excel Assignments
Create Excel assignments for the three questions with the lowest averages. Make the top three questions more challenging since we are meeting our goals on those. Hold the target at 73% for AY ending 2015.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Evaluate costing methods, budgeting practices, and decision-making alternatives for planning organizations operations (ACCT 4210)  
  Outcome/Objective: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Guymon

Create Excel Assignments
Create Excel assignments for the three questions with the lowest averages. There is still room for improvement on the questions with the highest averages. Increase the target to 70% for AY ending 2015.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Develop performance measures and analyze variances for controlling organizations’ operations. (ACCT 4210)  
  Outcome/Objective: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Guymon

Enrichment of Time Value of Money project
Time Value project is to be enriched by including more of Excel financial functions

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Analyze, value, and record operating activities (ACCT 4111).  
  Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: T. Park

Excel spreadsheet homework
Excel spreadsheet homework to analyze accounting system is to be reinforced

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Perform the steps in the accounting cycle (ACCT 4111).  
  Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: T. Park

In-Class exercise
Develop an in-class exercise related to applying the reporting principle.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Apply the auditing responsibility, performance, and reporting principles to fin. stmt. and internal control audits (ACCT 4610).  | Outcome/Objective: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Smith/Fuller

More in-class examples
More in-class examples will be developed

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Apply financial accounting theory and professional standards and judgment (ACCT 4113).  | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)  

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015  
Responsible Person/Group: T. Park

Redesign the introductory courses
We are redesigning the introductory courses, which will include adopting different textbooks with advanced online resources for students. Given the lead time for catalog changes, the implementation will occur AY 2015/2016. Fingers crossed for a storm-free winter in 2015.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Translate Business Activities into Accounting Information (ACCT 2101 and ACCT 2102)  | Outcome/Objective: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2015  
Responsible Person/Group: Clark and Partridge  
Additional Resources: Faculty and student time

Share set of practice lease problems
Professor Blunck has a set of practice lease problems that have been very helpful in teaching his students how to account for leases. Professor Blunck will share this resource with the other instructors of the course and encourage them to provide the to their students with hopes of increasing their student's understanding of lease accounting.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Analyze, value, and record financing activities (ACCT 4112).  | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112 and 4113)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Blunck

Spreadsheet skill progression
Create a spreadsheet skill progression for certifying skill level.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance. (ACCT 4310).  | Outcome/Objective: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Borthick

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

The course number has been attached to each SLO in the data input section.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?
Generally most of the SLOs have met their target. For those that are not met, the instructors have an Action Plan. Assessment shows that students’ Excel skills are weak. Action Plans for 2014-15 include strengthening the Excel skills of the students across several courses in each of the functional areas (Financial, Managerial, Auditing, Taxations, Systems).

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

All sections of all courses are assessed in Fall and Spring semesters. So all instructors are involved in the Assessment process. All instructors know which SLOs are assessed, are responsible for gathering data for the courses they teach, coming up with an Action Plan if the target is not met and then implementing the Action Plan in the subsequent academic year. Each course is assigned an assessment coordinator. All instructors for a course, submit assessment data for their sections to the course coordinator and discuss their Action Plans with the course coordinator. The course coordinator prepares a summary of the data across all sections of the course and submits the data to the person who is responsible for inputting the data into Weave.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Please see Action Plans for each SLO. The main proposed change in the BBA Accounting program is enhancement of the Excel skills of the students.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2013-2014 Accountancy PhD**  
*(As of 12/12/2016 06:08 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.

**G 6: Recruiting**  
Compete for the best and brightest students.

### 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.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 10: Recruiting Activities (G: 6)**
Prospective PhD students will be recruited from our own Masters programs and from other regions of the country.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Of the students taking comprehensive exams in the past five years, 83.3% (10/12) 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
All current students have taken the Critical Analysis seminar in each of the first three years of their programs. As part of this seminar, students continue to write down questions related to upcoming workshop papers and have their questions vetted during the seminar. This procedure continues to generate active research workshops where PhD students are engaged and learning to perform 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Of the four students currently beyond their third years, two have active research projects with faculty. 50% is below our target of 75%. Of the eight graduates in the past six years, three have had research in the publication process. 37.5% is below our target of 50%.

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

**Target for O4: Research presentations**
All students beyond the second year will have presented their research at internal workshops. 50% of graduating students will have presented a research paper at a research conference.
Findings 2013-2014 - Target: **Met**
All students beyond the second year have presented their research projects internally. Of the eight students who have graduated in the past five years, 4 (50%) have presented research at external research conferences. This just meets 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 2013-2014 - Target: **Partially Met**
100% of the graduates in the past six years have defended their dissertations in the first attempt. Of the five students currently on ABD status, four are on track to defend their proposals and final defense. One student continues to be 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 2013-2014 - Target: **Met**
Of the eight students who graduated in the past six years, four have placed at research institutions. At 50%, this just meets 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 2013-2014 - 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 minimum average overall effectiveness rating of 4.0 in semesters beyond the first one that they teach. 60% of students will achieve overall effectiveness ratings of at least 4.2 before graduating.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: **Met**
Over the past six years, all students have taught after passing their comprehensive exams. All graduates in the past six years have taught at least one upper-level course. Of the five students at ABD status, three have taught an upper level course. This average of 60% is above our target of 50%. Over the past six years, all students who have taught beyond their first course have attained an overall effectiveness rating of 4.0. Of the two students who graduated this reporting period, both achieved an overall effectiveness rating of at least 4.2 before graduating. 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 2013-2014 - Target: **Met**
Of the eight students who graduated in the past six years, all have placed at institutions with AACSB 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 observe the teaching of our most effective faculty and PhD students before they teach their first course. SEIPs are reviewed for each student. Any student who continually achieves ratings below 4.0 is required (rather than encouraged) to observe other faculty in the classroom as well as receive feedback from a faculty mentor. Students with average SEIPs below 4.2 are encouraged to observe other faculty and receive feedback from a faculty mentor.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Beginning of the Fall 2010 semester  
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** SOA Doctoral Program Committee

**Improve initial pass rate on comprehensive exams**

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

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

**Improve research collaborations**

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

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

**Recruitment of GSU Master’s students**

Recruitment of the best and brightest of our own Master's students to our PhD program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Each fall the School of Accountancy will hold a PhD Information Session to inform our own Master's students about our PhD program. This Information Session will include research active faculty and current PhD students.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** PhD Program Coordinator and PhD Faculty Committee

**Recruitment of senior faculty**

Senior accounting faculty who have achieved prominence in their research area will be recruited.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Research with faculty | Outcome/Objective: Collaborative research activity  
**Implementation Description:** Senior accounting faculty in financial accounting and auditing will be recruited to the School of Accountancy faculty.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** SOA Director and Recruiting Committee

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   SLO 1: Comprehensive exams in their first accounting seminar, incoming PhD students now complete a take-home midterm and final exam that include questions that resemble questions that would appear on their comprehensive exam. SLO 2: Critical evaluation of research. In their first three years of the program, PhD students attend a weekly Critical Thinking Seminar (ACCT 9100) where they learn to critically evaluate research. SLO 3: Collaborative research activity. In their first three years of the program, PhD students work as a Research Assistant for an accounting professor where they aid in conducting research and develop collaborative research projects. SLO 4: Research presentations. All PhD students are required to present the outcome of their 2nd year research paper at an internal workshop by the fall of their 3rd year. All PhD students are encouraged to present their research at external research conferences and the Miami Rookie Conference in their final year. SLO 5: Dissertation defense. All PhD students work closely with their supervising faculty member to develop a high-quality dissertation and form an appropriate dissertation committee to maximize the likelihood of successfully defending their dissertation. SLO 6: Initial placements - research. All PhD students work closely with their supervising faculty member to apply at research institutions and achieve visibility at such institutions. SLO 7: Teaching - training. In their first semester, all incoming PhD students complete a Seminar in University Teaching (BA 9200). SLO 8: Teaching - competency. All PhD students teach during their program and receive feedback via SEIPs (Student Evaluation of Instructor Profile). The program director also reviews each student’s SEIPs and provides feedback. SLO 9: Placement - teaching. All PhD students work closely with their supervising faculty member to apply at research institutions that will also utilize their teaching competency and interests.

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes...
Mission / Purpose

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

Goals

G1: 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.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Performance on relevant quiz questions was very poor. A new instructor that had to be replaced mid-course could contribute to the lower performance this semester. Also, AS student numbers or increasing and student quality is decreasing which also likely contributes to the overall performance.

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Performance on relevant quiz questions was very poor. A new instructor that had to be replaced mid-course could contribute to the lower performance this semester. Also, AS student numbers or increasing and student quality is decreasing which also likely contributes to the overall performance.

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Performance on relevant quiz questions was very poor. A new instructor that had to be replaced mid-course could contribute to the lower performance this semester. Also, AS student numbers or increasing and student quality is decreasing which also likely contributes to the overall performance.

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

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Rated as a 2.0. AS students generally do well in the course, especially relative to other majors. The course is perhaps too easy for AS majors while being perhaps too hard for other majors.

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

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Rated as a 2.0. AS students generally do well in the course, especially relative to other majors. The course is perhaps too easy for AS majors while being perhaps too hard for other majors.

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

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Rated as a 2.0. AS students generally do well in the course, especially relative to other majors. The course is perhaps too easy for AS majors while being perhaps too hard for other majors.

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

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

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

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

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Rated as a 2.5. Only 2/11 failed to get the major points of the first 7 of the 10 take home questions. 7 of the 11 scored an 84 or above, indicating significant progress on the more difficult duration, convexity and immunization problems which is very strong performance.

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

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

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

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

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

12% of students passed one exam, 12% passed two exams and 1 student passed 4 exams indicating 27% passed at least one exam.

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

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

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

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

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

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Eric Ulm

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Actuarial Science MAS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
Mission / Purpose

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

RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management.

RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

Goals

G 1: Actuarial valuation and risk modeling
Upon completion of the MAS program, students will be prepared to undertake actuarial valuation of liabilities and financial risk modeling of assets for insurance companies, financial institutions and consulting firms.

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

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Explanation of technical concepts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3)
The MAS graduate will be able to explain technical concepts to non-actuarial associates or clients.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
The MAS graduate will have the basic conceptual knowledge and technical skill in evaluating major types of risks for a typical insurance company’s investment portfolio.

O/O 3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The MAS graduate will have the basic conceptual knowledge and technical skills in evaluating major types of risks for a typical insurance company’s liability portfolio.

O/O 4: Enterprise Risk and Integration (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3)
The MAS graduate will have an appreciation of broader enterprise-wide risks and their integrations in insurance companies.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

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

Target for O2: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case studies from current events in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Measures were not collected in 13-14. The course, AS 8810, has changed in response to changes in the industry, philosophical perspective of changing program faculty, and new faculty teaching the course. See Assessment questions and Action Plans for additional information.

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

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Measures were not collected in 13-14. The course, AS 8810, has changed in response to changes in the industry, philosophical perspective of changing program faculty, and new faculty teaching the course. See Assessment questions and Action Plans for additional information.

**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.

**Target for O1: Explanation of technical concepts**

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Measures were not collected in 13-14. The course, AS 8810, has changed in response to changes in the industry, philosophical perspective of changing program faculty, and new faculty teaching the course. See Assessment questions and Action Plans for additional information.

**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)**

**Develop new coursework on in-depth analysis of accounting practices, conventions, and their implications**

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

**Improve instruction using integrated insurance company data**

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

**Development of new assessment plan**

Under the direction of the new MAS Faculty Director, a new assessment plan is being developed. The plan should be finalized in Dec. 2013 and the first round of data collection will be in Spring 2015.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

No data was collected in 13-14. The plan in place during 13-14 cycle was devised, implemented, and reported by a single faculty member who is no longer employed at GSU. The program has since shifted focus in response to industry changes and new faculty teaching in the program. Given the shifts, current MAS faculty decided that the current plan does not match the emphasis of the curriculum and the content of the course in which the assessment was embedded. A new plan is being developed with MAS faculty under the leadership of the new MAS program director. Data collection under the new plan is scheduled for Spring 2015.
Target for O1: Analytic

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

A sample of ten (10) students were assessed on their ability to critically analyze information from a civic, personal, and academic perspective. One hundred percent (100%) of students scored 3 or better on this criteria.

Target for O2: Communication

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

A sample of ten (10) students were assessed on their ability to communicate well organized ideas effectively with relatively grammatical errors. One hundred percent (100%) of students scored 3 or better on this criteria.

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

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Currently under review by the curriculum committee.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Currently under review by the Curriculum Committee.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Currently under review by the Curriculum Committee.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Currently under review by the Curriculum Committee.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 African American Studies BA
As of 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

Goals

G 1: Demonstrate critical reasoning
To be able to develop a thesis argument based on a critical understanding of social, economic, and political issues affecting people of African descent.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analytic skills (M: 1)
Students should be able to critically analyze and deconstruct concepts relevant to theory and research.

SLO 2: Communication skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
To be able to communicate ideas effectively through clearly written, well organized, and appropriately formatted scholarship

SLO 3: Acquisition of knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Demonstrate the ability acquire new knowledge and add to the body of knowledge in the field of African American Studies

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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 over generalizes and / or fails to organize data to support conclusions; 2) Paper reflects collection of data, but ignores critique and application of interdisciplinary scholarship; and 1) Paper relies primarily on rhetoric and generalized arguments. Communications Skills. 5. Paper is clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Paper is free of and uses appropriate (APA) writing style required for course. Citations are appropriately included to leave no room for charges of plagiarism. 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 be receive a rating of 3 or higher.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Analytic skills: AAS 3980 - Met – 83% 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. 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.

**Target for O2: Communication skills**

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

AAS 3980: Target met – 83% 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. AAS 3975: Target partially met. 75% 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. However 25% (2) of the papers reviewed failed to meet the criteria and was below expected norms. The primary weaknesses of these papers were in grammar and syntax.

**Target for O3: Acquisition of knowledge**

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

AAS 3980: Target met – A majority of the students (83%) scored 3 or better, the benchmark was met. A majority of the students were able to articulate key concepts and theoretical positions and clearly state a hypothesis. 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.

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

**Acquisition of knowledge**

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Final Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of knowledge
- **Implementation Description:** May 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** Unsure

**Analytic**

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Final Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Analytic skills
- **Implementation Description:** May 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee

**Communication skills**

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Final Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Communication skills
- **Implementation Description:** May 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** Unsure

**Action**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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: Acquisition 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
1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.
Currently under review of the Curriculum Committee.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment
process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Currently under review of the Curriculum Committee.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Currently under review of the Curriculum Committee.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Currently under review of the Curriculum Committee.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 African American Studies MA

As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST

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

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Analytic

AAS 6010: Eighty percent (80%) of the students will score six (6) or better on literature review section of the research proposal.
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

  *Course Objectives: Upon completion of the course, students will be prepared to: CO1: Assess ethical issues related to research, especially vulnerable and high risk populations CO2: Conceptualize and design a research proposal appropriate for social science research CO3: Understand, interpret and use descriptive and inferential statistics CO4: Integrate evidence-based practices and Afrocentric theories/concepts to inform research problem formulation and research design. Student Learning Outcomes: Upon completion of the course, students will be able to: SLO1: Prepare human subjects protocol (CO1) SLO2: Critique the appropriateness of methodological approaches relevant to research design, sample selection, measurement, data collection, measurement validation...*
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 the diversity that requires the scientific, biological, archaeological, and linguistic approaches to the study of humanity; (2) a cross-cultural and comparative study of humanity; and (3) a consideration of human problems within historical, cultural, and social contexts.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

In-class 'non-graded' bridge assignments are needed to help students translate the annotated bibliography assignment into a research proposal. This assignment is a mock review of the research proposal. The reviewer's scores will be aggregated to compose the students' grade for the assignment. Each mock review will last between 15 to 20 minutes (see Attachment B) (100 points). Students will have two opportunities during class to obtain informal instructor feedback on their research proposal prior to submitting it to the reviewers. The goal of this assignment is to give students constructive feedback on the primary components of the proposal and its merits in advancing the body of knowledge in African American Studies. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO2, SLO1, and SLO2. The Midterm The midterm examination is based on the course texts, in-class lectures, and the assigned article (see Attachment A) (100 points). The goal of this assignment is to teach students how to critically analyze, synthesize, and deconstruct empirical literature to communicate the importance of a research theme in order to formulate a research proposal. The table below summarizes the key components of the proposal. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO2, SLO4 and SLO5. The Final Research Proposal Paper The major assignment for the course is a research proposal. This assignment is the revised final draft from the Mock Review. The goal of this assignment is to teach students how to systematically collect and critique empirical research and apply Afrocentric theories and concepts in the context of an individual research theme. This assignment is designed to give students preliminary feedback on their proposal prior to submitting the final paper. Two external reviewers will be assigned to read each proposal and give feedback on the merits, strengths, and weaknesses of the proposal. The external review panel will consist of AAS faculty, former graduate students, and external researchers. The reviewer's scores will be aggregated to compose the students' grade for the assignment. Each mock review will last between 15 to 20 minutes (see Attachment C) (100 points). Students will have two opportunities during class to obtain informal instructor feedback on their research proposal prior to submitting it to the reviewers. The goal of this assignment is to give students constructive feedback on the primary components of the proposal and its merits in advancing the body of knowledge in African American Studies. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, CO4 and SLO2. The Final Research Proposal Paper The assignment for the course is a research proposal. This assignment is the revised final draft from the Mock Review. The goal of this assignment is to teach students how to critically analyze, synthesize, and deconstruct empirical literature to communicate the importance of a research theme in order to formulate a research proposal. The table below summarizes the key components of the proposal. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO4 and SLO5. Linkages between assignments: The Annotated Bibliography is linked to the Mock Research Proposal Review and Final Research Paper assignment in that the strengths/weaknesses and gaps in empirical literature inform the feasibility of the proposed research. The Mock Research Proposal Review is linked to the Final Research Proposal Paper in that they are written iterations of the Final Research Proposal.

Findings are used for internal purposes only (i.e., course instruction).

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

There are no current plans.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Anthropology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 06:08 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 the diversity that requires the scientific, biological, archaeological, and linguistic approaches to the study of humanity; (2) a cross-cultural and comparative study of humanity; and (3) a consideration of human problems within historical, cultural, and social contexts.
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 identify problems and appropriate critiques of 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**

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.

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

**Target for O1: Natural Selection**
- Ranking: 4/4 correct = Excellent 3/4 correct = Very Good 2/4 correct = Good 1/4 correct = Fair 0/4 correct = Poor
- Target: Over 70% = Excellent or Very good Under 10% = Fair or Poor

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Ranking Number of Students Percentage 4/4 – Excellent 80 76 3/4 – Very Good 18 17 2/4 – Good 3 2.8 1/4 – Fair 4 3.8 0/4 – Poor 1 0.9

**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

- Ranking: 4/4 correct = Excellent 3/4 correct = Very Good 2/4 correct = Good 1/4 correct = Fair 0/4 correct = Poor  
- Target: Over 70% = Excellent or Very Good Under 10% = Fair or Poor

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Ranking Number of Students Percentage 4/4 – Excellent 74 70.5% 3/4 – Very Good 19 18% 2/4 – Good 5 4.8% 1/4 – Fair 7 6.6% 0/4 – Poor 0%

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

Streamlining Instruction, Evaluation and Mentorship

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

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Identifying Major Elements of the Anthropological Critique of Race | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept
Implementation Description: We target the next assessment cycle
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010

Integrating Instructional and Testing Tools

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

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

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

1. Findings are consistent with previous years, indicating consistent achievement in student learning. The assessment process, however, could be more nuanced. While the overall assessment results indicate that students are indeed gaining knowledge in the areas targeted for monitoring, further analysis of answer patterns may reveal more about specific difficulties students are having with different aspects of the material. 2. Continued monitoring of target areas for student learning impact the program in the sense that the topics identified for learning outcomes assessment are emphasized in the classroom. 3) Based on the evaluation of the previous year’s assessment report, this year emphasis was placed on overall achievement and not on scored for individual questions. This allows to gain an overall picture of student learning.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

For following assessment cycles, a proposal that will be presented to the faculty is to develop a department-wide question inventory and sample students from more sections of the core course. This will be discussed among the faculty in a faculty meeting and implemented, modified, or tabled accordingly.

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, 4, 5)
Students apply key concepts and methods relevant to each anthropological subfield by conducting specialized methodological exercises. Under the premise that learning is best achieved through application, students identify, utilize and/or critique fundamental anthropological concepts, theory and methodology in cultural, biological, and archaeological anthropology, through conducting original research and/or critically evaluating current, peer-reviewed research in the field.

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

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

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

SLO 2: Content knowledge (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)
Students identify, apply and critique anthropological theory, methods and knowledge, appropriate to the subfield.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
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, 4)
Students interpret and produce competent and discipline-appropriate communication in speech and writing.
Measure, 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>major flaws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>conception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

N=5 1. Unsatisfactory: 0 2. Fair: 0 3. Good: 1 (44/40) 4. Excellent: 4 (2x 46/50, 1x 48/50, 1x 50/50)

**Target for O2: Content knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

N=5 1. Unsatisfactory: 0 2. Fair: 0 3. Good: 1 (44/40) 4. Excellent: 4 (2x 46/50, 1x 48/50, 1x 50/50)

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

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

N=5 1. Unsatisfactory: 0 2. Fair: 0 3. Good: 1 (44/40) 4. Excellent: 4 (2x 46/50, 1x 48/50, 1x 50/50)

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

Students in ANTH2020 - 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

N=19 Excellent (4) = 12 Good (3) = 5 Fair (2) = 2 Poor (1) = 0 Students demonstrated ability to identify and investigate cultural manifestations
**Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication**

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 10 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 10 and 12 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 12 and 16 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 16 and 20 (max) Traget: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior ability to construct an ethnographic narrative in proper English prose

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

n=19 Excellent (4) = 12 Good (3) = 5 Fair (2) = 2 Poor (1) = 0 Students demonstrated ability to communicate in solid english prose, appropriate to the discipline

**M 3: Capstone Seminar Paper (O: 2, 3)**

The Senior 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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Approximately 88% of students who turned in the assignment scored a 4 or 5; 6% scored a 3; % had a 2; 6% scored a 1. 5: 12 students 4: 3 students 3: 1 students 2: 1 students 1: O students 1 student did not complete the assignment

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Outcomes: Approximately 88% of students who turned in the assignment scored a 4 or 5; 6% scored a 3; % had a 2; 6% scored a 1. ANTH4970: 5: 12 students 4: 3 students 3: 1 students 2: 1 students 1: O students 1 student did not complete the assignment

**M 4: Biological Anthropology: Biocultural Approach and Applications (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students apply fundamental biological anthropology concepts and methods by completing a Problem Based Learning assignment on a bioanthropology project. Students analyze and critically interpret the data to support or disprove their hypotheses and generate recommendations for action. 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, generating recommendations), and the quality of writing in terms of organization and competent, academic English prose. See attached document for details.

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

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

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 10 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 10 and 12 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 12 and 16 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 16 and 20 (max) Traget: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior understanding of methods and process.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Excellent: 21 Good: 3 Fair: 1 Poor: 0

**Target for O2: Content knowledge**

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 10 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 10 and 12 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 12 and 16 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 16 and 20 (max) Traget: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior understanding of methods and process.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Excellent: 21 Good: 3 Fair: 1 Poor: 0

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

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 10 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 10 and 12 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 12 and 16 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 16 and 20 (max) Traget: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating competent use of discipline-appropriate English prose.
**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Excellent: 21 Good: 3 Fair: 1 Poor: 0

### M 5: Linguistic Anthropology - Transcription (O: 1)

Students apply fundamental linguistic anthropology concepts and methods by audorecording and transcribing a conversation according to the standards of full transcription in linguistic anthropology. Total points: 10, distributed according to the attached rubric.


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

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

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or use of transcription symbols and conventions. Scores below 5.
2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems use of transcription symbols and conventions. Scores between 5 and 6.
3. Good: competent conception and execution of project and good use of transcription symbols and conventions: Scores between 7 and 8.
4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, extensive and correct use of transcription symbols and conventions. Scores between 9 and 10 (max) Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating competent application of full transcription methodologies.

### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

N= 9
1. Unsatisfactory: 0 2. Fair: 0 3. Good: 0 4. Excellent: 9 (2x 9.5/10 and 7x10/10) Students properly record and transcribe conversation

### 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:** no
- **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:** no
- **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
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)

Advise ment
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 advisement
While the target was not fully reached, one student failed to return the exercise, receiving a score of 0, while one submission was satisfactory but had moderate conceptual and methodological problems. The 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: Competence in Fundamental Anthropological Methods

Monitoring and modification
The target for Excellent and Outstanding students was achieved, however 2% of students 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

Coaching
This assessment will continue to be used. As noted in last year’s action plan, the instructor worked with students on points of overlap with another one in which they are asked to write a personal statement. Different styles and writing for different audiences sometimes frees up students’ thought processes to come up with ideas of which they had not previously thought.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: Low

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

Coaching
This assessment will continue to be used. As noted in last year’s action plan, the instructor worked with students on points of overlap with another one in which they are asked to write a personal statement. Different styles and writing for different audiences sometimes frees up students’ thought processes to come up with ideas of which they had not previously thought.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Capstone Seminar Paper | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Findings indicate that student learning objectives are consistently achieved in the program. Changes have entailed more detailed monitoring of student achievement, expanded across sub-disciplines. This year we have included assessment on all 4 sub-disciplines represented in the department. In the past few years the assessment process has steadily evolved and we appear to have found a satisfactory, common assessment method across sub-disciplines.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Given the highly diverse nature of anthropology, the assessment process is helping in identifying a common method for monitoring student progress. We are basing our assessment on a model of Problem Based Learning, Lab, or other targeted research exercise module, and orienting coursework to accommodate such types of hands-on engagement by students. The department plan is to continue on this trajectory, incorporating all four subdisciplines, newly represented in full in our department. The addition of linguistics, and faculty monitoring and discussion of both teaching and learning process, and results is continuing, according to previous action plans.

---
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(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 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 of 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.

Anthropology is a highly diversified science, with five subfields, biological, cultural, archaeological, linguistic and applied anthropology, each addressing a different aspect of the human experience. All five directions are represented in the Department of Anthropology at GSU. There are distinct foundations and skills associated with each subfield, and graduate student reflects this diversity. As a result, there cannot be a common assessment core but each student crafts a specific trajectory in close collaboration with the faculty advisor and committee. The advisor and committee assess the specific learning achievements of students. The results of the comprehensive exam reflect particular areas of assessment per student.

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 and analyze anthropological knowledge relevant to their graduate research through a comprehensive examination, which consists of a topical, a theoretical and a methodological segment. The comprehensive examination is evaluated by the faculty members forming the students’ committee. Target: 0 Fail, minimal contingent pass, 80% Pass at first try

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the 2013-2014 cycle, 19 third semester graduate students took comprehensive exams. 19 passed all three portions of their comprehensive examinations on the first try and 3 on their second try, demonstrating a. Ability to synthesize and analyze theoretical approaches relevant to their research interests b. Command of anthropological research relevant to the area and topical concerns of their research c. Command of methodological issues, techniques, and ethics relevant to their research project. 3 students were required to improve on a portion of the exam by rewriting, and are in the process of completing their rewrite.

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, the theory and methods pertinent 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 exam on the first try, (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. Anthropology is a highly diversified science, with five subfields, biological, cultural, archaeological, linguistic and applied anthropology, each addressing a different aspect of the human experience. All five directions are represented in the Department of Anthropology at GSU. There are distinct foundations and skills associated with each subfield, and graduate student reflects this diversity. As a result, there cannot be a common assessment core but each student crafts a specific trajectory in close collaboration with the faculty advisor and committee. The advisor and committee assess the specific learning achievements of students. Successful defense of student theses and practicum papers reflect success in particular areas of assessment, as appropriate for each student.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the 2013-2014 cycle, a total of 10 students reached their final semester in the program. All 10 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, as well as major faculty advisors, discuss 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
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 focus 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

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. While research and writeup vary 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

Writing seminar
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 writing seminar course will serve as a hands-on, workshop for improving academic research and writing during the third and fourth semester of study.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Assessment findings consistently indicate a high level of student achievement in the program. A particularity of our program, however, is the highly diverse nature of anthropological inquiry, which means that there can be no single, unified metric to assess students, since subdisciplines, and projects are so highly diverse. A cultural or linguistic anthropology project, for instance, utilizes entirely different theoretical and methodological structures than a bioarchaeology project, or a primatological project. While this is not considered an assessment weakness, it does make it difficult to fully illuminate the details of the assessment process, since it depends on the expertise of the particular graduate advisor and committee, relative to each student project. In light of previous cycles' findings, departmental programmatic conversations, and assessment report feedback, the faculty is considering different methods for both enhancing student learning opportunities and monitoring, including a new research and writing seminar to be offered for the first time in the following assessment cycle, and different methods for committee reporting of student results in comprehensive exams and MA research projects. A new committee reporting form is currently being tested.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

1. Report forms: A new form for reporting comprehensive exam results and thesis defense results has been created and being tested.
2. Graduate Research and Writing Seminar: A new course for 3rd and 4th semester graduate students, to specifically address research writing has been created and will be offered for the first time in Spring 15. Both these changes are likely to positively impact both student learning and the assessment process. Actions planned and implemented in previous cycles, emphasizing faculty communication and close monitoring of graduate advisees are continuing and contributing to student learnign target achievement.
anthropology, speech and hearing science, psychology, cognitive science, sociolinguistics, lexicography, intercultural communication, natural language processing, forensics, and text and discourse analysis.

Goals

G 1: Language Analysis
Graduates of the BA in Applied Linguistics will be competent language analysts.

G 2: Critical Thinking
Graduates of the BA in Applied Linguistics will be critical thinkers, capable of considering multiple perspectives and recognizing their own and others' biases.

G 3: Communication
Graduates of the BA in Applied Linguistics will be competent communicators in a variety of cultural contexts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Core Areas of Linguistics (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students demonstrate understanding of the core areas within linguistic study: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and semantics.

SLO 2: Awareness of Bias (G: 2) (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 (G: 1) (M: 3, 4, 5)
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 (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 6)
Students demonstrate competency in making credible claims about data they have collected and analyzed themselves.

SLO 5: Written Communication and Editing Skills (G: 3) (M: 7)
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Across four sections of AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics in the fall and spring, 64 out of 66 students, or 97%, demonstrated their mastery of foundational linguistic knowledge by scoring 70% or higher on the final exam. The target for this measure was far exceeded and the associated outcome of "Core Areas of Linguistics" was realized.

M 2: Final Papers in AL 3031 Language in Society and AL 4151 Communication across Cultures (O: 2)
The CTW papers in AL 3031 are graded on a 4 point rubric that includes the following categories: (A) identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives; (B) shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem. The AL 4151 rubric for CTW papers includes the following categories: (A) demonstrates an honest awareness of one's feelings/thoughts about cultural difference; (B) shows awareness of oneself as a cultural being. The percentage of students scoring at least "competent" on these areas on the final CTW papers in these course will be tabulated.

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

Target for O2: Awareness of Bias
On final CTW papers in AL 3031 and AL 4151, at least 80% of students will be judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all relevant criteria on the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
During fall and spring semesters, 44 of 47 students, or 93%, in AL 3031 Language in Society scored at least competent on "Identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives" and 41 of 47 students, or 87%, scored at least competent on "Shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem". In AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, 37 of 40 students, or 93%, scored at least competent on both "Demonstrates an honest awareness of one's feelings/thoughts about cultural difference" and 38 of 40 students, or 95%, scored at least competent on "Shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being". The target was therefore met across all criteria, and the associate learning outcome of Awareness of Bias was achieved.
M 3: Performance on language analysis problems (O: 3)
The final examinations in AL 4011 Phonetics & Phonology and AL 4012 Morphology & Syntax consist primarily of language analysis problems. The number of students demonstrating competency in linguistic analysis on these examinations will be tabulated.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure
80% of students will demonstrate competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on the final examinations in AL 4011 and AL 4012.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In AL 4011 Phonetics & Phonology, 32 of 35 students demonstrated their competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on the final examination. In AL 4012 Morphology & Syntax, 29 of 33 students scored at 70% or above on the final. Across these two courses, 90% of students succeeded on this measure; the target was met across all criteria and the associated learning outcome of Analysis of Linguistic Structure was realized.

M 4: Performance on language analysis papers (O: 3)
In AL 3041 Second Language Acquisition, students write papers critically examining the characteristics of written or oral language samples produced by non-native speakers (i.e., interlanguage). The number of students successfully completing competent interlanguage analysis papers will be tabulated.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure
80% of students will demonstrate competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on interlanguage papers in AL 3041.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In AL 3041 Second Language Acquisition courses across fall and spring semesters, 55 of 57 students, or 96%, demonstrated competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on interlanguage analysis papers. This target was met, and the associated outcome of Analysis of Linguistic Structure was achieved.

M 5: Performance on semantic analysis portfolios (O: 3)
Students in AL 4111 Semantics & Pragmatics complete a portfolio project across multiple weeks of the semester, compiling their semantic analyses of a single word. Portfolios are assessed with a rubric that judges students' linguistic analysis skills to be Not Yet Competent, Partially Competent, Competent, or Sophisticated across a number of criteria, including the thoroughness and thoughtfulness of the analyses.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure
80% of students in AL 4111 Semantics & Pragmatics will be judged Competent or Sophisticated in linguistic analysis based on their performance on the semantic analysis portfolio assignment.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
AL 4111 Semantics & Pragmatics will become part of the "Linguistic Analysis" set of upper level elective choices in the next catalog change. We will begin collecting and analyzing data for this measure in the coming cycle.

M 6: Final Papers in CTW Courses (O: 4)
The final papers in CTW courses (e.g., AL 3031 Language in Society, AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, and AL 4241 Senior Seminar in Applied Linguistics) are graded on a 4 point rubric that includes the following categories: (C) presents convincing arguments based on data; (D) draws reasonable conclusions. The percentage of students scoring at least "competent" on these areas will be tabulated.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Across fall and spring semesters in the 2013-2014 cycle, 41 of 47 students, or 82.9%, in AL 3031 Language in Society scored at least competent on the final paper with regard to "Presents convincing arguments based on linguistic data" and "Draws reasonable conclusions". In AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, 36 of 40 students, or 90%, scored at least competent on "Presents convincing arguments based on data" and 38 of 40 students, or 95%, scored at least competent on "Draws reasonable conclusions". This target was met across all criteria, and the associated learning outcome of Reporting on Primary Research was achieved.

M 7: Writing assignments in CTW courses (O: 5)
The final papers in CTW courses (e.g., AL 3031 Language in Society, AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, and AL 4241 Senior Seminar in Applied Linguistics) are rated on a 4 point rubric in five areas, including (E) presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion. The number of students who score "competent" or "sophisticated" in this area on the final papers for these courses will be tabulated.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O5: Written Communication and Editing Skills
80% of students will be judged as competent or sophisticated in the area of "presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized
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 2021 and move straight into AL 3021.
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair

Undergraduate GTA training
We have determined that the PhD students teaching as GTAs in our undergraduate courses need some support from faculty, especially in terms of policies and procedures for the following: 1. Registration adjustments 2. Academic dishonesty 3. Observations 4. SLO data 5. Course coordinators

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The director of undergraduate studies will gather information from the faculty and put together a training session for GTAs.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

The BA in Applied Linguistics has five student learning outcomes linked to three main goals. Each learning outcome is associated with one or more mandatory courses in the major program of study, as outlined below: SLO 1 Core areas of linguistics - Students demonstrate understanding of core areas within linguistic study: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and...
The Master's degree in Applied Linguistics integrates the study of linguistic theory with practical applications and focuses on the curriculum, and the other to implement training sessions each semester for the GTAs teaching in the undergraduate program. They are moving forward with two new action plans - one to add an AL course (AL 2012 Languages of the World) into the university core faculty believes new signature experience courses like internships, study abroad, etc. would be better for students. Furthermore, we have decided to delete the requirement of two upper level electives outside the department, in cognate disciplines. This programmatic experience bottle-necks (AL 4121 Senior Seminar CTW for AL 4151 Communication across Cultures). In addition, the faculty assessment process in the coming cycle. However, our major continues to grow each year, and for this reason the undergraduate have been fully analyzed in terms of their long-term impacts, we are not planning any major changes to the educational program or changes to the assessment process.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

In contrast to years past, when targets for outcomes were sometimes only partially met, this year all targets were met, indicating that our students are meeting each of our five learning outcomes and thus achieving our three program goals. Our students have often had trouble, for example, with the measure for learning objective one Core Areas of Linguistics, and have not always met our target for that measure. We recently made a major programmatic change in response to this issue, creating a new lower-level introductory course called AL 2021 Introduction to English Linguistics, which now functions as a prerequisite to AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics (the course associated with this SLO and its measure). AL 2021 is evidently proving successful in two ways: first, by using an exemption exam for AL 2021 in order to separate students who need more basic instruction from those who already have sufficient background to succeed in upper level coursework; and second, by better scaffolding students' knowledge of the core areas of linguistics for those who take the new lower-level course. Since the implementation of this curricular change, many more of our students are performing satisfactorily in AL 3021. On another note, our CTW courses continue to be successful on a number of levels, including consistently accomplishing three of our five learning outcomes (Awareness of Bias, Reporting on Primary Research, and Written Communication and Editing Skills). We have very low failure rates in our CTW courses as compared to other departments; at the same, based on end of course student evaluation comments, most students seem to enjoy these mandatory courses and find them very useful in developing a variety of skills.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are used and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

The director of undergraduate studies collects and compiles data throughout the year in order to complete the SLO report each fall. In writing the report, the undergraduate director compares data with targets for each measure, as well as with data from previous years. Data are also reviewed in relation to planned and in progress action plans to determine how the implementation and status of those plans and objectives have changed. The final draft of the report is compiled and circulated for review to each member of faculty. After any suggested revisions have been made, the final report is shared with the entire department faculty via email and discussed at a faculty meeting. Insights shared by faculty function to guide program changes developed by the curriculum committee.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Because all of our targets for this year were met, and because we recently made some major programmatic changes that have not been fully analyzed in terms of their long-term impacts, we are not planning any major changes to the educational program or assessment process in the coming cycle. However, our major continues to grow each year, and for this reason the undergraduate curriculum committee in our department is considering a few small changes in the major program of study that would allow more flexibility for students struggling to finish their major requirements in a timely manner. For example, we are in the process of developing additional upper level elective courses that could be substituted for some of the current mandatory courses that experience bottle-necks (AL 4121 Senior Seminar CTW for AL 4151 Communication across Cultures CTW). In addition, the faculty has decided to delete the requirement of two upper level electives outside the department, in cognate disciplines. This programmatic requirement is a hold-over from the days when our undergraduate program was a BIS degree instead of a BA program, and the faculty believes new signature experience courses like internships, study abroad, etc. would be better for students. Furthermore, we are moving forward with two new action plans - one to add an AL course (AL 2012 Languages of the World) into the university core curriculum, and the other to implement training sessions each semester for the GTAs teaching in the undergraduate program.
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Mission / Purpose
The Master's degree in Applied Linguistics integrates the study of linguistic theory with practical applications and focuses on the
language acquisition needs of the adult or near-adult learner of an additional language. Students receive the theoretical and practical foundational knowledge needed to teach language at the postsecondary level and to progress to doctoral work in applied linguistics or other language-study or language-teaching related areas.

### 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

**SLO 1: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**

- Demonstrates knowledge of the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse

**SLO 2: Teaching methodology (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 5)**

- Applies the basic principles of ESL/EFL learning and teaching methodology

**SLO 3: Professional development (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 6)**

- Reflectively engages in professional development activities as a means of promoting personal professional growth.

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

- Uses technology effectively in research and teaching

**SLO 5: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

- Communicates effectively in both written and oral language in English

**SLO 6: Connecting theory and practice (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4)**

- Analyzes and critiques theory and practice of L2 teaching and learning

**SLO 7: Cultural knowledge (G: 1) (M: 3)**

- Uses cultural knowledge in second language learning and teaching

### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

96% of 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 for the outcome "professional development."

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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
95% of students scored "good" or "excellent" 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
95% of the students were rated "excellent" or "good" in connecting theory to practice and scholarship on their MA papers.

M 5: classroom teaching observation (O: 2)
For their classroom-based experience portfolio requirement, students' classroom teaching will be observed by an experienced supervising teacher using a rubric. 90% of students will score "meet expectations" in all rubric categories.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O2: Teaching methodology
90% of students will score "meet expectations" in all rubric categories for their classroom teaching observation.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students scored "meet expectations" in all rubric categories for their classroom teaching observation.

M 6: Professional Development Reflections (O: 3)
For students' professional development portfolio requirement, reflections written for all professional development activities reported in the portfolio will be assessed by MA advisors using a rubric. 90% of students will meet expectations by scoring "good" or "excellent" in all rubric categories.
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

Target for O3: Professional development
90% of students will meet expectations by scoring "good" or "excellent" in all rubric categories for their portfolio professional development activities reflections.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students met expectations by scoring "good" or "excellent" in all rubric categories for their portfolio professional development activities reflections.

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

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: Teaching performance and videotapes | 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 teaching observation | 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.

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 Reflections | 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

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Knowledge of linguistic systems of English: AL 8460 English Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers Teaching methodology: AL 8450 Approaches to Teaching a Second Language; AL 8480 Classroom Practices in TESL/FL Professional development: Portfolio requirement: Reflections on two professional development activities per term Technology: AL 8620 Technology and Language Teaching Communication: Oral presentations and research papers required in each course; Master's Paper and oral presentation of Master's Paper Connecting theory and practice: AL 8450 Approaches to Teaching a Second Language; AL 8250 Second Language Acquisition; portfolio reflections

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

All targets were met. In previous years, some targets not met had included confidence in using technology and applying understanding of other cultures in the language classroom. In response, we added a course, Technology and Language Teaching, and we strengthened the pedagogical connections made in our Intercultural Communication course. More recently one target not met was connecting theory with practice. In response, we asked advisors to encourage explicit reflection on theory and practice connections in their advisees' portfolio professional development reflections, and we added a rubric for advisors to use in evaluating those reflections and the personal practice connections articulated in them. This was one of two new rubrics used over the past year. The other rubric was for supervisors who evaluate our MA students' classroom-based experience, i.e., classroom teaching. In both cases, we moved away from simple completion measures, that is, counting the number of reflections written and verifying the number of hours spent teaching, to rubric-based evaluation of written reflections and classroom teaching. MA paper advisors were also urged to call students' attention to the need to connect theory and practice in their MA papers, an explicit category in the MA paper scoring rubric. We now have met our theory and practice connection target.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment findings are shared at a full-faculty meeting, discussed in a graduate faculty meeting, and discussed in MA Curriculum Committee meetings. Graduate faculty advice is solicited at graduate faculty meetings for input on possible improvements in assessment measures, outcomes, and instruction. Those involved in MA course instruction have collaborated on the development of rubrics for, for example, classroom observation evaluation and portfolio professional development reflection evaluation.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Since all targets were met, we are pleased with the most recent changes that were made, i.e., the addition of supervisor-evaluated classroom observations and advisor evaluation of professional development portfolio reflections. No additional changes are currently planned.
**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**

**M 1: Qualifying exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Six students took the QE in 2013; five passed and one failed. The one who failed did not meet expectations, but 100% of students who passed scored at least "meets expectations" for theory and content knowledge. Overall, 60% met expectations, 17% exceeded expectations, and 17% did not meet expectations.

**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 research methodology competence.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Six students took the QE in 2013; five passed and one failed. The one who failed did not meet expectations, but 100% of students who passed scored at least "meets expectations" for research methodology competence. Overall, 50% met expectations, 33% exceeded expectations, and 17% did not meet expectations.

**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; 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 about his/her research and future in an appropriate and thoughtful way), or "Exceeds 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

Six students took the QE in 2013; five passed and one failed. The one who failed did not meet expectations, but 100% of students who passed scored at least "meets expectations" for both components of communication skills. Overall, for writing 50% met expectations, 33% exceeded expectations, and 17% did not meet expectations; for speaking, 33% met expectations, 50% exceeded expectations, and 17% did not meet expectations.

### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

Six students took the QE in 2013; five passed and one failed. The one who failed did not meet expectations, but 100% of students who passed scored at least "meets expectations" for career planning and development. Overall, 33% met expectations, 50% exceeded expectations, and 17% did not meet expectations.

### 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 2013-2014 - 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. All scored "Exceeds expectations" for at least one question.

### 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

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

### 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
61% of graduate students beyond their second year presented at least one paper at a conference, with most of those presenting multiple papers (at least 44% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% (of four) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% (of four) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% (of four) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% (of four) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**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 2013-2014 - 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)**

**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:** Medium

**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:** Medium

**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.
change QE target

Because we have fewer than ten students in any given year, our target of having 90% of students meet expectations on the Qualifying Exam in effect would mean that all students must meet expectations if we look at each year individually (i.e. nobody could ever fail). Therefore, we will change our target to specify that 90% of students over a three-year period meet expectations, allowing for an occasional student who does not work out in the program.

monitor student presentations & obstacles to presenting

For now, we are not making changes in response to this unmet target, since we don’t know if it represents a systematic problem or merely a anomalous year. However, we will be looking at student presentations more closely this year, and if students are not presenting, we will look at what obstacles they are facing to presenting to see if we can address those obstacles.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

In this round of assessment, we have seen improvement in one area (student publications) but did not meet our targets in two others (Qualifying Exam performance and percentage of students presenting), both of which are targets that we have met in the past. While the lower number of students who presented at conferences during the past assessment period may just be an anomaly, it is possible that the limited funding for students may have affected their ability to attend the most important conferences (two of which were on the west coast this year). We intend to monitor the situation to see if the number of students presenting again does not meet our target, and if so, what obstacles there are to their presenting. On the other hand, all students who graduated this year have had at least one published or in-press refereed journal article or book chapter, an improvement over previous years. The fact that we are now monitoring student publications throughout the program increases the chances that most students will be mentored through the publication process and succeed in publishing at least one paper during their graduate study. Thus, the long-term results look very positive.

In the case of the Qualifying Exam, the failure to meet the target was based on one student who did not pass the exam, and in fact did not meet expectations in any area of the exam. On the other hand, the other five students all met or exceeded expectations on every part of the exam, and thus we feel that this (new) process is beneficial for students, who for the most part are able to excel at this challenge. The change from a Qualifying Paper to a Qualifying Exam, first made in the reporting cycle before the current one, appears to have had positive results overall. Students now have an opportunity to talk to a faculty committee about their work and interests early on in the program, as well as have practice for similar events such as their dissertation defense and conference presentations. The fact that we now have a rubric assessing their work at this stage allows us to have a better idea of where students’ strengths and weaknesses are (although thus far the only student who did not meet expectations had difficulties in all areas).

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

We are not implementing any changes in the educational program at this time. In general, our outcomes suggest that the program is preparing students well. In terms of assessment practices, based on the first two years’ experience with the Qualifying Exam, we have revised the rubric to make it more explicit. The revised version will be used for the first time this year. We are also now providing students with the rubric so they can see what our expectations are. We are changing the target for the Qualifying Exam so that the target percentages are calculated over a period of three years instead of each year. We may need to change other targets, such as the publication target, to likewise be calculated over multiple years, so that percentages don’t vary wildly from year to year due to the small numbers of students at each stage. However, we are leaving them as is for the time being. From the previous years’ action plans, we are continuing to monitor student publications so that we know whom to encourage faculty to mentor on publishing.
**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

G 1: Goals

We address our overall mission in the following ways:

- Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills
- Expand students understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts
- Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world
- Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

G 2: Delineated Goals

- Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills
- Expand students understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts
- Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world
- Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Theoretical and critical thinking (M: 1, 3)**

Knowledge of art criticism and theory and facility in applying theory and critical thinking to visual analysis. 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Ten students graduated Spring 2014. The majority of these students (5) were rated between accomplished and exemplary (3.5), and three were rated as exemplary (4). The average for all students was 3.5 -- the achievement target 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Of the ten students assessed for this outcome, the majority (6) were assessed as exemplary (4). The overall average for all students was 3.55 -- the achievement target for this goal 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Three of the assessed students were ranked accomplished (3), five were ranked between accomplished and exemplary (3.5), and two were ranked as accomplished (4). The average for all students was 3.45 -- for all intents and purposes, the target for this goal was met (a variation of .05 is insignificant in this context).

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Two of the assessed students were ranked accomplished (3), three were ranked between accomplished and exemplary (3.5), and five were ranked accomplished (4). The average for all students was 3.65 -- the target for this goal was met.

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
 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.

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).

Continue Exhibition Opportunities
For the past three years, the School of Art and Design has created an opportunity for graduating MFA students to exhibit at the Aqua Hotel during Art Basel/Miami. This is a huge opportunity for helping students establish their professional profiles and is integral to their professional practice. The School of Art and Design plans to continue to offer this type of opportunity going forward.

New Professional Practice Course
The previous course proved to be inadequate. The School of Art and Design is implementing a new Professional Practices course, which will take place in the second year of MFA studies. The course will cover elements of fine art and design practice needed for life outside the university (e.g. gallery representation, incorporating a small business, copyright issues, etc).

Thesis Writing Course
As part of its plan to enhance the professionalism of its MFA students, the Welch School of Art and Design will implement a Thesis Writing course for its students. The course will occur at the beginning of the third year of the MFA and will focus on the elements needed for research and writing at the professional level.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings? 

The outcome findings appear to indicate that the program is successful. That said, the School of Art and Design is committed to evolving its programs and to that end is working on a retooling of the MFA. This redesign is geared toward making the course of
study more transparent and streamlined. It also adds a significant Professional Development/Preparation element to the curriculum.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The MFA redesign is not driven by any dips in our assessment numbers but by student feedback regarding what they wish to see in a program. Further, the redesign is based on best practices by peer institution and is calculated to keep the MFA program current and relevant.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Art and Design Assessment of Core**

(As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST)

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 1: Critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain broad knowledge of World art history and demonstrate critical-thinking relative to the study of the visual arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Critical thinking in core (G: 1) (M: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Critical thinking in multiple choice exam (O: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One exam from AH 1850 was selected for assessment. The exam had 50 multiple choice questions, of which 8 were selected for CT assessment. The average correct response to the “CT” questions was measured, and compared to the overall test average. The average response to the 8 &quot;CT&quot; questions: 92% Average test score overall: 91% The average score on the CT questions exceeds target of 75%, an is in keeping with the high test average overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking in Core Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to: 1) include 15-20 CT questions on every exam and 2) include class discussion of critical thinking in test format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: AH faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CT in Art History Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to: 1) encourage faculty to include 15-20 critical thinking questions in their exams and 2) encourage faculty to employ more effective practices in writing multiple choice exams (eg. avoiding, when possible, the use of &quot;all of the above&quot; and &quot;none of the above&quot; answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Art History faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

1) desired result of 75% or higher was achieved. 2) results exceeded previous two years. 3) we have not made any recent changes in the assessment process. For 2014-15 cycle, however, some survey courses are being taught without a textbook. This is an attempt to defray excessive textbook costs for the students and to instead employ alternative (and free) options via D2L (eg. short articles, lecture outlines, pptx, online databases). 1) the results for 2013-14 are positive, but they raise the question of consistency across the survey level courses. The assessment coordinator will remind faculty to include a minimum number of CT questions and encourage them to employ best practices in writing multiple choice exams. 2) n/a 3) n/a

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment finding will be discussed in the next faculty meeting at the end of the fall 2014 semester.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Art Education BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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).

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).

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).

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).

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

Use of video technology

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

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio + | Outcome/Objective: Instruction
| Instructional Resources | Learning Environment
Implementation Description: Considering the grant cycle for Tech Fee awards, we intend to make equipment purchases in the summer for use in Fall 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

Increase student field experience hours
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.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Instruction

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

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.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Instruction

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

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.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Instruction

Responsible Person/Group: Art Education 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

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.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Instruction

Responsible Person/Group: Art Education area
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art Education MAEd 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

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
The total number of 10 MAED students completed their thesis with the average score of 4.5, which exceeded the aimed average score of 4. The target for this goal was met.

Target for O2: Research skills in critically analyzing evidence
Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
The total number of 10 MAED students completed their thesis with the average score of 5, which exceeded the aimed average score of 4. The target for this goal was met.

Target for O3: Written Communication Skills
Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
The total number of 10 MAED students completed their thesis with the average score of 4.8, which exceeded the aimed average score of 4. The target for this goal was met.

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

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning in the fall semester 2009.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrantd, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh
Summer triad of courses
In order to engender greater cross disciplinary activity in our students classrooms, we are focusing on integrating the three required summer courses that address contemporary issues in art education, postmodern art history and a studio mixed media course.

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

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

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

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

Expanded course offering times/days
The current MAED program has low-residency course offered, those courses are offered online and off campus. In order to accommodate in-service teachers, MAED program also has evening courses during the weekdays and Saturday courses.

Response to new certification requirements
PSC is requiring a new tier of certification. Teacher candidate will need to be certified before they are admitted into the master program. The current MAED program at the School of Art and Design has the certification built-in feature and the program faculty members are planning to restructure the program in order to recruit post-bacc. students to apply the MAED program.
**Summer and Maymester courses**
There were three MAED students participated in the Study Abroad Program and took non-western art history course and one studio course. The program encourages MAED students to do so for their study at the School of Art and Design.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings**: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

No real changes since last year's report

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement**: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

No program changes indicated from outcomes. The changes noted in the action plans are in response to non-outcome driven issues.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Art History BA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Art History BA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive, and accessible undergraduate education in 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)**
Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

SLO 3: Research Skills (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)

SLO 4: Written Communication Skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)

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.

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).

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).

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 4.5/5 (Very Good-Excellent).

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills |
| Knowledge of Content | Research Skills | 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills |
| Knowledge of Content | Research Skills | Written Communication Skills |

Implementation Description: This course addition will have increased enrollment in the fall 2009 as a new requirement for the major.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009

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

AH 3000 and AH 4990 as CTW courses
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills |
| Knowledge of Content | Research Skills | 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Content Knowledge and Critical Thinking Skills
The outcomes for Objective 1 (Knowledge of Content and Critical Thinking Skills. 3.85 and 3.58 respectively) are lower from the previous academic year. While the students we evaluated 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.
We need, however, to consider how this will affect such things as RPG and credit-hour generation.

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.

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.

The average score for Objective 4 (Written Communication Skills) dropped from the previous academic year (from 4.1 to 3.58). This was a disappointing result, given our focus in recent years on the need to improve the quality of our students' writing. We hope that with increased attention to writing in our designated CTW courses (AH 3000 and AH 4990), we will see improvement in the scores for this objective. We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breadth of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

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.

We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breath of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

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.

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.

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.
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 (Objectives 2, 3, and 4). 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
- Written Communication Skills

Implementation Description: The Art History area needs to discuss this proposition, potentially with input from 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: This would be dependent on receiving support from WAC in the form of training grants for faculty and writing consultant positions for graduate students.
University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: • Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills • Expand students understanding as scholars and advocates of the visual arts • Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world • Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community

Goals

G 1: Strengthen Program
The goal of the Art History MA program has been to strengthen course offerings and increase graduate student skills/abilities.

G 2: 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 3: 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 4: 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: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence) (M: 1, 2)

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
4.2 Highlight the arts and media.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

SLO 2: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence) (M: 4)
Ability to read, process and critique high-level scholarly articles and books in multiple fields (eg. history, religious studies, women studies, anthropology, sociology, etc), and be able to make multiple types of arguments (e.g. rhetorical, visual, contextual) each of which has its own methodological and historiographical complications.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)
**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.3 Create a Georgia State Faculty Fellowship Program.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
4.2 Highlight the arts and media.
5.1 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.2 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**SLO 3: Written Communication skills (M: 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).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.3 Create a Georgia State Faculty Fellowship Program.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
4.2 Highlight the arts and media.
5.1 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.2 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**SLO 4: Knowledge**

Demonstrated knowledge of the field.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Gathering of Evidence (O: 1)**


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

**Target for O1: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence)**

We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

The number of students for this year’s assessment was 5. The minimum score for achieving this outcome was 3 out of 5 and 80% of the students assessed (4) met this goal. The target for this year was 4.5 (the previous year was 4.4). The students assessed this year averaged 3.4, which means that the goal was not met. In large part, the average was lowered by two weaker students whose performance in the program was hampered by outside work and life commitments (one of whom performed very poorly at the end because of work issues). The relatively small sample size appears to make it more susceptible being skewed by one or two data points.

**M 2: Critical Analysis of Evidence (O: 1)**


Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence)**

We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

A total of 5 students was assessed for this year. The minimum score for meeting expectations for this outcome was 3 out of 5. Out of the total, 3 students (60%) met this minimum, 2 did not. The Art History Area chose to be aggressive and set a goal of 4.5 for this outcome this year (last year’s number was 3.7). The average for this year was 2.9, which means that the goal was not met. As noted in measure 1, the average number appears to have been substantially lowered by two students whose performances were weaker than expected as a result of work and life issues. As noted above, the small sample size for this year makes it vulnerable to being skewed by just two data points.

**M 3: Written Communication Skills (O: 3)**


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

**Target for O3: Written Communication Skills**

We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

The number of students for this year’s assessment was 5. The minimum score for achieving this outcome was 3 out of 5 and 80% of the students assessed (4) met this goal. The target for this year was 4.5 (the previous year was 4.4). The students assessed this year averaged 3.4, which means that the goal was not met. In large part, the average was lowered by two weaker students whose performance in the program was hampered by outside work and life commitments (one of whom performed very poorly at the end because of work issues). The relatively small sample size appears to make it more susceptible being skewed by one or two data points.
The traditional thesis length for Art History has been 80 or more pages. In the past, this was seen as a way of ensuring that students are prepared to carry out high-level research. However, 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.

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.

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 1 came close to meeting our desired level. One potential reason for the rise in outcomes may be that each of the students assessed benefited from the institution of Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH 8010). This course introduced students to graduate-level methodology and provided them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research. We plan to continue offering this class (currently we are only able to offer it every other year because of the College's minimum enrollment requirement). In keeping with our recent NASAD review, we also began offering graduate only seminars. Previously, our graduate students have taken mixed classes and this may have negatively impacted their performances. We are hopeful that the combination of AH 8010 and graduate only seminars will have continued positive effects on our students.

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.

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.

Change thesis format to reflect working realities
The traditional thesis length for Art History has been 80 or more pages. In the past, this was seen as a way of ensuring that students
demonstrated mastery of the subject. This approach is no longer preferable. The increased pressure on academics of all levels to publish has increased over the past decade. For MA students hoping to gain entry into PhD programs (especially top-tier programs), it is advisable to have an article in press, published, or ready to send out for review. As a result, the Art History area is changing the thesis requirement to reflect these working realities. The thesis will now be article-length (approx. 9,000 words plus notes) and the candidate must have identified at least two journals s/he wishes to send the paper to once it is completed. The awarding of the degree, however, will NOT be contingent on getting published. The Art History area feels that this will properly train students for the tasks that await them and will give them a much-needed head start for applying to PhD programs.

Challenges for Next Year

It has become clear that many of our students are seeking work in museum and gallery fields. These fields traditionally do not require a written thesis but, instead, focus on classroom knowledge supplemented by internships and hands-on work in the gallery or museum space. These students tend not to place as much emphasis on the thesis as the Art History area would like to see, which leads to underperformance. By introducing a non-thesis track in which students take more courses, those opting for non-thesis forms of post-graduation employment opportunities will be able to show their strengths in a manner appropriate for their goals.

Introduce non-thesis track

The Art History area graduated 7 students (5 in Spring, 2 in Summer), which shows an upward movement in graduations for the year. The major accomplishment for the year has been the introduction of a non-thesis track in the Art Studio BFA program. This change was necessary due to the increased emphasis on publishing and presenting in museum and gallery fields. The non-thesis track consists of more courses and seminars, which is in keeping with the expectation that working scholars should be publishing.

The Art History area graduated 7 students (5 in Spring, 2 in Summer), which shows an upward movement in graduations for the year. The major accomplishment for the year has been the introduction of a non-thesis track in the Art Studio BFA program. This change was necessary due to the increased emphasis on publishing and presenting in museum and gallery fields. The non-thesis track consists of more courses and seminars, which is in keeping with the expectation that working scholars should be publishing.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The analysis shows that the Art History area has not achieved its desired results. The numbers for the year were below those of the previous year but this appears to be a result of 1) the low sample size under consideration and 2) the inclusion of low-performing students who disproportionately affected the final numbers because of the small sample size. The Art History area learned from the analysis that 1) it is important to assess students in terms of their eventual professional goals (i.e. PhD program or work in the gallery/museum field) before they go into thesis, 2) the likelihood of unfunded students struggling during thesis is high (the two underperforming students were unfunded and work commitments appear to have been the key factor in their poor performance), and 3) that the current thesis and thesis-track formats need revision. The program's strengths are its course offerings, especially the newly instituted graduate-only seminars as well as the graduate methods class. Its weakness is its inability to fund a larger portion of graduate students. Not only does this show in poor performance during thesis, it also shows in the length of time it takes unfunded students to complete the degree. The last of these weaknesses appears to have a huge impact on the outcome numbers. The Art History area is continuing to assess its program and program offerings and is working toward a greater degree of options for students. It is hoped that these options will allow students to find their strengths and complete their degrees in a timely manner.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The Art History area is proposing two key changes based on the current data, as well as that of the last few years. First, it is implementing a non-thesis option for students interested in museum/gallery careers rather than PhD programs. Second, it is changing the format of the thesis away from an older "mastery" model to a more contemporary "dissemination of knowledge" model more in keeping with the expectation that working scholars should be publishing.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

The Art History area took a thoughtful look at the program, found two major areas that need to be changed, and created a plan for doing so. The Art History area graduated 7 students (5 in Spring, 2 in Summer), which shows an upward movement in graduations (likely a result of changing the program from a 3-year MA to a 2-year MA).

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 continued inability to fund more than a few graduate students at any given time will continue to be an issue for on-time graduation, retention, and quality of work. If students are working two jobs to pay for school, they don't really have time for school.
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).

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

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

Target for O4: Professional preparation
Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Accomplished), 4 (Exemplary).

**M 2: Final Portfolio, Artist's Statement, Resume and BFA Senior Exhibition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

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

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

**Target for O1: Technical skills**

Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in four categories: Technical skills, conceptual skills, historical and contemporary knowledge and professional preparation. Possible scores are: 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, 4 = exemplary. Target for technical skills is 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.

**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.

**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.

**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
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.

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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Astronomy PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Coming Soon

Goals
G 1: Coming Soon
Coming Soon

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 4)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

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

O/O 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4)
Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

O/O 5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)
Astronomy Ph.D. students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge. Areas of required knowledge are: i. at least two of the core physics areas, classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. ii. fundamental astrophysics and astronomical instrumentation and techniques. iii. stellar atmospheres, stellar structure and evolution,
the interstellar medium, extragalactic astronomy, and relativistic astrophysics and cosmology. All Ph.D. students shall be able to
demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and
tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.

O/O 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2)
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature
research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Scientific Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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.
Lesson Plan Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include lesson title and description, primary learning outcomes, procedures, technology, assessment, modifications, extension, and reflection.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O4: Effectively plan and assess instruction.

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric.

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

Action Plan for All indicators

Data for the Initial Certification program in BLD were collected again on the new measures established for the 08-09 academic year as recommended in our APR plan. The data indicate that student performance was met for three measures and was at 86% for the other measure; target for all was 90%. The faculty have indicated that the student’s performance on these measures is adequate since they were within 4% points of the target. We will explore increasing reliability in the future. The faculty members are now using the new rubric for performance (mentioned in the 08-09 report) that aligns with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

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

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

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator and BLD faculty

Explore reliability of teaching sequence rubric

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

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

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

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

Projected Completion Date: 11/2011
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator and faculty

Revise rubric

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

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
2013-2014 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST

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

Through a focus on teacher education as an area of excellence and research, the Behavior and Learning Disorders Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing advanced special educators who can make decisions that enable them to provide high quality instruction and support services consistent with the diverse needs and abilities of individuals with disabilities and their families. The M.Ed. program in Behavior and Learning Disabilities provides students who already hold certification in special education with the depth of knowledge and the breadth of skills in educating students with mild disabilities required of a "master teacher."

Goals

G 1: Understands student development regarding learning
The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn.

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

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
For Fall 2013-Summer 2014 with an N of 17, 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
For Fall 2013-Summer 2014 with an N of 13, 77% (10 out of 13 students) scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the rubric with a range of 2 to 4 and mean of 3.3.

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 disability 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/deficits 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-responsive. 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.

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For Summer 2013-Spring 2014, with an N of 17, 94.1% (16 out of 17 students) scored at 80% or better on the rubric with a range of 9 to 20 indicators met and a mean score of 85% (17 out of 20 indicators met).

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

**Monitoring Student Progress**

Data for the Masters Program in BLD are being collected using new rubrics for two goals 9a) performance evaluation - student demonstrates understanding of learning (goal 90%; achieved 100%), and (b) assessment for instruction - effectively teaches diverse groups of learners (goal 90%; 93% achieved). Both targets were met and data will be monitored on these two goals to determine whether changes are needed. Per earlier data and action plans, the BLD faculty continue to address student data onto he third goal - comprehensive exam - demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. For 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**

1. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicating those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Overall, the results are positive. The overwhelming majority of students demonstrated the desired learning outcomes, especially as it relates to understanding student learning and development and content knowledge related to their field (advanced knowledge of the field of behavior and learning disabilities). One objective was not met, where 10 out of 13 students did not perform adequately in assessment for instruction (12 out of 13 would have been necessary to meet the established objective). That said, recent changes to program content, delivery, and rigor appear to have been implemented successfully and positively for student. This is most noticeably reflected in students' performance on comprehensive exams. This was the first year that all students were required to take the newly formatted exam (which reflected program changes). Sixteen out of 17 students passed—an indication that students were well supported in meeting expectations of the program. Importantly, these results are an improvement over previous years, where more variability in student performance was observed.

2. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

No changes to the educational program or assessment process are planned for 2014-2015. The current assessment process reflects program changes that have only recently been implemented. Additional data over successive years (and cohorts of students) is desired to most appropriately assess the program. The faculty will continue to monitor student performance in response to program changes.
**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, 5, 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 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, 8)**
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, 8)**
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**
75%

**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%

**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%

**M 4: Analysis, and Scientific Method in BIO2300 (O: 3, 4)**
Using recombination frequencies between genes to determine the physical map of genes located on the same chromosome
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method**
75% receive at least 6 of 12 points

**M 5: Historical Changes over time content (O: 1)**
Question: Matching the following people to their contribution toward the advancement of microbiology
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Of all of the scientists listed the lowest score was 80% and the highest 97%, thus the average was 88.5%

M 6: Cell structure identification (O: 1)
Students were asked to match labels to their respective cellular parts on a diagram
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Content in Biology
80%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90%

M 7: Parts of Cell Matching (O: 1)
Students were asked to match label of cell parts to a diagram of unlabeled cell parts
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Content in Biology
85%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90% were successful in matching at least 80% of the questions

M 8: Evolutionary adaptation mechanism (O: 1, 3, 4)
Students were asked to assess the function of certain adaptations of various organisms in different habitats
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Content in Biology
80% would get over 75% correct

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
87% met goal of 75%

Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method
85% would get 75% correct

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90% earned 75%

Target for O4: Analysis
80%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90%

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Biology BS
As of: 12/13/2016 06:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
To critically think about and communicate Biology. Students will be able to recall basic concepts in Biology, think critically and evaluate Biological claims, and communicate these concepts both in writing and orally.

Goals
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: 12, 13, 14)**
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: 11, 16)**
Students will be able to perform basic techniques used in biological research which are applied in a laboratory setting and, in some cases, in outdoor settings such as during data collection.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 2: Communication (M: 15)**
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: 10, 13, 14, 16)**
Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability to formulate a hypothesis, perform background research, design appropriate experiments to address biological questions, and analyze the results of the experiment.

**O/O 4: Analysis (M: 10, 11, 13, 14, 15)**
Students will be able to execute basic problem solving skills and data analysis in Biology.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**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

**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%

**Target for O5: Basic field/lab techniques**
85%

**M 12: Historical Changes over time content (O: 1)**
Question: Matching the following people to their contribution toward the advancement of microbiology
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
85% match with correct scientist

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Of all of the scientists listed the lowest score was 80% and the highest 97%, thus the average was 88.5% were answered correctly

**M 13: Merging knowledge from many disciplines to biological theory (O: 1, 3, 4)**
Content of questions: Apply knowledge from other scientific disciplines (ie. General biology, immunology, and human anatomy/physiology) to the understanding of fundamental biological principles
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
75% of questions to be answered correctly (10 questions)
Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method
75%

Target for O4: Analysis
75%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Of 10 questions the average answered correctly was: 77%

M 14: Creating molecular bonds (O: 1, 3, 4)
Students were asked to choose an amino acid that would create either a hydrogen, hyrophobic or ionic bond with a putative substrate in an active site
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Content in Biology
70%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
72%

Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method
70%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
72%

Target for O4: Analysis
70%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
72%

M 15: Oral presentation of scientific findings (O: 2, 4)
Students were asked to orally present data of experiments performed in BIO3810
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: Communication
75%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90% received at least a 70%

Target for O4: Analysis
75%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90% received at least a 70% grade

M 16: Students were asked to design experiments (O: 3, 5)
In animal Biology, 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: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method
75%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% completed task correctly

Target for O5: Basic field/lab techniques
75%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% completed task correctly
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
Responsible Person/Group: Amy Horner

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Biology MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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**
1.2 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: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Scientific Literacy</strong></th>
<th>90% of the thesis proposals are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Conduct Research</strong></th>
<th>100% of students conducting laboratory research should complete certification online course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Scientific Literacy</strong></th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Biology PhD**

_{As of 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST} (Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Scientific Professionals**

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**

**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. [Preview Formatting]

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.

3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.2 Establish University-Level Research Centers.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
5.3 Establish a Georgia State University International Center.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**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. 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.

**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 Fail (unsatisfactory performance on both the proposal and the oral defense). Students who Fail the examination two times are subject to expulsion from the Ph.D. program.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: 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.

**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.

**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.

---

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

### Action Plan for Qualifying Exam

**Related Action Plans:** Evaluation of Revised Doctoral Examination Format During the 2011-2012 academic year our goal was partially met. In addition there was frustration among faculty regarding systematic areas of weakness and consistency of the evaluations. We are instituting a grading rubric that will be completed by all of the examiners. (see appendix 2). During the 2010-2011 academic year, the format for the Ph.D. examination was modified in a way that decreases the complexity of the proposal-based format and limits faculty input into the process. Compared with the 2009-2010 year, a lower percentage of students passed the exam on the first attempt. This may be due to the need for both students and faculty to adjust to the new format. The Department has decided to use the new format for another year and, should the trend toward low pass percentages continue, re-evaluate the exam format at that time. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report. M 2: Time to receipt of degree Students are expected to complete their degrees in a timely fashion. The current median time to receipt of degree in the biological disciplines that form the research focus in our department is approximately 6-6.5 years. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

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

**Measure | Outcome/Objective:** PhD Qualifying Exam  
**Outcome/Objective:** Experimental Design

### 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. 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. The current median time to receipt of degree in the biological disciplines that form the research focus in our department is approximately 6-6.5 years. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

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

### 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. The current median time to receipt of degree in the biological disciplines that form the research focus in our department is approximately 6-6.5 years. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

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

### 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. 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.
evaluations. We are instituting a rubric that will be completed by all of the examiners. 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 6.5-6.5 years. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Priority: High

Related Action Plans
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. 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 6.5-6.5 years. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Priority: High

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 BIS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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 B.I.S. program's focus on interdisciplinarity leads to two academic goals that fun through the variety of programs contained within the B.I.S. umbrella: : (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. These couple with the university-wide commitment to critical thinking through writing in encouraging students to effectively identify, formulate, analyze, and evaluate arguments, hypotheses, evidence, and truth claims or to use these skills to solve problems.

Goals
G 1: BIS Program Goals
The goals of the B.I.S. program are to expose students to interdisciplinary thinking through a variety of courses that require them to consider problems from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and encourage the use of logic, terminology and analytic methods from more than one academic discipline. Further, it is our goal to teach students to combine the disciplines creatively and in a manner that demonstrates a deep knowledge of all aspects of each discipline involved. For example, students in the environmental studies program combine work in the hard sciences, communication, political science and public management and science. Theatre students in the performance area can combine theatre studies with film, English, communication and folklore, while those in design and production combine theatre with art history, interior design and studio arts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: BIS Program Objectives (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students coming out of the BIS program will be able to: 1. Analyze and evaluate materials in terms of the reliability of evidence assumption of the authors. 2. Synthesize materials from a variety of disciplines to determine their relevance to individual interdisciplinary programs. 3. Formulate research questions related to individual interdisciplinary programs. Apply critical thinking skills in reporting research findings in oral and written form.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: BIS Assessments (O: 1)
In their graduating year, Eric Brown, the university advisor for BIS students, solicits students graduating with that degree to submit papers written early and late in their academic careers. Ideally, early papers were assigned in the students’ 3000-level Critical Thinking Through Writing class or earlier than that, while late papers are those submitted for the 4000-level Critical Thinking Through Writing class or the capstone class in the BIS concentration. These are then reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council in accordance with rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. 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. For students graduating in 2014, Mr. Brown received papers from ten students in Asian studies, community studies, environmental studies, international studies and theatre performance. Papers came from a wide variety of classes. Ratings on a five-point scale in six rubrics (see attached rubric and spread sheet) indicated an overall rating of 3.04 on entrance papers, with the strongest rating for knowledge (3.63) and the weakest for depth of interdisciplinary focus (2.27). The latter is to be expected among students just starting their studies in an interdisciplinary field. The rubric for breadth of interdisciplinary focus was also low (2.33), reflecting the same situation. On exit papers, the average rating had improved to 3.6, with the strongest field being grammar and mechanics (4.03) and structure (4) a close second. The weakest areas continued to be breadth and depth of interdisciplinary focus, with the former recording a 2.83 and the latter a 2.9. Improvement occurred in all six rubrics, with the most improved being structure, for which exit papers averaged .83 higher than entrance papers. The least growth was recorded in argumentation/critical thinking, with an improvement of .27, however it should be noted that the initial rating of 3.3 in that area would be considered average.

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

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

BIS Completed Action
Create a workable mechanism for evaluating the work of BIS students from a wide variety of disciplines.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Current BIS Priorities
Evaluate and necessary refine the assessment process to provide the most accurate possible reflection of student progress in the BIS program. Continue training counsel members in assessing student accomplishments in fields other than their own and in producing WEAVE reports.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Ongoing discussion and workshops with BIS Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence and Associate Dean Carol Winkler.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: BIS Council

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

This is an adaptation of the process for CTW assessments developed last year for the BIS program. It represents an attempt to summarize and assess student accomplishments in a wide variety of fields. Because of this, some modifications are not possible through the BIS programs themselves as BIS students are required to take courses offered in a wide variety of disciplines. With the exception of the BIS program, none of the areas of concentration with the degree offer their own courses. Nonetheless, it is possible draw some conclusions from the findings of this round of assessments. Strong averages in the traditional critical thinking through writings rubrics -- argumentation/critical thinking, development, grammar and mechanics, knowledge and structure -- indicate that the emphasis on critical thinking through writing in the many courses falling within the BIS program has yielded improvements in those areas. By contrast, the poor showings for the two rubrics specific to the BIS program -- breadth and depth of interdisciplinary focus -- suggest the need for a rigorous reexamination of those programs, particularly with reference to the students’ performance on exit papers.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Because of the number of different subjects that fall within the BIS program, it is difficult to make changes in course content or assignments. Students in the BIS program take most of their classes in fields that have designed courses form majors in specific disciplines and not planned to meet the needs of interdisciplinary students. The major issue at present is the continued evaluation and refinement of the assessment model for the BIS program. Issues that remain open are the paper gathering process and the individual assessment by members of the BIS Council's Subcommittee on Assessments. At present we do not have a mechanism in place to guarantee that entrance and exit papers truly are entrance and exit papers. Papers are solicited from the year's graduates with no assurance that the papers they submit actually represent early and late work. In terms of the assessment by individual subcommittee members, on some papers there was a wide divergent in scores assigned to individual rubrics. While this would be taken care of in the analysis of averages of the subcommittee members' scores, there are some disturbing disparities between the scores for the two sets of theatre papers submitted between the theatre lecturer on the subcommittee and the other two members. On one student's entrance paper, for example, the theatre lecturer assigned a one for knowledge while the other subcommittee members assigned fours. On a student’s exit paper, the theatre faculty member assigned a five, while one of the other members assigned a three. This would suggest that we either need to do a better job of educating each other about our various fields or develop a grading model whereby student papers are evaluated by members of the faculty for their programs.
Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines' assessments.

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.
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines' assessments.

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
This is the first year in which the BIS program has been required to report on assessments and, hence, the first time we have used the current measurements. As described on other pages, we are assessing students by soliciting graduating students to submit papers written early and late in their academic careers. Those papers are then read and evaluated by a subcommittee using a rubric created by the BIS Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. The rubric measures student performance in a variety of critical thinking areas— including argumentation/critical thinking, development and structure—as well as two areas distinct to interdisciplinary studies, breadth of interdisciplinary focus and depth of interdisciplinary focus.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
This is the first year in which the BIS has been required to report on assessments, hence, the first time we have considered outcomes. We have a set of targets we hope to have students reach: 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: +0.75 Breadth of Interdisciplinary Focus: +1.75 Depth of Interdisciplinary Focus: +1.75 Development: +0.75 Grammar/Mechanics: +0.5 Knowledge: +0.4 Structure: +0.75 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: 3

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines’ assessments.

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines' assessments.

International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines’ assessments.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines’ assessments.

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).
Since interdisciplinary studies is not a distinct subject area with its own faculty but rather a program using faculty drawn from a variety of individual disciplines, this material is best dealt with in the individual disciplines’ assessments.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Business Analysis MS
As of 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

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

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

Goals

G 1: Goal of the MS in Business Analysis
The goal of the MS in Business Analysis program is to provide students seeking a degree with a singular focus on business analyses tools, techniques and frameworks with the theory, method, and rational for understanding, selecting, and utilizing those tools, techniques, and frameworks over a wide range of applications used in for-profit and not-for-profit organizations in the 21st century.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (M: 1)**
Normal 0 false false 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 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 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 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The average score for 2013-14 for the 12 students evaluated was 3.58. This exceeds the requirement.

**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 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The average score for 2013-14 for the 12 students evaluated was 3.33. This meets the requirement.
**M 3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 3)**

Students will show skills using a) regression analysis, b) time-series forecasting, c) factor and cluster analysis, and d) discriminant analysis and/or logistic regression.

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

**Target for O3: Understanding of Techniques**

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 3 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from across the curriculum. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in every course where it is applicable during the academic year Learning Outcome 3 Rubric Understanding of Techniques Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Regression Analysis

Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. ii Time Series Forecasting Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. iii. Factor/Cluster Analysis Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. iv. Discriminant Analysis or Logistic Regression Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The average score for 2013-14 for the 12 students evaluated was 3.50. This meets the requirement.

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

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

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Software Skills**

Learning Outcome 4 Rubric Software Skills Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Microsoft Excel


Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique or interpretation of results. i. Regression Analysis

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 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 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The average score for 2013-14 for the 12 students evaluated was 3.42. This meets the requirement.

**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 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.

3. To add more resources online to aid in software competency. 2. To encourage students to engage in collaborative learning. Students post projects on the web and learn from each others' work. This strategy has over the years yielded very positive results.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** BA Faculty Members

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**To Hire New Faculty**

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

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** We are currently in the middle of the hiring process, conducting interviews.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** A hiring committee chaired by Dr. Subhashish Samaddar

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment
**Goals**

What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Given the popularity of analytics in business in recent times, a few more students were enrolled last year than before. Based on anecdotal data (there has not been a systematic effort to collect data on job placements after graduation), most if not all students were able to find satisfactory employment in the field of analytics. Several students received internships during their MS program, and thus enhanced their skills and job prospects. They uniformly reported that what they learned in the program helped them get jobs and do them well. The strength of the program has been a practical, applied nature of the coursework. Guest speakers from industry are invited to several classes, keeping students and instructors alike abreast of the latest developments in the business world. The key change was the easier availability of software (SAS, SPSS) through the University’s VCL system. This helped students avoid common problems. An experiment with distance learning (one section was taught downtown and broadcast to Buckhead and Alpharetta) had mixed results. Students did well despite some glitches with technology. The assessment process has not changed much. Due to some retirements and faculty leaving, the assessment focused on two main courses, which provide enough information about their performance.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

As mentioned in last year’s report, there was a push to create a research focused MS in Analytics at the college level, across multiple departments. This has now come to pass with the first cohort beginning the new MS program in Fall 2014. The other change is to the MS offerings within Managerial Sciences. Rather than four different areas, they have been consolidated into two fast track MS programs, one in OB/Strategy and another in Supply Chain and Analytics. This will better use the department’s resources, and given the new MSA program in the college, the new offering will help differentiate the department’s program better. These proposed changes to the department’s MS programs are currently proposed, and will go through the approval process in the college.

---

**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, public sector, 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 department’s association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and 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**

**G1: 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 of science

### 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.

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

Target goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 6.2 out of 8.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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

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

Goal was 4/8

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Students averaged a 4.9 out of 8

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

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

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

Goal was 4/8

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Students averaged a 4 out of 8

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

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

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

Goal was 4/8
### Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry
Goal was 4 out of 8.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Students averaged a 4 out of 8

### M 5: Laboratory Reports in 1211 and 1212 (O: 2)
Assessment of Critical thinking in laboratory report for 1211 and 1212 students 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
88% of students were adequate or better

### 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

---

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

**2013-2014 Chemistry BS**
*As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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 devotion of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.
Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking
Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to express 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Average was a 4 out of 8
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 who are majoring in biology, as well as, pre-Nursing, pre-Medical, pre-Dental, pre-Pharmacy, and pre-veterinarian students. General Chemistry (CHEM 1211K, CHEM 1212K) is a prerequisite for the first course in the biology major (Principles of Biology). Chemistry is a required minor for biology majors, so most biology students also take both semesters of Organic Chemistry Lecture (CHEM 2400, CHEM 3410), both semesters of Organic Chemistry Lab (CHEM 3100, CHEM 3110), and biochemistry CHEM 4600) as well. All biology majors will complete the first two and a half years of coursework from the chemistry major. Pre-medical students, Pre-Dental, Pre-Pharmacy, and Pre-Veterinarian students are also required to complete chemistry through organic chemistry at a minimum. These majors will complete our general chemistry and organic chemistry course sequences as well. Pre-nursing students are required to take our Survey of Chemistry course sequence (CHEM 1151K, CHEM 1152K). In addition, there are many non-major students who use our lower level courses 1151/1152 or 1211/1212 as the laboratory sequence required for non-majors. In Fall semester 2013, a total of 929 students enrolled in the General Chemistry sequence (1211K/1212K). Of those 929 students, 400 were enrolled as Biology majors (43%), 98 Chemistry majors (11%), 59 Neuroscience majors (6%), 30 undeclared majors (3%), and 342 non-science majors (37%). This report addresses our departments' efforts to meet the demand for, and progress students through the courses which are used by both majors and non-majors as part of the core curriculum (CHEM 1151, CHEM 1152, CHEM 1211K, CHEM1212K) and courses used by students wishing to major in chemistry, minor in chemistry, or pursue medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinarian school (CHEM 2400, CHEM 3410, CHEM 3100, CHEM 3110, CHEM 4600). Over the past ten years, the department has placed a priority in improving the retention of students in the 1211/1212 sequence and our 2400/3410, as these courses maintain the largest enrollment and form the fundamental basis of the program. These efforts have been supported by the University System of Georgia's RPG initiative and STEM initiative. In 2006, 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. Previous Course Development Tutorial Courses Tutorial Courses 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 tutorial courses (1201, 1203, 2401, 3411) which are 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. These tutorial sections have been in place now for several years, and the feedback about these courses has been increasingly positive. These tutorials are interactive and students are required to work out problems on the board as the peer leader circulates throughout the groups providing help where needed. We believe that this activity will actively engage the students allowing them/her to work the problem on their own with hints from the leader. The department has also been providing student access to ACS practice examination books for the general and organic chemistry courses in order to help prepare students for the standardized final exams for these classes. These books are available from the chemistry club and are helpful in preparing students for standardized exams like their course exit exams, the MCAT, and the PCAT. 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 with 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 have exchanged ideas on how to teach different topics, discussed student misconceptions and developed slides which we can use as needed. Current Course Development While our department has seen a reasonable drop in our DWF rates for our core courses over the last ten years, we have still been working on ways of maintaining and increasing retention up for our freshman and sophomore classes. Successfully progressing students through foundation courses is still a fundamental priority of our department. We are always looking for new methods that will enhance performance and provide new and more thorough alternatives to the overwhelming demand for these courses. Course Coordinators As a result of an internal audit of our program it was determined that our lower level instruction courses need unity. We also noticed that there was a need to increase mentoring for new faculty. The departments' fundamental courses are more often than not taught by Visiting Lecturers which can lead to a turnover of instructors for these courses every few years. To address the issues we have instituted course coordinators for our lower level lectures. These coordinators function as mentors for new faculty. They also aid in unifying course curriculum. Online Homework Over the last two years, instructor satisfaction with our CHEM 4000 online homework system has been strong. This has been due to many factors including time saved in grading homework, the ability to focus on chemistry content instead of technology, and the ability to check homework correct vs. incorrect. Online homework system evaluations have been conducted by arranging free trials of these systems for entire classes, so that the students could use the homework over the course of the entire semester. Students were then surveyed to determine not only which homework systems they thought worked the best, but to also find out which aspects of these systems aided their studies, and which aspects did not help or even detracted from their learning of material. Course online homework systems were then chosen based on student feedback as well as word of mouth from other faculty members. We have since found that 10 different homework systems are now available to our systems to our student needs and wishes. Our faculty have also been working to help develop personalized quizzes and practice exams for these systems as well. Peer Led Team Learning (PLTL) Courses Based on the success of our Tutorial courses (1201, 1202, 2401, and 3411) we have also began to implementing the Peer Led Team Learning model in organic chemistry. Our first pilot was carried out in Spring 2014. We implemented a hybrid component of one section of the second-semester organic chemistry course (CHEM 3410) in conjunction with Peer-Led Team Learning (PLTL). Both PLTL and hybrid classroom have been identified as promising practices to improve student learning. Traditionally, the organic chemistry course consists of three lectures per week. In spring semester 2014, students participated in lecture twice per week. The third lecture was replaced by PLTL. The missed lecture was supplemented by online YouTube videos created by the instructor of record. The key concepts on these YouTube videos were further re-emphasized during lectures. The PLTL model: students were divided into groups of approximately 16-17 students/group (a total of 194 students with an upper level course student peer leader in a different classroom). The PLTL-hybrid classroom model is currently being implemented this Fall of 2014 in one section of organic chemistry I (CHEM 2400) and will be subsequently implemented in organic chemistry II in Spring 2014. This further expands on the concept of small group learning experiences. Course Restructuring and Expansion Over the last ten years the main action plan of our department has been the expansion of our program to meet an ever growing demand on our core courses. In the fall semester of 2003 the chemistry department taught 6,266 undergraduate credit hours and in the spring semester of 2004 the department taught 6,868 undergraduate credit hours. Based on 12,920 undergraduate credit hour demand in 2004-2005 the fall semester of 2013 the chemistry department taught 15,285 undergraduate credit hours and in the spring semester of 2014 the department taught 13,650 undergraduate credit hours for a total of 28,935 undergraduate credit hours during the 2013-2014 school year. This represents a 124 % increase in undergraduate credit hours taught over the last ten years. During the 2003-2004 school year the department had 184 Chemistry Majors. During the 2013-2014 school year the department had 498 Chemistry Majors. This is a 170 % increase in the number of chemistry majors over the last ten years. In 2003 we offered 20 sections of CHEM 1211K for 723 students, we offered 21 sections of 1212K for 556 students, 3 sections of CHEM 2400 for 495 students, 3 sections of CHEM 3410 for 355 students, 9 sections of 3100 for 279 students, 5 sections 3110 for 154 students, 3 sections of CHEM 4600 for 231 students. In 2013 we offered 38 sections of CHEM 1121K for 1118 students, 33 sections 1212K for 1077 students, 6 sections of CHEM 2400 for 802 students, 7 sections of CHEM 3410 for 750 students, 14 sections of 3100 for 528 students, 10 sections 3110 for 407 students. Sections of CHEM 4000 course shows an increase from 573 students in 2003 to 519 students in 2013 which is an increase of 79 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 27 % to 13 %. The ACS scores are slightly higher. A ten year analysis of the 1152 course shows an increase from 236 students in 2003 to 419 students in 2013 which is an increase of 77 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 31 % to 25 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same. A ten year analysis of the 1211 course shows an increase from 723 students in 2003 to 1118 students in 2013 which is an increase of 54 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 45 % to 22 %. During that time the ACS scores have increased from 72 % to 81 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same. A ten year analysis of the 2400 course shows an increase from 566 students in 2003 to 1077 students in 2013 which is an increase of 94 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 22 % to 18 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same. A ten year analysis of the 2400 course shows an increase from 495 students in 2003 to 802 students in 2013 which is an increase of 62 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 36 % to 22 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same. A ten year analysis of the 3410 course shows an increase from 495 students in 1998 to 750 students in 2013 which is an increase of 111 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 39 % to 22 %. There has been a slight drop in ACS scores over this 10 year period. There was an increase in all ACS ext exam scores of roughly 10-18% which was followed by a large drop. This large drop in ACS scores was noticed directly after the university changed from a 16 week semester to a 14 week semester. The loss of two weeks of instruction had an apparent effect on the ability to deliver all of the information required for our exit examinations. Going forward we may need to reevaluate our standards for these exams as this drop in scores was consistent for all of our instructional courses using ACS exams. Course coordinators along with the department have been working to readjust our curriculum to fit the 14 week semester, however it is difficult to do without cutting material from our courses, and we still do not view that as a viable option. As part of the University goal of expanding enrollment, the Department of Chemistry has witnessed a strong pattern of growth over the past 6 years. During this time, the number of our upper level students has doubled to just over 2,000 in Fall 2014. Based on the growth we have experienced during this expansion, and recognizing the University goal of 40,000 students by Fall 2020, the Department has been able to approximate our headcounts and space requirements for the next 8 years. Upper Division Courses for Majors As with our overall instruction, the department has seen a dramatic increase in the number of majors as well. Most of the growth in our major has occurred over the last 5 years. During the 2003-2004 school year the department had 184 Chemistry Majors; during the 2008-2009 school year the department had 300 Chemistry Majors, and during the 2013-2014 school year the department had 498 Chemistry Majors. This is a 170 % increase in the number of chemistry majors from 2003 to 2008, and a 45% increase in majors from 2008 to 2013. Over the last two years the department is noticing a dramatic upswing in the number of upper division course hours necessary to meet the increasing demand from our majors. Our action plan for our major is the same as our plan for the Lower Division courses. We wish to increase the availability for our course as much as possible without sacrificing the quality of our courses. Secondly, we wish to increase the retention and progression of students who have claimed chemistry as a major. Our initial evaluation is on our mass enrollment for our CHEM 4000 course. This class acts as our basic course for all of our upper division courses. CHEM 4000 is also the first of our required CTW courses. It has proven to be a valid indicator of the growing demand for our upper division courses. We first noticed a dramatic demand increase for this class in the fall semester of 2011. During the 2011-2012 school year we had 56 students take CHEM 4000 and we met the demand for all of our students. During the 2013-2014 school year we had 88 students take our CHEM 4000 and we were not able to meet all of the student demand for that year. In the fall we have some division courses for our upper division courses for our other majors. Our upper division courses follow a four day a week and two day a week schedule. Our department is making it our topmost priority to address the growing demand for our upper division course as this will directly affect our ability to retain and progress student pursuing our major. Another course that we use to analyze our major is our second CTW course CHEM 4160 which is a research based course required for all of our majors. This course is usually taken towards the end of our major’s stay with us, so it can be a good indicator of the number of our major that are getting ready to graduate. In the 2003-2004 school year we had 24 students enrolled in CHEM 4160, in the 2013-2014 school year we had 70 students enrolled in...
CHEM 4160. This shows a drastic increase in the number of students reaching the end of their major with our department. In 2003 we offered 5 sections of CHEM 4000 for 40 students, we offered 4 sections 4010 for 40 students, 2 sections of CHEM 4110 for 53 students, 2 sections of CHEM 4120 for 34 students, CHEM 4160 for 24 students, 4 sections 4190 for 25 students. In 2013 we offered 6 sections of CHEM 4000 for 88 students, 5 sections 4010 for 71 students, 3 sections of CHEM 4110 for 90 students, 3 sections of CHEM 4120 for 50 students, CHEM 4160 for 70 students, 5 sections 4190 for 53 students. Summary As part of the University goal of expanding enrollment, the Department of Chemistry has witnessed a strong pattern of growth over the past 6 years. During this time, the enrollment for the entire University has increased by ~7,000 students to just over 32,000 for Fall 2014. Based on the growth we have experienced during this expansion, and recognizing the University goal of 40,000 students by Fall 2020, the Department has been able to approximate our headcounts and space requirements for the next 8 years.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

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: In-Progress
Priority: High
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(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 to become a leading public research university by providing resources and services for teaching, learning and research, which enable discovery and the use of information and the creation of knowledge. The Department of Chemistry has highly active research programs in each of the five traditional areas of chemistry (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 research faculty, many of whom are distinguished and noted scholars. The Department is growing and has doubled in the number of students enrolled and committed to and has the ability to maintain outstanding facilities to support research efforts. The Department's goal is to deliver high quality instructional programs at the graduate level to prepare students for productive careers in academia, industry and government. The emphasis of our graduate program is in the training of scientists.

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
### M1: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014 (FA13-Sum 14), 4 students were eligible to defend a thesis, and 4 successfully defended. 7 students were eligible to graduate with a non-thesis masters and 7 students graduated.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014 (FA13-Sum 14), 4 students were eligible to defend a thesis, and 4 successfully defended. 7 students were eligible to graduate with a non-thesis masters and 7 students graduated.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014 (FA13-Sum 14), 4 students were eligible to defend a thesis, and 4 successfully defended. 7 students were eligible to graduate with a non-thesis masters and 7 students graduated.

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

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D. (Graduate Director) Donald Hamelberg, Ph.D.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**2. Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

MS students continue to defend at 100%. No change here.
**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 chemical and biological 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. Perform and analyze and be able to relate experiments which address a current problem in the chemical sciences. This is demonstrated in a number of ways and includes oral presentations given during group meetings, poster presentations, and end of semester reports which summarizes research progress using the ACS style research paper guidelines. These guidelines are consistent with the following format: Title; Abstract; Introduction; Experimental Details or Theoretical Analysis; Results; Discussion; Conclusion; References. Our students are also encouraged to attend local, regional, national, and international conferences to present their research through poster and oral presentations.

**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. 6. 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 3: Technology (M: 2)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Plan and conduct experiments using state of the art 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 their 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 PhD 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, carefully selected by program faculty, 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In June 2014, 16 students took the Qualifying Exam—100% or all 16 passed the exam.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**
The target would be 85% of all PhD 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In June 2014, 16 students took the Qualifying Exam--100% or all 16 passed the exam.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Skills**
The target would be 85% of all PhD 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In June 2014, 16 students took the Qualifying Exam--100% or all 16 passed the exam.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
The target would be 85% of all PhD 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In June 2014, 16 students took the Qualifying Exam--100% or all 16 passed the exam.

**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 review, 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 only at the approval of the research advisor and dissertation committee.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In 2013-2014 (Fall, 13, Spring, 14, Summer 14), 20 out of 20 or 100% of those defending, successfully defended their dissertation and graduated.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In 2013-2014 (Fall, 13, Spring, 14, Summer 14), 20 out of 20 or 100% of those defending, successfully defended their dissertation and graduated.

**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 at a high and publishable level Work with research advisor to conduct analyses of research projects, interpret test results, or develop nonstandard tests.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In 2013-2014 (Fall, 13, Spring, 14, Summer 14), 20 out of 20 or 100% of those defending, successfully defended their dissertation and graduated.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
All PhD students are encouraged to explore current issues and address them through scientific problem solving.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In 2013-2014 (Fall, 13, Spring, 14, Summer 14), 20 out of 20 or 100% of those defending, successfully defended their
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
- Responsible Person/Group: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

Continued Quality and Growth
The department has met all its goals and will continue to grow while keeping the quality of the program.

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

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

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

1). In 2012-2013, the goal was to achieve 85% pass rate with score of 80% or above for all QE test takers. 2). In 2013-14, the goal was exceeded such that 100% of QE test takers passed with score of 80% or above. 3. What brought about this change? In Fall, 2013, a standardized ACS exam was administered to all incoming new PhD students during orientation to assess background knowledge. This change provided the Department with information that identified areas of weaknesses and strengths and allowed for better advisement of course selection.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The Department will continue to strive to meet targets. No significant changes in program assessment planned.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Communication Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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.
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 SPC1000 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

Now that we’ve successfully implemented the 2012-2013 action plan to collect a more robust set of data regarding SPCH1000 and its facilitation of critical thinking skills, we plan to begin a larger conversation with instructors and graduate students who teach SPCH1000.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The goal of that conversation is to develop teaching strategies in SPCH1000 that more directly target the various subsets of critical thinking, including: 1) Deduction; 2) Meaning & Fallacies; 3) Source Credibility; 4) Hypothesis Testing; 5) Planning Experiments; 6) Definition; 7) Assumption Identification. From this conversation and introduction of new teaching methods into SPCH1000, we expect to see a greater increase in both the overall CTA scores, as well as specific increases in the subset scores.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Davin Grindstaff, SPCH1000 Course Director

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Critical Thinking Measure: Fall 2013 – Summer 2014 SPCH1000: Assessment Data Discussion, Part One All sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the CT measure, producing: 1020 scores in fall 2013 817 scores in spring 2014 40 scores in summer 2014 Due to the robust nature of SPCH1000 assessment during the 2013-2014 academic calendar year, we have broken down the data into three categories: (a) overall mean average (b) overall distribution of scores (c) mean average for each subset of critical thinking skills Discussion, Part Two The overall mean averages indicated an overall increase in students’ critical thinking aptitude: from 21.83 to 24.17 (fall 2013) from 21.28 to 23.08 (spring 2014) from 21.6 to 23.78 (summer 2014) Discussion, Part Three The overall distribution of scores indicates that SPCH1000 helps GSU undergraduate freshmen acclimate to the rigors of critical thinking at the university level, and prepares them for the demands of upper division courses at GSU. Both the mean average score and the overall distribution of scores shifted significantly toward the raw score expected for the majority of lower division undergraduates (26.4). There was also a trend away from what is considered to be the norm for “remedial” undergraduates (20.8), and a slight increase in students who possessed the necessary critical thinking skills for upper division undergraduate courses.

Discussion, Part Four The mean average for each subset of critical thinking skills demonstrates how SPCH1000 facilitates the growth of critical thinking skills in a wide range of areas, including: 1) Deduction 2) Meaning & Fallacies 3) Source Credibility 4) Hypothesis Testing 5) Planning Experiments 6) Definition 7) Assumption Identification

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

In the 2012-2013 Assessment Report, we proposed the following: “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.” We successfully implemented this action plan, and collected more meaningful data regarding the success of SPCH1000 in teaching critical thinking skills at the undergraduate level.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Communication Sciences & Disorders (CSD) Program is a unit of the Educational Psychology, Special Education, and Communication Disorders 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.

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

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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
91% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Three scored above, 2 scored below, and 17 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
87% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Eight scored above, 3 scored below, and 11 scored within the national average.

Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
87% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Eight scored above, 3 scored below, and
11 scored within the national average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) (O: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Score for Category III Speech Disorders.  
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state  
**Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**  
90% of students will score within the national average range or above. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students for which there is data fell above or within the national average. Six scored above, one scored below, and 15 scored within the range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) (O: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87% of students fell above or within the national average. Four students fell above, 3 fell below, and 15 fell within.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) (O: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Score for Category V Audiology, Hearing.  
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state  
**Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**  
Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (4-6), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall program performance was 79%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemt) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Score for Category VI Clinical Management.  
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state  
**Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**  
90% of students will score within the national average range or above. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall program performance was 79%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) (O: 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Score for Category VII Professional Issues, Psychometrics, Research.  
**Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**  
90% of students will score within the national average range or above. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students for which there is data performed above or within the national average. Eleven students fell above and 11 students fell within the national average range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
95% of students for which there is data fell above or within the national average range. Three students fell above, 1 student fell below, and 18 fell within the range.

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
95% of students for which there is data fell above or within the national average range. Three students fell above, 1 student fell below, and 18 fell 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students achieved a 3.83 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

M 11: Portfolio Section 3 (Comm & Swallow Disord) (O: 3)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can discuss the etiologies and characteristics of communication and swallowing disorders.

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

Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students achieved a 3.9 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students achieved a 3.87 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.

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

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students achieved a 3.87 on this section of the portfolio.
M 14: Portfolio Section 6 (Eval Research) (O: 6)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can critically evaluate published theory and research.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target for O6: Evaluate Research Relevance
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 demonstrate that they can develop and implement functional and effective intervention programs.
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 their knowledge of linguistic and cultural issues related to communication and swallowing disorders.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target for O14: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.73 on this section of the portfolio.
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

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

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. During the 2013-14 cycle this goal was met.

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 | 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. Overall program performance was 79% for 2013-2014. Goal was met during this cycle.

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 | 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. During the 2013-2014 cycle 87% of our students achieved this goal demonstrating minimum improvement. We have recently added two new language courses (School-Age Language Disorders and Aphasia) and are predicting that there will continue to be an improvement in scores in this area.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders | Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None

PRAXIS Category IV

We will continue to monitor our students' ability to achieve our stated goal for another two years. Given the consistent attainment of this goal previously it is believed that this goal will be reached in the next cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

With only a few exceptions our goals were met indicating that our program is successfully preparing speech-language pathologists. We will monitor the few goals not met this year. The unmet goals have been historically achieved and were not met only by a small amount. We are confident we will achieve all goals during our next reporting period. Over the last several years we have added courses to our curriculum and are constantly monitoring the outcomes of our courses. Our accrediting agency, Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, has standards to which we adhere. We have been successful in adhering to these standards and will continue to do so.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Given our high achievement and low number of unmet goals we will continue to monitor our student’s performance.
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 time 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)

The department brought on two new graduate directors in July 2013, and this year has been spent getting up to speed on the department’s past assessment strategies, which have undergone significant change in the last few years. See below for the background on this, from 2010–2013, as described by our predecessor. CURRENT PLAN. The plan we have made for the future, toward which we have made some progress, is that MA students will be assessed using new assessment forms (in progress) at three key points: first, following their completion of one first-year course (depending on the track they’re in) next, following the defense of their prospectus, and finally, following the defense of their thesis. The assessed course will be 6010 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 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 line with our successful strategy for PhD student assessment, which occurs at the taking of the comprehensive exams, prospectus defense, and dissertation defense. MA students do not take comprehensive exams, so we determined that one key course for each MA track would suffice as an assessment measure that would occur prior to their prospectus. Graduate directors have written assessment forms for 6010 and 6020, partially based on the forms used for these courses back in 2012 when the department still assessed multiple seminars for all MA students. We are still in the process of writing an assessment form for 6145, which has never been one of the courses we assessed. We expect to use these forms this semester, Fall 2014, for the first time. (See below regarding the transitional phase in 2012 (see below) but abandoned in 2013 when then-grad director Restivo received feedback saying that assessing seminars was less helpful than assessing student work at the point of comprehensive exams, prospectus defense, and thesis/dissertation defense. The 2012 list of courses assessed differs from the planned courses to assess in 2014 and onward, because our new plan is not to assess multiple courses for each student. Instead, we aim to assess each MA student at three (3) points, only one of which will occur during their coursework. – BACKGROUND, 2010–2013. The following was written by our predecessor, Angelo Restivo, and as we are new to the assessment procedures, we think it best to leave it here, in case it’s useful for context. As stated above, the plans he describes for assessing particular courses has changed: “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, [the 2011] plan included a complete rethinking of the graduate assessment in the department. In the Fall, the graduate director (Restivo) met with Marti Singer to discuss ways to implement a new assessment for a very complex graduate program with many areas of specialization. The grad director then mapped out some preliminary sets of rubrics and measures. Early in the Spring of 2012, the grad director met with each area of the doctoral and MA faculties, and worked with them to devise clear and relevant learning outcomes, rubrics, and measures for each of the tracks of the MA and PhD programs. We decided to designate key core courses in each area of the MA and PhD programs as those in which student performance would be measured. We developed learning outcomes which, while parallel throughout the various tracks, nevertheless are able to measure learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are expected across all the tracks. (See associated appended documents.) "For the Mass Comm and Human Comm MA tracks, the core courses for assessment will be Issues and Perspectives in Communication, and Research Methods in Communication. New rubrics are being designed for both these courses, to more accurately pinpoint student performance across a variety of areas. For the Film-Media Studies area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media History. The rubrics have been developed for Advanced Film Theory and are in the process of being developed for Media History. For the Film Production area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media Expression. These rubrics have been developed."

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions

New graduate directors are in the process of developing new assessment forms for the three (3) MA courses, one from each track, that will be assessed. Because those are still in development, targets in some areas cannot be set yet. In the two courses for which we have assessment forms (6010 Issues and Perspectives, and 6020 Advanced Film Theory), we would like to see students performing at level 3.0.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

Although assessment forms for seminars are still in progress, we do have a measure, built into the assessment for comprehensive exams across all three MA tracks, for assessing command of the literature. The average here was 3.4.

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

For background narrative, see Description of Measure #1. In brief, the department learned in 2012 that an overabundance of individual courses were being assessed, and we have cut back to three (3) courses, for which assessment forms are being written or revised.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Understanding of research methods

Because the new assessment forms for the MA are still in development, targets in some areas cannot be set yet. Each of these forms will have a question that assesses method. In the past (prior to 2012) version of the assessment form for Advanced Film Theory, for example, our target on that question in the was 3.0 or higher for all students. In revising and creating new forms, we will need to calibrate the rubrics so as to achieve meaningful assessments in this area.
M 3: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing (O: 2)
For a background narrative, see the description in Measure #1. The forms for all three (3) core MA course assessment forms will include this measure: "WRITING – student's ability to effectively and critically communicate directorial intentions in written form (take into account organization and logical progression of ideas, clarity of expression, etc."
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
Given that core seminars are generally taken in the first year of the MA program, we expect the outcomes to be lower than we would see for the thesis prospectus and thesis. The target is 80% of the students performing at 3 or higher, with 25% of the students performing at 4 or higher.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Although assessment forms for seminars are still in progress, to be implemented in Dec. 2014, and given that the department stopped assessing individual courses in 2012 (see Measure #1 for background narrative on that), we do not have a way of measuring writing in core seminars during this cycle.

M 5: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense (O: 1, 2, 3)
Earlier versions of the thesis prospectus assessments were too vague, so we have developed new assessment forms which will measure competencies that correspond to those being measure in the core-seminar assessments. See appended documents.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
All students should score a 3 or higher; 40% of the students should score 4 or higher.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
A few more prospectus defenses were assessed this year than last, I believe, but our data set is still much too small a fraction of the whole. (This is steadily improving with the efforts we've made to communicate to the faculty the importance of assessing prospectus defenses.) Based on the data we have, students are succeeding in this area, averaging 3.67 on five questions in the assessment form and 4 on another. The question on which they scored lowest, averaging 3.3, was the one assessing whether their "writing displays familiarity with the background literature relevant to the topic." We think more data is needed to make any judgments about need for improvement in this area.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
A few more prospectus defenses were assessed this year than last, I believe, but our data set is still much too small a fraction of the whole. (This is steadily improving with the efforts we've made to communicate to the faculty the importance of assessing prospectus defenses.) Based on the forms we received, students averaged 3.67 on "Oral Skills: mastery of the topics researched," and 4 on "Oral skills: able to answer questions effectively and efficiently." We did not receive any prospectus defense assessment forms from MA production students, thus we cannot draw any conclusions about media-making competencies. We think more data (i.e., more prospectus defense assessment forms being submitted by faculty) is needed to make any judgments about need for improvement in this area.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
A few more prospectus defenses were assessed this year than last, I believe, but our data set is still much too small a fraction of the whole. (This is steadily improving with the efforts we've made to communicate to the faculty the importance of assessing prospectus defenses.) Based on the question that assesses writing in the prospectus. Students averaged 3.67 on "Oral Skills: mastery of the topics researched," and 4 on "Oral skills: able to answer questions effectively and efficiently." We did not receive any prospectus defense assessment forms from MA production students, thus we cannot draw any conclusions about media-making competencies. We think more data (i.e., more prospectus defense assessment forms being submitted by faculty) is needed to make any judgments about need for improvement in this area.

M 6: Quality of creative or research thesis (O: 1, 2, 3)
Earlier versions of the thesis assessments were too vague, so we have developed new assessment forms which will measure competencies that correspond to those being measure in the core-seminar assessments. See appended documents.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
All students should score a 3 or higher; 40% of the students should score 4 or higher.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Eight (8) theses were assessed during this cycle: four (4) research theses and four (4) creative theses. 100% of the four (4) research theses assessed in this cycle scored, on average, a 4 or higher on all questions in the forms. The four (4) students defending a creative thesis (screenplay or film) scored 4 or above, on average, on all but the question that addresses the strength of the student's individual point of view, on which they scored, on average, 3.87. On the questions that speak most directly to scholarly traditions, the research thesis students scored an average of 5, 4.25, and 4.5. The creative thesis...
assessment forms do not seem to have a question that correlates to the outcome of “understanding of scholarly and creative traditions. Given the jump in scores from last year, we think more data (i.e., more thesis defense assessment forms being submitted by faculty) is needed to make any judgments about having met the targets in this area.

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

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

---

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

In the research theses, students scored on average 4.25 in the method question, with all four (4) theses above 4. The creative thesis assessment forms do not seem to have a question that correlates to the outcome of “understanding research methods,” unless technical skills can be considered in that sense.

---

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

**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

**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:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee

**Begin new assessment system based on data collected 2010-11**

Background: Last year, the department implemented an online evaluation system with six rubrics, for all MA and doctoral students in the program, for every course that they took. The results were aggregated by year-in-program, program of study, and were averaged for each student across all the seminars the student took. The results have been reported throughout this WEAVE report as finding; in addition, the raw data and the interpretation of that data has been deposited in the document repository. The amount of data collected has given us valuable information with which to move forward in assessment (see below); while at the same time, it would be overkill to collect all this data every semester. (For one thing, it required that two tenure-track faculty spend over 50 hours of work during summer research time crunching data; this is clearly not something we can do on a regular basis.) Thus, we plan to redo this assessment in 7 years; in the meantime we plan to use the results to focus on targeted areas for assessment, in order to come up with more concrete revisions of curriculum, assignments, and so on. To this end, a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee will devise a system of rubrics that begins at the thesis and prospectus. Then we will target two courses during coursework which will serve as assessment courses, so that we can measure student progress at every stage of the program. Because there are several very different tracks in the Communications MA program, we have not decided yet whether we will develop separate rubrics for each track, or whether we can have common rubrics. (However, we definitely will need a separate set of rubrics for the creative work done in the film production area.) The data gathered from last year should help us determine this. Once the grad committee has drafted the new integrated set of rubrics, then they will be given to the faculty in each area, where further revisions will be done. We expect the entire set of rubrics to be ready by the end of Spring semester 2012.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** 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
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
Implementation Description: BoR signed off on this program in August 2014. Department will accept first applications in March 2015 for admission fall 2014.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2015
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.

Assessment forms online
Until fall 2014, assessment forms had only been available in two forms: a) in hard copy in the graduate coordinator's and graduate directors' offices, and b) as e-mail attachments included in e-mail reminders from the graduate directors, sent out once each semester. In September 2014, we posted the forms in a password-protected area of our (new) temporary graduate studies blog, and the response from faculty has been positive. When the new department website goes live, we plan to post all assessment forms in a password-protected faculty-only area of the site. Additionally, we plan to make the forms "fillable" PDF files. These two steps will, we think, make it easier for faculty to locate and access the forms quickly (even at the last minute, during the prospectus defense itself), which we expect will improve the rate of submission. Finally, once the forms are available in this way, we plan to send out e-mail reminders with links to the forms, several times during the semester. These steps will put the assessment forms on faculty's mental radar and will encourage faculty to submit the forms more consistently.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
Implementation Description: See above.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate directors Barker and Tindall
Additional Resources: Website must be live before we can implement this plan.

New assessment forms for MA core seminars
Grad directors are in the process of revising or creating assessment forms for three (3) MA courses, one for each track: 6010 Issues and Perspectives, 6020 Advanced Film Theory, and 6145 Digital Editing.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Literature and Theory | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
Implementation Description: We will finish these forms in Oct. 2014 and implement these in Dec. 2014 by sharing with instructors of those courses.
Responsible Person/Group: Grad directors Tindall and Barker.
Additional Resources: None.

Revise creative thesis assessment form
We need to revise the creative thesis form to include a question that closely correlates to the outcomes identified here, including "understanding of scholarly and creative traditions" and "understanding research methods."

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Quality of creative or research thesis | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
Implementation Description: We will revise this form during the 2014-2015 year for use next year.
Responsible Person/Group: Grad director Barker
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Developed BA/MA program 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
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Mission / Purpose

The Graduate Program in Communication offers its students a multi-disciplinary curriculum leading to the Ph.D. degree. The program is designed to prepare students for research and teaching in one of three primary areas of emphasis: Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Image Studies. The curriculum is designed to provide students with in depth training in communication pedagogy and the professional expectations of the discipline, as well as mentored experiences in both teaching and research.

Goals

G 1: To produce PhDs highly skilled in research
The areas of Rhetoric/Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Image Studies are all highly interdisciplinary, drawing on a broad range of theoretical and intellectual traditions. We would like our PhDs to frame research questions with full understanding of their positioning within this broad discursive matrix, while at the same time having highly developed research skills specific to their research questions.

G 2: To produce excellent undergraduate teachers
We seek to produce PhDs with demonstrated teaching excellence in the undergraduate classroom, both at the level of the introductory or survey course and in higher-level courses related to their research projects.

G 3: To foster academic professionalism
We strive to produce PhDs with significant professional experience, including presentation at conferences in their area (Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, or Moving Image Studies), professional interaction with leading scholars in their areas of research, publication in journals, and service activities in the graduate student caucuses of the professional organizations in their area.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of Literatures (G: 1) (M: 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 (Resillo) 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, measures 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: 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).

2.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

SLO 3: Proficiency in communication theory (G: 1) (M: 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: 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 6: Comprehensive doctoral examinations (O: 1, 2, 3)

The new Comprehensive Exam assessment form was designed specifically to integrate with the assessment forms developed for course work above. The assessment of comprehensive exams will be specific to each doctoral track, and will provide summarizing information which will connect back to assessment information gathered from the seminars. We have designed the comprehensive exam assessment to allow us to add specific rubrics for each doctoral track, depending upon what we discover as we assess performance in seminars. Thus, if we find that students in one of the tracks are consistently scoring low in one specific area of the field, we can then add that as an area of assessment in the comprehensive exams, with the intention that if the weakness has not been ameliorated by the time of comprehensive exams, then a revision of the curriculum in relation to that area would be advisable.

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

Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Research and Method</strong></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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory</strong></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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></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 in the past had not been assessed. Because only a very small number of prospectuses were defended in the period between the development of the measure and the end of the cycle, it is too early to develop targets or report findings here. Prospectuses will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported in next cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;prospectus calendar&quot; that shows all upcoming prospectus defenses and allows grad directors to follow up on assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 8: Assessment of Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></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 in the past had not been assessed. Because only a very small number of dissertations were defended in the period between the development of the measure and the end of the cycle, it is too early to develop targets or report findings here. Dissertations will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported in next cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Research and Method</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Proficiency in writing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 9: Presentation of work at conferences (O: 4, 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, &quot;Conferences and Publications,&quot; into two separate measures, as achievements are significantly different in the two areas.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Professional development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 10: Publication in peer reviewed journals (O: 4, 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Proficiency in writing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 (i.e., from the time of submission, to 'revise-resubmit,' to final acceptance) vary so widely that one cannot set expectations that are tied to academic years.

---

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

**Increased opportunity to revise written work**

Currently, slightly over 50% of our doctoral seminars incorporate paper revision into the seminar. We would like to encourage faculty to adopt this practice more widely. One of the systems we would advocate is to have the students present short versions of the final paper orally to the seminar as a conference presentation, and then use the resulting feedback to revise the paper for final submission. This is already done in some seminars; we would like to see it more widely adopted in doctoral syllabi.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication in peer reviewed journals</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of work at conferences</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised doctoral prosem seminar curriculum**

At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new prosem format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosem at least twice during their doctoral residence, once before comprehensive exams, and once in the dissertation-writing period. We believe that this shift in focus in the prosem seminar will help bring the students more quickly up to speed in the theoretical foundations of the field, and in their oral and written proficiency.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of work at conferences</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** We have already begun the new prosem format; we will monitor its effectiveness during the year.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009

---

**Bring top doctoral applicants to department in mid February**

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

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

**Implementation Description:** Has been in place now for the past 2 years.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Cheshier, Graduate Committee, all area faculty

---

**Continue annual manuscript workshops with senior scholars**

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

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

**Responsible Person/Group:** Cheshier; departmental faculty

---

**Continue the Moving Image Studies conference**

Currently, the Moving Image Studies conference set for Feb 2011 promises to bring a highly visible group of scholars together under the theme of “Rendering the Visible.” The area should consider continuing this conference, perhaps biennially given the vast time commitments a conference like this requires, rotating themes and principal faculty.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Committee; in consultation with Graduate Admissions (Amber Amari, Chad Van Gorden)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 to 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Non-thesis option adopted 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Committee; Fujioka and Wilkin for statistical design; Restivo, Stuckey, and committee members for assessment questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Already implement in Prosem syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Cheshier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate committee; graduate directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Because there are three very different tracks in the Communications doctoral program, we have not decided yet whether we will develop separate rubrics for each track, or whether we can have common rubrics. The data gathered from last year should help us determine this. Once the grad committee has drafted the new integrated set of rubrics, then they will be given to the faculty in each area, where further revisions will be done. We expect the entire set of rubrics to be ready by the end of Spring semester 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, dissertations. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 possibility of accepting students on condition that they do not-for-credit remediation work in film theory and media history, based on an examination of their transcripts during the admission process.
**Mission / Purpose**

In today’s highly competitive global environment, the effective deployment of information technology has become the key to organizational success. There is a continuing shortage of individuals with the combination of business and technology skills needed to develop and manage information systems that provide competitive advantage in the global marketplace. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete. In many respects these applications are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The mission of the M.B.A. concentration and major in information systems is to produce graduates able to fill this need. Students will learn how to combine their general business knowledge with contemporary and emerging information systems concepts to enable organizations to compete strongly in the global marketplace. The courses to constitute a concentration (12 semester hours) in information systems are chosen from the 8000-level offerings of the Department of Computer Information Systems or IB 8680. This flexibility enables students to select courses that provide the best foundation for their career advancement. The M.B.A. IS enrollment over the 2008-2009 academic year was used to identify the specific courses for this assessment. Based on highest registration, the selected courses were CIS 8000 IT Project Management, CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation & Organizational Change Management, CIS 8020 Systems Integration, and CIS 8080 Security and Privacy. Indeed, these are logical extensions of the overall MBA program. Businesses need to continually innovate. This typically requires employing IT enabled business process reengineering and careful management of organizational change and of the overall innovation project. Finally, security and privacy are evermore important to maintain integrity and trust in this highly connected business environment.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Build and renew business via technology and process (M: 1)**

Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

**O/O 2: Manage projects and balance resources (M: 2)**

Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan. Students will be able to work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**O/O 3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls (M: 3)**

Students will be able to articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate controls.

**O/O 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (M: 4)**

The student will be able to employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. This includes: Define the objectives of and issues associated integration of information systems applications. Explain alternative strategies for systems integration. Identify commonly used tools for integrating information systems, describing the benefits of using each. Explain how Web services can aid in systems integration, identifying the underlying tools and technologies that facilitate the creation of such services. Discuss the characteristics of systems integration projects, emphasizing the management issues and practices associated with them. Identify information systems application and organization characteristics that are most likely to cause an organization to employ a systems integration company to carry out the project work.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by IT, and manage the required change (O: 1)**

Students will be able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the required organizational changes.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Build and renew business via technology and process**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the midterm and final exams in CIS 8010. Learning Objective: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were not able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. 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.

**M 2: Manage projects and balance resources (O: 2)**

Manage projects and balance resources
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 856 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. As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST

Target for O2: Manage projects and balance resources

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the written assignments in CIS 8000. Learning Objective: translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

O2: 3

Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

O3: 4

Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8020. Learning Objective: Identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals Students were not able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
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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 the requirements for a replacement system. Within the context of a capstone course, the quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by the client organizations. The quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Students will be proficient in systems design (M: 5, 6, 9)**

Students will be able to read a system specification and analyze user data requirements within the context of a three-tier architecture. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to presentation tier, business tier, and data tier abstractions. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design current system architectures will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design current system architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by a faculty panel. 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 make effective and efficient use of Internet applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design and develop effective, graphically pleasing web sites will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**SLO 3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency (M: 7, 8, 10)**

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.

**M 2: Specified System Requirements (O: 1)**

Specified, analyzed, & refined the system and user requirements

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis**

4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**M 3: Developed Program Specifications (O: 1)**

Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis**

4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4:</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><strong>Target for O1:</strong> Students will be proficient in systems analysis</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5:</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><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Students will be proficient in systems design</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6:</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><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Students will be proficient in systems design</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7:</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><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8:</th>
<th>Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9:</th>
<th>Designed user interface (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Students will be proficient in systems design</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10:</th>
<th>Appropriately used database concepts (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11:</th>
<th>Appropriately used business process modeling concepts (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriately used Business Process Modeling Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1:</strong> Students will be proficient in systems analysis</td>
<td></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>
</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-Oriented. 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: Finished
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: Terminated
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: Finished
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

Require programming course
Curriculum change was approved Fall 2013 requiring CIS majors to complete CIS 3260 or CIS 3265 (Exam) as part of the required program courses. Recommendation of self-paced course did not provide results needed for student competency in programming. First group of students under this requirement will be assessed in Spring 2015.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Georgia State University
Mission / Purpose

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

Number of graduates in the MS CIS/IS degree program Summer 2008 Fall 2008 Spring 2009 3 5 5 Summer 2007 Fall 2007 Spring 2008 3 4 3 Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 8 8 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 5 13 7 Number of students in the MS CIS/IS degree Summer 2008 Fall 2008 Spring 2009 10 38 39 Summer 2007 Fall 2007 Spring 2008 16 27 22 Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 31 34 27 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 38 57 46 The 2004-2005 assessment report for this program may be found at [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/programassessment/graduate/CIS_MS_Assessment_Report_9_16_2005.htm](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/programassessment/graduate/CIS_MS_Assessment_Report_9_16_2005.htm). While this document primarily addresses specific course-level assessment of our departmental programs, it is but part of a larger assessment and curricular improvement activities engaging the energy of CIS faculty for two very compelling reasons. The first arises from the core nature of our discipline and the second arises from purely economic realities. 1) The disciplinary core. Our discipline is at the nexus of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Social Organizations. The modern business, governmental and Nonprofit organization is increasingly dependent upon these technologies to compete in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. Both these technologies and the organizational settings in which they are embedded are highly dynamic, and emergent settings. As such our discipline, and our curricula, must necessarily address those principles and skills that are stable over time, but also to anticipate where changing technical and social/political 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 curricula they are a part of is in constant flux. Thus, by technical and economic necessity, the CIS faculty are confronted with compelling reasons for continuous improvement of our programs, course offerings and course content. We offer three examples as evidence of this attention to continuous curricular improvement. The first is that in the past 5 years the curriculum has undergone two major revisions at each the undergraduate and graduate programs and is in the stages of yet another substantial revamping. Secondly, three times in the past five years faculty have engaged Chief Information Officers and other leaders from major Atlanta Metropolitan business and service industry organizations in group discussion covering the nature and content of our programs and course offerings. A fourth such process is in the offing for early 2007. And thirdly, CIS faculty hold leadership positions in the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) special interest group on computer personnel research (SIG CPR) and make a specific study of study the changing technical skill sets required of our graduates in the workforce. Our faculty are represented on Microsoft's academic advisory board and routinely engage with CIO and CTO level personnel in other industry and academic venues, which coupled with an active field research agenda provides a view of the changing skill-sets needed by our students. Thus, at both holistic and detailed levels of analysis, CIS faculty attempt to keep abreast of societal and technical changes requiring curricular adjustment. This document is, however, largely concerned with course-level assessment. It depends on direct measures of curricular competence, i.e., student exams, projects and presentations. Because it is an analysis of the artifacts of the curriculum and instructional activity, it is also an indirect assessment exercise. This assessment exercise addresses the fidelity by which the core course set in our CIS major meets a set of stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are represented below. Figure 1 (Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2006) Course-level Assessment method As is typical student performance was measured by sets of direct and indirect measures of exams, homework, projects and presentations, adjudicated by the principal instructor, and in many cases, with the participation of other faculty and industry representatives as outside adjudicators. The course level assessment provided herein was arrived at by indirect means; that is, via the evaluation of static artifacts. Those assessments were based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall learning objectives. For each of the core courses the departmental evaluation committee developed a survey instrument (c.f., [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/programassessment/graduate/index.asp](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/programassessment/graduate/index.asp)). The draft instrument was created from published course documents and then reviewed by instructional staffed to access the efficacy of the instrument and the completeness of the courses learning objectives. At the conclusion of the Fall and Spring term instructional faculty were asked to provide a sampling representing 15% of the student’s work, with the provision that there should be a minimal sub-set of work representing all the stated learning objectives. These materials were made available to the assessment team of faculty, and PhD students. Those evaluating review all documents and the course syllabi and relevant assignment materials then completed the assessment questionnaire. The summary results are reported herein and the overall summary of the graduate assessment may be found at: (To Be Completed for 2006-2007). A fuller description of the assessment process is represented by the diagram above (except figure 1 here) and may be found in Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2006 from which we excerpted this diagram.

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)**

In lieu of this, a surrogate objective will be used: 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.
Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with an emerging technology. Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business processes, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system (O: 1)**
Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs.

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

**Target for O1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 2: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure (O: 2)**
Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

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

**Target for O2: Create environments for programs and systems**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 3: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan (O: 3)**
Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan.

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

**Target for O3: Manage an information technology project**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 4: III.2: Manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques (O: 3)**
Students will be able to manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques.

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

**Target for O3: Manage an information technology project**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 5: IV.1: Identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies (O: 4)**
Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies.

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

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 6: IV.2: Diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations (O: 4)**
Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations enabled by information technology.

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

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the target”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the target”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 7: IV.3: Formulate an implementation plan to manage organizational changes associated with introduction of new technology (O: 4)**
Students should be able to formulate an implementation plan to manage organizational changes associated with introduction of new technology.

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

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the target”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the target”), according to the evaluation rubric.
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
**Mission / Purpose**

It is critical for all students to master a basic understanding of computing due to its pervasiveness. Also, due to its rapidly changing nature it is imperative for student to 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

**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.

**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.

**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

**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.

**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
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 students upon graduating will have the necessary foundation to contribute meaningfully to their job

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: Theoretical Foundations of Computer Science (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
1.5 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
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
### M 1: Alumni Surveys
We propose to periodically contact our alumni with an online survey with the intention of finding out how much their studies at GSU contribute to their success in their career.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

### M 2: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews
A senior level online course survey and exit interview will be conducted each term to solicit input from graduating seniors on a self-assessment of their education, on their concerns with the department, and their ideas for possible curricular improvements. The undergraduate coordinator will administer the survey in conjunction with the graduation audit check out.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

### M 3: Senior Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 5)
Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee. (each semester) Students are encouraged to participate in external design competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions. (ongoing)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

### Target for O1: Computer Systems Development
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### 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 (O: 2, 3, 4)
Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on assignments and projects targeting specific components of the corresponding outcome. Each outcome will be measured via the quality of the students’ answers to selected questions on the assignments and projects in the corresponding courses. Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

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

### Target for O2: Programming Skills
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### 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: Theoretical Foundations of Computer Science
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 2310, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2510, 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.

### 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: Theoretical Foundations of Computer Science**
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: Written Assignments and Reports | 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. We have also added a lab period to all of our 2000 level classes as of the Spring of 2014 and have extended it to the 3000 level classes as of Fall 2014. The expectation is that we can encourage retention and hence enhance graduation rate.

- **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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We were unable to implement the surveys as intended, but we have had anecdotal comments from graduating students and some alumni who have indicated that the implementation of the CTW classes have given them a better grasp tackling a problem in a more formal manner. This has let them spend less time in correcting mistakes that they would have made otherwise.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We have decided to add labs to all of our 2000 level class as well as the Data Structure class (a 3000 level class). We are doing this hoping that it will help in both a reduction of DWF as well as retention of students and eventually enhance our graduating rate.

**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 have increased the size of our 2000 and 3000 level classes because of a lack of human resources (not enough instructors). We are hoping that it will not lead to a reduction in our graduation rate nor an increase in DWF.
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 cataloged and made available to the Assessment Committee (on going).
Source of Evidence: External report

Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking

Findings 2013-2014 - 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.

Target for O4: Communication

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).
M 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 5)
Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

M 3: Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Copies of selected oral presentations and written reviews will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

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 O3: Collaboration
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Target for O4: Communication
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

M 4: Examinations (O: 1, 5)
Student ability will be assessed via examinations. Copies of selected examinations will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should
demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

M 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 (ongoing).
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

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
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.

M 2: Qualifying exam (O: 1, 6)
The Ph.D. qualifying exam covers a breadth of the foundation material for the Computer Science curriculum. All Ph.D. students are required to pass this exam within the first three semesters of entry into the program.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Qualifying Examination Committee.
Target for O6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Qualifying Examination Committee.

M 3: Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses (O: 1, 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

---

**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)**
Performance on assignments in Acct 8410
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. Revised target for
2014-2015: 90% in Question 1, 80% in Question 2, and 85% in Question 3.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2013-2014, the overall mean score on Question 1 was 90%, on Question 2 it was 64% (up from 43% in the prior year), and on Question 3 it was 81%. Targets of 80% were met or exceeded in 2 of the 3 questions. Therefore, targets are being revised upward for 2014-2015 to 90% in Question 1 and 85% for Question 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on exam questions in 8410.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Financial reporting skills: Develop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 80% or above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Collaboration Skills (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation by student peers of contributions to team projects in Acct 8030 and Acct 8410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Collaboration Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 85% in Tax 8120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Communication Skills (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students exited course with a B level grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Communication Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students exited course with a B level grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Analytical Skills (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in Acct 8700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Analytical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 75% on relevant quiz questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Assurance Skills (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in Acct 8610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Assurance Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam mean of 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Apply tax law (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply tax law to individuals and entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Technological skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research project mean of 85% or above for class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Analytical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills

Implementation Description: Use financial statements of fortune 500 companies to illustrate, explain, and understand the concepts of analysis.
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran
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. The plan is working! Students are doing the homework questions and the test scores are correspondingly higher.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict

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: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran
Additional Resources: Faculty Time

Assign and collect homework problems for class participation credit
Continue the assignment of homework problems for class participation credit. Use the Socrative App in class to check answers from homework problems for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Students have downloaded the socrative app. They enter key numbers from consolidated financial statements on to the app and the faculty checks to see if it is right/wrong for class participation credit.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran

Assign and collect homework problems for class participation credit
Continue the assignment of homework problems for class participation credit. Use the Socrative App in class to check answers from homework problems for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Students have downloaded the socrative app. Homework problems are being collected, with students reporting key financial statement numbers on socrative app for class participation credit.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran

Assign and collect homework problems for class participation credit
Continue the assignment of homework problems for class participation credit. Use the Socrative App in class to check answers from homework problems for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict

Implementation Description: Students have downloaded the socrative app. Homework problems are being collected, with students reporting key financial statement numbers on socrative app for class participation credit.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran

Use socrative app to assess student homework
Continue the assignment of homework problems for class participation credit. Use the Socrative App in class to check answers from homework problems for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Use socrative app to assess student performance
Continue the assignment of homework problems for class participation credit. Use the Socrative App in class to check answers from homework problems for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Use socrative app to assess student performance on homework problems
Continue the assignment of homework problems for class participation credit. Use the Socrative App in class to check answers from homework problems for class participation credit.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Concentration in Business Analysis MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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
G 1: Goal of the MBA Concentration in Business Analysis
The goal of the Concentration in Business Analysis for students in the MBA program is to provide students seeking a degree a broader MBA education with a meaningful exposure to an array of tools, techniques and frameworks used in business analysis and with techniques for using those tools, techniques and frameworks effectively with other functional information to improve decision making in both profit and not-for-profit organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (M: 1)
Students should be able to qualitatively state the key issues clearly and accurately the issues in a business problem.

SLO 2: Model Building Ability (M: 2)
Students will be able to clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics in a given business problem.

SLO 3: Understanding of Techniques (M: 3)
Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

SLO 4: Software Skills (M: 4)
Students will acquire expertise in the selection and use of key decision making software packages.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (O: 1)
Students will be measured on their ability to a) understand the business goals, b) identify the key variables that need to be analyzed, c) analyze the potential relationships among the variables and d) interpret the results of their analysis.

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

Target for O1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
Achievement Target: 80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 1 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from courses across the curriculum. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in every course where it is applicable during the academic year Learning Outcome 1. Rubric Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Understanding of the business goal / issues Is able to state the key issues clearly and accurately Either clarity or accuracy can be improved Both clarity and accuracy are below expectation It is clear that the student does not understand the issues ii Identifying Key variables that need to be analyzed Knows clearly what variables must be used to represent the key issue(s) Some lack of clarity in expressing the key variables Unsure or incomplete understanding of what needs to be analyzed. Does not understand the key variable that relate to the issues. iii. Analysis potential relationships among variables
Accurate and thorough qualitative analysis of the situation. Some lack of clarity in expressing the relationships. Weak understanding of relationships among concepts/variables. Very little understanding of how variables/concepts are related. iv. Interpretation of results. Can clearly relate the results of model building and quantitative analysis back to the main issue. Can make the connection of model results to situation most of the time. Some errors in interpretation of results in the context of the situation. Inability to connect the results of model with the situation at hand.

**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. Deal 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.

**M 3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 3)**

Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

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

**Target for O3: Understanding of Techniques**

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

**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. 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, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects. 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, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects. iv. 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, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects.

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

**On-Going Improvement**

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA
(As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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)

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: Tranformative Reflection
Student average on criteria will be 2.5 on a 5.0 scale

M 2: Vicarious experience reflection (O: 1)
Entrepreneurship students (MGS8500/8050) 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.
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 2-2013: 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.

**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.

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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.

**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.

**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
- Measure: Development and application of foundation knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Development and application of technical skills

Implementation Description: continuous
### 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

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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/HRM 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.

### 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 meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected exam questions in MGS 8300, 8360, and 8390. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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. Adapto workforce diversity issues 1 = Students can react to a 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 Mergers 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 MBA/HR 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 (rectal, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O8: Union and employee relations**
80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 average 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 average 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
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**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
- Proposed Completion Date: 11/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Lecture Changes Integrating Law and Policy

- Review in more detail written assignments in MGS 8320 and MGS 8300 concerning the linkages between HR law and policies. Discuss in class and compare student products, giving feedback and analysis. Reevaluate after next offering.

  
  
  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
  Implementation Status: Planned  
  Priority: High  
  
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
  - Measure: Understanding and Interpreting case Law  
  - Outcome/Objective: HR Law  

  
  
  Projected Completion Date: 12/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg  
  Additional Resources: None  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Reading Changes in MGS 8360

- Assign readings to MGS 8360 and require students to explain conclusions and implications in their own words. Discuss in class. Reevaluate after next offering.

  
  
  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
  Implementation Status: Finished  
  Priority: High  
  
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
  - Measure: Resource Identification in HR  
  - Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving  

  
  
  Projected Completion Date: 12/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg  
  Additional Resources: None  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add additional 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 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)

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
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.

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 team work 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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
### Target for O1: A Strategic View of OM

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2.5 on the Rubric for Measurement One. Learning Objective 1: A Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 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 excels at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

### M 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 1)

Students should be able to determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic and integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm and/or industry.

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

### Target for O1: A Strategic View of OM

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1: Learning Objective 1: A Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meets standards=2 Exceeds standards=3 Measure 2: Integration of recommendations The student is not able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student determines the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student excels at integrating recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student easily determines the effects that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic.

### M 3: Performance (O: 1)

This item measures the students' ability to analyze or understand how a firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment through their ability to identify the critical success factors of an OM application and the assessment of available resources and capabilities.

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

### Target for O1: A Strategic View of OM

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1: Learning Objective 1: A Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meets standards=2 Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3: Performance The student is not able to identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student excels at identifying 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 exceeds 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 answered on time.

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

### 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. Learning Objective 3: Develop an Environmental/Sustainability Viewpoint Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meets standards=2 Exceeds standards=3 Measure 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environmental impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environmental impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an excellent understanding of the environmental impact of OM or are easily able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.

### M 6: Team Skills (O: 4)

The students should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

### Target for O4: Become a Strong Team Member
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric.

Objective 4: Become a Strong Team Member
- Fail: Fails to meet standards = 1
- Meet: Meets standards = 2
- Exceed: Exceeds standards = 3

Measure 6: Team Skills
The student did not develop team skills by indicated by poor returns on peer evaluations.

The student develops team skills by indicated by average returns on peer evaluations.

The student develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations.
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Mission / Purpose

The manager in today's business environment deals with a variety of complex concerns including structural and organizational design, people issues and managing people, power and politics, and cultural dimensions. The Master of Business Administration in Organization Management prepares managers to analyze issues, events, problems, resource constraints, and change from the vantage point of each of these concerns and to consider each as they make decisions to chart the organization's future. Organizations are composed of people, and people bring unique challenges to the workplace. These challenges include working with people as individuals, people in work groups, and people collectively in organizations.

Goals

G 1: Diagnose Organizational Events and Problems
Goal 1: To graduate students from the MBA in Organizational Management with the ability to diagnose the basic causes of organizational events, issues, and problems.

G 2: Recommendations for Org. Events & Problems
Goal 2: To graduate students from the MBA in Organizational Management with the ability to recommend appropriate responses to organizational events, issues, and problems.

G 3: Understand Impact of Power & Politics
Goal 3: To graduate students of the MBA program in Organization Management with an understanding of the impact that power, influence, and political behavior have on general organizational success and upon the success of specific initiatives in organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analyze Organizational Situations (G: 1) (M: 1)
Outcome/Objective 1: Analyze a variety of organizational situations and identify the causes of effective and ineffective movement toward meeting the organization's agenda. Full Description: Organizational issues, events, and problems have causes that simultaneously emanate from structural, human, political, and cultural roots. Therefore, most significant issues, events, and problems must be viewed from multiple perspectives to obtain a reasonably complete understanding. Graduate should be able to simultaneously see issues, events, and problems from multiple perspectives. Related Measures Case assignments and exam questions in MBA 8165, MGS 8435, and MGS 8440.

SLO 2: Specify Courses of Action (G: 2) (M: 2)
Outcome/Objective 2: Review a variety of organizational events, issues, and problems and specify appropriate courses of action the organization should take as a response. Full Description: Organizational issues, events, and problems have causes that simultaneously emanate from structural, human, political, and cultural roots. Graduate should be able to simultaneously see issues, events, and problems from multiple perspectives and to formulate responses that reflect an understanding of these multiple roots. Related Measures Case assignments and exam questions in MBA 8165, MGS 8435, and MGS 8440.

SLO 3: Analyze Political Realities (G: 3) (M: 3)
Outcome/Objective 3: Effectively analyze political realities in organizational situations. Full Description: The MBA graduate will be able to identify the effect of power and politics on resource allocations, personnel decisions, and other decisions that organizations make. Related Measures Exam questions, cases, and projects in MGS 8435.

Strategic Plan Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Find Four-Perspective Causes of Events /Problems (O: 1)
M1: Students can examine organizational events, issues, and problems and identify structural, human, political, and cultural elements in the cause of situation.

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

Target for O1: Analyze Organizational Situations
### M 2: Recommend Responses Incorporating Four-Perspective Analysis (O: 2)

M2: Students can recommend organizational responses to problems that are cognizant of structural, human, political, and cultural dimensions to the situation.

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

**Target for O2: Specify Courses of Action**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected case assignments and exam questions.

### M 3: Identify Political Dimensions of Decisions (O: 3)

M3: Students can identify political dimensions of organizational decisions.

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

**Target for O3: Analyze Political Realities**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 Rubric to randomly selected exams, cases, and projects.

---

**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

  **Responsible Person/Group:** MBA 8165 instructors

**Additional Case for Analysis of Causes**

Add an in-class case discussion just before mid-term that requires students to provide analysis of organizational causes of events, issues, and problems.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** 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

---

**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 are 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

---

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 2.66 100% students met standard.

---

M 2: Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals (O: 2)

Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals  
**Criterion 1:** Understand the process for estimating workplace demand 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;
**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 2.33 66% students met standard. Average on Criteria 2: 3.00 100% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 3.00 100% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 2.66 100% 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: Finished

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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The MBA-RE will be assessed as part of the MBA in the future. The MBA-RE program is currently not enrolling students.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

The MBA-RE will be assessed as part of the MBA in the future. The MBA-RE program is currently not enrolling students.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The MBA-RE program is currently not enrolling students. The MBA-RE will be assessed as part of the MBA in the future.
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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students received evaluation of 4 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students score a 3 or above on practicum evaluation items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Performance in ethics course (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Advanced Ethics course (i.e., CPS 8530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Comprehensive examination question on ethics (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of students receive passing grade on ethics comprehensive area question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance in assessment didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written practicum evaluation from supervisors. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must receive a score of 3 or higher on all quantitative items to be satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will receive a score of 3 or higher on related practicum evaluation items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Performance in theories courses (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance in theories related courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Understands relevant clinical theories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by instructors of theory related courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received evaluation of 4 or higher on theory related course evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 9: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 4)
Theory comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students write a 12-page answer to the question to demonstrate their knowledge of counseling theories and applications. Answers are evaluated by a 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
80% of students received evaluation of 4 or higher on theory exam question.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students received evaluation of 4 or higher 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: Evaluation by practicum supervisor | Outcome/Objective: Clinical effectiveness with diverse groups of clients | Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice
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.
**Annual Report Section Responses**

### Most important accomplishments for year

Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

All goals were met. Program was recently re-accredited by the American Psychological Association.

### 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 were adopted.

### Modifications in Intended Outcomes

If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

No outcomes were modified.

### University-wide Committee Participation

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

Faculty serve on IRB, University Senate, and Regents Professor group.

### Publications and Presentations

Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

Numerous professional presentations by faculty at the American Psychological Association and other professional conferences. In addition, faculty published numerous professional articles in a variety of psychological journals.

### International Activities

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

Several faculty presented at international conferences in Japan, Israel, and South Africa.

### Contributions to Student Retention

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

Current retention for the program is 100%.

### 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 regularly present to community audiences on psychological topics. In addition, faculty have projects in the refugee community in the area and in violence-prevention in local schools.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   Opportunities to learn, practice, and master the SLOs are clearly outlined in the required curriculum outlined in the catalog and student handbook.

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

   All goals were met. Recent accreditation visit from the American Psychological Association has prompted the faculty to reflect on possible additional means of assessment.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

   Results of assessment findings are shared in regular core faculty meetings in doctoral seminar with current PhD students.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

   All goals were met. Faculty are beginning discussions of alternate assessments, as prompted by a recent review of American Psychological Association Accreditation guidelines.
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**Mission / Purpose**
The Counselor Education and Practice Ph.D. program prepares students to work as counselor educators, supervisors, and advanced practitioners in academic, public schools, and clinical settings.

**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 knowledge 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.

**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 minimum of 2 points (0=still not evident; 1=stills emerging; 2=skills evident; 3=exemplary) on the teaching section of their professional portfolio which is one of the assignments in their CPS 9963 course. Students are required to submit a copy of a sample course syllabus that they developed for a course they have taught or are currently teaching. The syllabus will be assessed based on the following criteria: 1) does the syllabus clearly state the purpose of the course; 2) does the syllabus detail the criteria for evaluation; and 3) does the syllabus present a tentative outline of the course. Students must receive at least 2 points for each criterion.

**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 equate to competent; 3 points equate to exemplary.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
During the 2013-2014 cycle, five doctoral students taught courses. Three received 3 points and two received 2 points on their
teaching competency section of their doctoral portfolio (Average 2.6 points).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Teaching (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The range of scores on this question was 4.7 to 5 with a mean of 4.88. 100% (N=5) met this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Teaching (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness is measured by question 13 on the Student Evaluation of Instructor form (The instructor helped me understand the connection between issues and concepts discussed in this course and my profession. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Teaching**

On the teaching effectiveness question (The instructor helped me understand the connection between issues and concepts discussed in this course and my profession) of the Teaching Evaluation Form students will receive at least a 3 out of 5 with 80% receiving either a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The range of scores on this question was 4.8 to 5 with a mean of 4.94. 100% (N=5) met this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Research (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. The predissertation study is a research study where the students design and implement a research project. The student’s major professor reviews the predissertation study notifies the CEP program coordinator once the project is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Research**

Students will complete and submit their predissertation study.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Two students successfully completed their predissertation study. One student has his predissertation study accepted for publication in the Journal of Individual Psychology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Research (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. The comprehensive exam is reviewed by three faculty members. Students can receive 0 points=does not pass; 1 point=pass with revisions; and 2 points pass. Students must receive a 2 in order in each section of the comprehensive examination, including the research section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Research**

Students will receive a pass on the research portion of their written comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

During this cycle, we had three students take the written comprehensive examination. All three students received a pass (2 points) from the three reviewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Clinical Skills (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Clinical Skills**

Students will receive at least 3 out of 5 on the relevant questions on the Supervisee Evaluation Form.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the advanced practica sequence was not offered (this course is only offered every...
other year). No data was collected for this objective.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
During Fall 2013, eight (n=8) students completed the first semester of supervision training. 1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of supervision and counseling theories and concepts. The range of scores was 4 to 5 with an average of 4.375. 2. Students will demonstrate professional and ethical behavior in the practice of clinical supervision. The range of scores was 4-5 with an average of 4.125. 3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds. The range of scores was 4-5 with an average of 4.625. During Spring 2014, the same eight (n=8) students completed the second semester of supervision internship. 1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of supervision and counseling theories and concepts. The range of scores was 4 to 5 with an average of 4.875. 2. Students will demonstrate professional and ethical behavior in the practice of clinical supervision. The range of scores was 4-5 with an average of 4.875. 3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds. The range of scores was 4-5 with an average of 4.75.

**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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

**Clinical practice**
Continue to monitor the supervisee evaluation forms.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Clinical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Skills

**Supervision**
Continue to monitor the SIT evaluation forms.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Supervision | Outcome/Objective: Supervision

**Teaching-goals/objectives**
Continue to monitor the teaching evaluations.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

**Teaching-preparedness**
Continue to monitor the teaching evaluations from our students.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching
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: Finished
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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

All SLOs in the CEP program are linked to specific courses. We have four major goal areas and each is linked to a course. More specifically, Teaching is linked to EPY 7000: Facilitating College Teaching Supervision is linked to CPS 9480: Supervision of Counseling Services and CPS 9661: Supervision Internship Research is linked to CPS 9920: Research and Publication Clinical Practice is linked to CPS 8660: Applied Practice II and CPS 9660: Applied Practice III. All the SLOs are also reviewed as a part of the doctoral competency portfolio which is a requirement of CPS 9963: Leadership in Counselor Education: Professional and Social Advocacy.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The findings suggest that our students are developing skills in our target areas of teaching, research, supervision, and clinical practice. The findings are consistent with past years with our students meeting all the outlined objectives. Our program is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) and as such our curriculum follows the standards set forth by CACREP.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment findings are shared in multiple ways. 1. All CEP faculty are given a copy of the WEAVE online report. 2. CEP faculty meet regularly to discuss the program and ways to improve the program. 3. All CEP students must attend mentoring meetings with CEP faculty annually. The purpose of these meetings is to provide concrete feedback to the students related to areas in which the student is excelling as well as to discuss areas in which the student may need additional mentoring and guidance. The outcome of this meeting is a list of action items for the student to work on in the upcoming year. 4. The CEP faculty has an advisory board that meets annually. The advisory board consists of community members who employ and supervise our CEP students as well as other counselor educators from other doctoral programs in Georgia. During this meeting, the program coordinator provides an overview of the CEP program and shares the findings of the assessment. 5. The CEP program publishes online a summary of our performance data per CACREP requirements. This data includes CEP student productivity, admissions and graduation data, awards and employment data.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

At this time, there are no plans to make any changes to the educational program or to the assessment process. The assessment process appears to be effective in measuring the SLOs. Last year, one of the action plans included the development of the Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling Track for the CEP students. We have established this track. Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling is one of the cognate options for CEP students.
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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. In addition, those students presenting for the first time at a national conference and who are to be financially supported by the department will participate in a dry-run of their presentation no later than 2 weeks before the national conference in question.

#### 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 Vita.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target for O1: Presentations**
100% of students will have presented at least once at a regional or national conference by the time they graduate. 60% of students will have presented at least twice at a regional or national conference by the time they graduate. 20% of students will have presented 3 or more times (at least 2 national presentations) by the time they graduate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
This year, six doctoral students presented findings at the 2014 annual meeting of the American Society for Criminology in San Francisco.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
All students who graduated and were hired into tenure track positions this past year had multiple publications in peer-reviewed journals.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Teaching Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Faculty Evals (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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&amp;C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Teaching Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Comps Rubric (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty committees will establish satisfactory guidelines for the assessment of Comprehensive Examinations that all students must take in order to advance to the dissertation stage of the program. These will be decided on a committee-by-committee basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory performance on the comprehensive exam will be measured on a committee-by-committee basis. Comprehensive exam format changed. New parameters to be established this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. The mission of the Department is to produce students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for criminal justice leadership positions in public and private agencies. This report provides an assessment of student learning for the 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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students 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=5) of CRJU 2200 were offered during the Fall 2013 (n=2), Spring 2014 (n=2), and Summer 2014 (n=1) semesters. Of the five sections offered, three were taught by full-time tenure track faculty members, and two were taught by doctoral students. 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 2013, one taught in the Spring 2014, and one taught in the Summer 2014, 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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 266 students (N=114 for Instructor 1; N=121 for Instructor 2; N=31 for Instructor 1) 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: 93%; Q2 Pass Rate: 95%. Overall for Instructor 1, 94% pass rate (Overall: Met target goal) Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 71%; Q2 Pass Rate: 87%. Overall for Instructor 2, 79% Pass Rate (Overall: Partially met target goal). Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 83%; Q2 Pass Rate: 83%. Overall for Instructor 3, 83% (Overall: Met target goal).

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

A total of 266 students (N=114 for Instructor 1; N=121 for Instructor 2; N=31 for Instructor 1) 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: 93%; Q2 Pass Rate: 62%. Overall for Instructor 1, 77% pass rate (Overall: Partially met target goal) Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 80%; Q2 Pass Rate: 96%. Overall for Instructor 2, 88% Pass Rate (Overall: Met target goal). Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 93%; Q2 Pass Rate: 62%. Overall for Instructor 3, 78% (Overall: Partially 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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

A total of 266 students (N=114 for Instructor 1; N=121 for Instructor 2; N=31 for Instructor 1) 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: 71%; Q2 Pass Rate: 86%. Overall for Instructor 1, 79% pass rate (Overall: Partially met target goal) Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 91%; Q2 Pass Rate: 98%. Overall for Instructor 2, 95% Pass Rate (Overall: Met target goal). Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 76%; Q2 Pass Rate: 86%. Overall for Instructor 3, 81% (Overall: Partially met target goal).

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

Review of course content and assessment measures
See plan for contemporary criminal justice issues.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Review of course content and assessment measures
See plan for contemporary criminal justice issues.

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

Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Blackwell

Assessment of course materials
Instructors will be queried regarding their teaching of materials related to questions to determine links between material coverage, how material is covered, and reinforcement strategies related to outcomes not or partially met.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary 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

Evaluation of assessment items considering goal
Continued evaluation of assessment items utilized to ensure applicability of goal will occur.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
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

Evaluation of assessment items considering goal
Continued evaluation of assessment items utilized to ensure applicability of goal will occur.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues

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: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

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 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 test student's ability to test an issue in criminology or criminal justice. The assignment, included as an attached document, requires students to identify a single issue from the internship experience, identify a relevant theory (criminological, sociological, psychological, organizational, or legal) that can be utilized to enhance understanding of the issue, and prepare a position paper that addresses policy implications and recommendations. The assessment rubric is attached, and includes the different sections for the separate learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2013 (n=42), one section in Spring 2014 (n=56), and one section in Summer 2014 (n=31). The attached files labeled “Fall 2013 CRJU4930 Rubric Data”, “Spring 2014 CRJU4930 Rubric Data”, and “Summer 2014 CRJU 4930 Rubric Data” contain data for these 129 students. At the end of the year, 92% (n=119) of the students scored a 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale on the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric dimension. Sixty-eight percent (n=88) 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 83% (n=107) 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 1.5% (n=2) showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point). Toward meeting the last dimension, it is important to note that 38% (n=49) of the students achieved the highest score (4 of 4) on the final submission. Consequently, this made it difficult for the students as a whole to show improvement when they already achieved the highest rating of 4. Nevertheless, where possible, 46% (n=59) of students increased scores between first and final draft submissions. Although this figure is just slightly below the 50% goal set for this dimension, it is rather remarkable achievement in light of the preceding finding.

**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 to 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2013 (n=42), one section in Spring 2014 (n=56), and one section in Summer 2014 (n=31). The attached files labeled “Fall 2013 CRJU4930 Rubric Data”, “Spring 2014 CRJU4930 Rubric Data”, and “Summer 2014 CRJU 4930 Rubric Data” contain data for these 129 students. Overall, 98% (n=127) of the students earned a score of 2, 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. Eighty-three percent (n=107) of students received a score of 3 or 4, and 48% (n=62) 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 97% (n=125) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 3% (n=4) exhibited a decrease and 45% (n=58) showed no improvement in the Application & Analysis rubric dimension where improvement was possible (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point). Finally, 52% (n=67) of the students showed increased scores on the Application and Analysis dimension of the rubric between the first and final draft submissions.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2013 (n=42), one section in Spring 2014 (n=56), and one section in Summer 2014 (n=31). The attached files labeled “Fall 2013 CRJU4930 Rubric Data”, “Spring 2014 CRJU4930 Rubric Data”, and “Summer 2014 CRJU 4930 Rubric Data” contain data for these 129 students. At the end of the year, 84.5% (n=109) of the students enrolled earned a score of 3 or 4 on the Writing Quality & Style dimension of the rubric. We barely missed the second dimension, showing that 49% (n=63) of the students earned a score of 4 on this dimension for the final draft of the paper. We also missed the goal of 50% on the final dimension, revealing that 43% (n=56) of the students showed
improvement on their scores between the draft and the final draft submissions. It is worth pointing out that 84% (n=108) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 16% (n=21) exhibited a decrease and 40% (n=52) 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O3: Application and analysis

80% of student presentations will be rated as a 4 or 5 on a five point assessment scale utilized on a rubric (with 1 representing a poorly identified topic, lack of linkage between course/program content and internship experiences and 5 representing an achievement of excellence, with a timely and important topic relevant to internship agency functioning identified and analyzed using appropriate course and program materials and information.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 scored 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

All three sections of the capstone seminar were used to assess oral communication skills. Eighty-eight percent (n=111) of the 126 students scored an 80% or higher on the rubric to assess oral communication skills.

M 3: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment (O: 7)

Starting in AY 2010-2011, 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. These assignments along with a grading rubric served as a basis for assessing our students as ethical thinkers (i.e., the identification and evaluation of ethical frameworks). At that time, the department’s Undergraduate Committee had no requirement or expectation that these assignments and grading rubric would necessarily become standard for the course. This is in stark contrast to CRJU 4930, where the internship seminar course follows a fixed set of assignments and grading rubrics that must be evaluated by all faculty teaching the course. However, the faculty point-person who regularly taught the Ethics course and designed the particular assignments is no longer teaching the course. Beginning in AY 2013-2014, the department designated a new faculty member to provide instruction of the course. The department had no requirement nor expectation that the new instructor would be using the same assignments or assessment tool. 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. They then apply these criteria. At the end of the term, after exposure to ethical frameworks and assessments critically steeped in different ethical approaches, students revisit the assignment, thinking critically about the assignment, their 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

We did not assess outcomes using this measure this year.

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 effort 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: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and CTW teaching faculty

Objective assessment measures
The CTW Ambassador will meet with faculty to discuss the need to use objective assessment measures that are independent of grades.

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

Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador

Continued data collection
As a discipline, we believe that cross sectional data may yield findings that are not accurate, particularly given that contextual factors may enter into any particular course during any particular semester. Because we value examining a greater breadth of data, we will continue to monitor results over the next two years to determine whether our goals are being consistently met before we move on to address another question.

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

Implementation Description: Continued data collection

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: UG committee and program faculty

Expanded gathering of data
We will work to expand collection of data across sections of the capstone seminar next semester to collect a wider range of data relevant to assessment of oral presentation requirements and outcomes in the coming two years.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis

Implementation Description: This year the committee reviewed departmental syllabi to determine the degree to which oral presentations are required in the curriculum. The coming year the committee will assess the viability of inclusion of this as a learning outcome seen as important by the faculty. If the outcome is continued, then the committee will work to ensure that curriculum structure leads in a linear manner to ensure that students develop requisite skills for success.

Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate coordinator/committee

Continued Monitoring
The department will continue monitoring outcomes annually to ensure that new cohorts continue to demonstrate success in achieving this learning outcome.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
| Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information | Written communication skills
Measure: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
| 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 curing 2013-2014 school year for possible use in CRJU 4930 in future years.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor in CRJU 3060
Additional Resources: none

New CRJU 3060 Assignment and Grading Rubric
A new CRJU 3060 assignment and grading rubric will be used in place of the previous assignment.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Identification and evaluation of ethical frameworks

Implementation Description: Over the past year, the instructor has developed and implemented a new “Scruples” assignment for the CRJU 3060 Ethics course. A grading rubric has been developed but will not be implemented until the beginning of the Spring 2015 semester at the latest.
Responsible Person/Group: Michael Shapiro

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice Issue Essay An analysis of the assessment findings suggests that the majority of the target goals for the student learning outcomes were met satisfactorily. For the learning outcome of demonstrating knowledge and ability to synthesize information, all of the target goals for the three dimensions were met. Additionally, a comparison of the AY 2013-2014 data with the previous year showed consistent findings. For example, 98% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 81% in AY 2012-2013) scored a 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale on the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric dimension. Also, 68% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 46% in AY 2012-2013) received the highest score of 4 on this dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper. Other findings have remained consistent. For AY 2013-2014, 46% of the students increased their scores between the first and final draft submissions (compared to the same 46% for the previous year). Both percentage are slightly below the target goal of 50%; yet, a more detailed analysis of this year’s data revealed that at significant percentage (38%) of the students achieved the highest score (4 of 4) on the draft submission. This made it difficult for the students as a whole to show improvement. Perhaps greater consideration (e.g., adjusting the rubric requirements along the 4-point scale) must be made with respect to the scoring on the draft submissions regarding this particular learning outcome. For the Application and Analysis learning outcome, all of the target goals for the four dimensions were met. Additionally, a comparison of the AY 2013-2014 data with the previous year showed consistent findings. For example, 98% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 95% in AY 2012-2013) earned a score of 2, 3, or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. Similarly, 83% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 82% in AY 2012-2013) received a score of 3 or 4. Greater improvements were evidenced with respect to students scoring a 4 on this dimension: 48% in AY 2013-2014 compared to 33% in AY 2012-2013. Finally, 52% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 50% in AY 2012-2013) showed increased scores on the
Application and Analysis dimension of the rubric between the first and final draft submissions. For the Written Communication Skills learning outcome, the target goals (i.e., one of three dimensions) were partially met. These results are largely consistent with the AY 2012-2013 findings. For example, 84.5% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 91% in AY 2012-2013) met the first dimension which is to have at least 80% of the students receive scores of 3 or 4 on their final paper. Also, 49% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 40% in AY 2012-2013) earned a score of 4 on this dimension for the final draft of the paper. Finally, 84% of the students in AY 2013-2014 (compared to 48% in AY 2012-2013) maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores between the draft and final submissions. This year’s findings show marked improvement for this dimension.

This year’s findings show marked improvement for this dimension.

Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment
An analysis of the assessment findings indicated that the target goal of 80% was easily met for Oral Communication Skills. The results are consistent with previous years.

Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment
No assessment tool or rubric was used to evaluate the target goal. We anticipate that the Identification and Evaluation of Ethical Frameworks learning outcome will be assessed during the next assessment cycle.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
No immediate changes to the educational program are planned. However, the department is in the midst of a major curriculum mapping and program assessment project. In particular, the Undergraduate Committee is in the process of designing a faculty survey that will allow us an overview of the structure of the curriculum and help us to understand how individual courses contribute to program goals. The curriculum map should help us identify program strengths (i.e., student learning outcomes that are thoroughly addressed), as well as the gaps (i.e., learning outcomes that are addressed by only a few courses or not at all) and redundancies in the curriculum. This evaluation process began in Fall 2014 and should be completed no later than Spring 2016.

Georgia State University
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2013-2014 Criminal Justice MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the M.S. in Criminal Justice is to engage students in generating and applying knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. This is accomplished by (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings with M.S. students; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; and (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice. Through these activities, the Department strives to promote basic principles of justice that enhance the criminal justice profession and benefit the community at large.

Goals
G 1: Develop knowledge
Students will be knowledgeable about crime and criminal justice systems and processes.

G 0: Critical thinking
Students will be critical thinkers with regards to issues of crime and criminal justice.

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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

### M 2: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)

The Thesis knowledge assessment survey is a 21-item faculty-rated questionnaire that measures the degree to which students who defended their thesis successfully have met the student learning outcomes. The questionnaire is completed by the student's thesis supervisor. Items are rated 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

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

#### Develop Embedded Measures in Core Courses

The current assessment of non-thesis students in the Masters program is based solely on indicators derived from the capstone course. Later this year, we will begin to work with faculty who teach core courses to develop measures that can be embedded in at least three of these courses and ways in which these measures can be retrieved, stored and analyzed by the graduate coordinator. Data on thesis students will be collected as well.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** End of Fall semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate committee and faculty who teach statistics, methods and theory

### Develop Rubric for assessing non-thesis students

While our students continue to meet or exceed our target levels for learning outcomes, assessment of outcomes based on the revised capstone course suggested the need for a more reliable assessment tool than what is currently being used. The rubric will focus on the same learning outcomes as have already been established, but will provide more detail for assigning numerical scores. Once the rubric has been developed multiple members of the graduate committee can assess final papers in the capstone course in order to provide increased reliability.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate committee

### Re-design the instrument used for assessing thesis students

Faculty have noted that the current instrument used to evaluate the thesis students does not seem to work well, leading to several items that cannot be rated (resulting in missing data for some items), and consequently low reliabilities for outcome measures. Further, the low numbers of students that we have completing theses and the low number of items that are being answered by faculty (missing data) make it difficult to reach our very high performance targets. As suggested by the GAC we have set up a tiered target and our targets are being partially met, but some of the higher targets are not being met. This may be the result of small sample sizes (low reliability and missing data). We plan to revise the thesis instrument this year, with those limitations in mind.

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

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the MBA concentration in Health Informatics is to provide students with specialized skills to improve healthcare services enabled by information technology. Such improvements focus on the information-intensive nature of healthcare institutions and processes to increase the quality and reduce the cost of healthcare services.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources (M: 3)

Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and the practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the resources that comprise it. This includes the overall planning, organization, management, evaluation, quality, and major health policy issues.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls (M: 1)

Students will be able to articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate controls.

O/O 2: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems (M: 2)

After completing this course successfully, a student should have: · An in-depth knowledge of ubiquitous and pervasive information systems · A high-level understanding of UPIS applications and their usage scenarios · An understanding of multiple networking technologies to be used in UPIS environment · The skills to identify and design the infrastructure-support for ubiquitous and pervasive information systems · An in-depth knowledge of devices and middleware challenges in UPIS environment · A high-level knowledge of network and quality of service management · Skills to derive security and data-access requirements of different UPIS applications · An understanding of multiple factors in offering, adoption and usage of UPIS services · An awareness of emerging trends and development in UPIS

O/O 4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems (M: 4)

Envision and describe considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and evaluation of health information systems in a variety of settings such as health systems, hospitals, and medical practices with a focus on the critical role of e-health and information systems in the planning, operation, and management of health care organizations.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions. (O: 1)

Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

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.
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 recommended 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

2.2 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
Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: M1: GACE I and II Exam scores (O: 1)
Licensure exam scores will be analyzed for progress toward content knowledge development of MAT candidates.

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

### Target for O1: SLO1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge
**Target:** 95% of our students will obtain a passing score on the GACE I and II as determined by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. A passing score on these tests is required for teacher certification/licensure in Early Childhood Education.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of candidates completing our program in Spring 2014 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.

### M 2: M2: Responsive Planning Project (O: 2)
Responsive Planning Project Directions for the Responsive Planning Project This project will demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in your classroom context. Through this project, you will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student’s interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Specifically you will utilize planning and instructional artifacts to demonstrate your development as an increasingly responsive educator across your two years of engagement in the MAT. Specifically, you will need to attend to the following questions: How has your planning and instruction changed as you have gained a more complex understanding of your students, the community, and the subject matter? Looking back at the first unit that you planned for your class/students, how would you characterize those plans in relation to your current understandings and practices related to curriculum design and implementation? These questions will be the basis of your self-analysis and narration of your growth in your planning and instructional practices over your two years of teaching. Through the examination of the instructional plans you have created and the type of engagements and learning opportunities you have crafted with/for students throughout the years you will use various media to demonstrate your increasing understanding and incorporation of the following key components of responsive planning and instruction: (a) holding high expectations for excellence; (b) valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum; (c) recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners; (d) enacting broader curriculum to develop a reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors; (e) informing planning and instruction 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?

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

### Target for O2: SLO2: Plans effectively for instruction
A critical priority of the ECE MAT is to ensure that beginning teachers of record demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in their classroom contexts. Through this project, candidates provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student’s interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Through this two year longitudinal self study of planning and instruction, candidates utilize planning and instructional artifacts to demonstrate their development as increasingly responsive educators.

---

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

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

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

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

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

### Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### 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.

---

5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
across the two years of engagement in the program. Due to this commitment, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "standard met," or 4, "standard exceeded" on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings will work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a "standard met" rating. In the case that candidates do not achieve this rating, they will not be recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric by the endpoint of the program: Level 3 or 4=95%, Levels 2, 1, and 0=5% or less.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Planning and Instruction - Spring 2014 Responsive Planning and Instruction Composite Scores Standard Exceeded (with a composite score of 4) - 4 candidates (57%) Standard Met (with a composite score of 3) - 3 candidates (42%) Standard Not Met - 0 Target was met for this standard with 100% of completing candidates meeting or exceeding the standard on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment. Additional data indicated that while all completing candidates from the MAT Met Standard (42%) or Exceeded Standard (57%) on the composite scores of the Responsive Planning and Instruction Key Assessment, data indicated that the subscale of Holding high expectations for excellence had 50% of candidates scoring on the lower end of Meeting the standard, rather than exceeding it. Taken together with the two other subscales with the next lowest means, "informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment" and "Facilitating productive learning tasks" we will be focusing on ways to ensure that candidates are delineating carefully the connections between the formative and summative assessments they engage in along with their learners, and the ways that they use that information to plan and conduct learning tasks that foster productivity. We will be revising our Responsive Planning and Instruction subscales by including questions that align with these constructs more explicitly and also to incorporate more language of the commentaries of edTPA. Faculty are collaborating during Fall 2014 to revise this commentary framework and to ensure that it is an emphasis of our field based coaching collaborations in ECE 6575, 6585, 7575, and 7585. This data has informed program decisions.

**M 3: M3: Impact on Student Learning Project (O: 3)**

**IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT** Directions for the Impact on Student Learning Project This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices across two years. You will identify six focal students and describe the ways that a range of holistic data drove instruction to support the growth trajectory of each student. The six focal students, determined through pre-assessment data, should include one student from each year who began the year as a struggling learner, one student from each year who began the year as a middle level student, and one student from each year who began the year as a high achieving student. Assignment Includes: Evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formal and informal, formative and summative assessments (such as the Developmental Reading Assessment-DRA- or other literacy assessment tools, math assessments based on the common core curriculum, or benchmark/anchor papers for writing assessment). A narrative description of the gains made by the students and support for these claims which includes specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth. Reflection demonstrating the development and improvement of instructional practice through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. Description of how it is used in the program: Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. 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. Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: SLO3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

As beginning teachers of record, MAT candidates are already in classrooms and responsible for student learning and development. Therefore, attention to learning of pupils is given primacy throughout the program. Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. For example, candidates may provide evidence for progress candidates may provide evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formative, informal, and summative assessments. Through this project, candidates will describe the gains made by their students and demonstrate such claims by including specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth. The rubric used to assess this project is aligned with PSC domains, the PCE rules for ECE 505-3.16 and the Conceptual Framework Standards of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) of Georgia State University. Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "standard met," or 4, "standard exceeded," on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (standard met). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, and 0=5% or less.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of completing candidates from the MAT Met Standard n=2 (25%) or Exceeded Standard n=6 (75%) on the composite scores of the Impact on Student Learning Key Assessment. Additional data indicated that 77% of candidates completing in 2014 could have presented data which more clearly demonstrated that impact on student learning in the area of mathematics [25% exceeded, 62% met, 12 % -- one student was approaching this standard]. Additionally, while candidates are to provide a clear and evidenced description of use of data 37% could have demonstrated this more effectively (though only one student— or 12% failed to demonstrate that adequately). This is likely related to the finding that while candidates are to document the longitudinal impact on individual learners across time, 37% of our candidates could have done so more effectively (meeting rather than exceeding the standard). This data has been used to inform our practices and pedagogy for future candidates.

**M 4: M4: Dispositions (O: 4)**

The new Dispositions Survey (implemented Fall 2010 and forward) called Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals is a university supervisor rating of candidates’ dispositions (values and actions) as observed in clinical practice in the following areas: Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful Purpose and Vision. Data presents mean scores across these five areas. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
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 Emotional Professionals of ECEC 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Spring 2014 Dispositions Midpoint and Endpoint Analysis Target met- 100% of completers met dispositional subscales
Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Not Met Empathy 6 (75%) 2 (25%) - Positive View of Others 7 (87%) 1 (12%) - Positive View of Self 7 (87%) 1 (12%) - Authenticity 5 (62%) 3 (37%) - Meaningful Purpose and Vision 7 (87%) 1 (12%) - While program completers seem to have well developed purpose and vision along with positive views of self and others and a sense of empathy, 37% of our completers could benefit for more support with authenticity. As second year candidates in our program and second year teachers, they are navigating the structures, limitations, and habits of mind of their school context as well as our program spaces and discourses. Midpoint evaluations indicated some learning needs in empathy and authenticity. Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Not Met Empathy 4 (50%) 2 (25%) 2 (25%) Positive View of Others 4 (50%) 3 (37%) 1 (12%) Positive View of Self 1 (12%) 6 (75%) 1 (12%) Authenticity 3 (37%) 3 (37%) 2 (25%) Meaningful Purpose and Vision 3 (37%) 5 (62%) - Authenticity, as defined in this rubric is “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.” As beginning teachers, it is difficult to continue to find your own voice amidst the pressures and realities of schooling. These completers (and our midpoint candidates) are courageously advocating for learners and also wary about the role they have in their schools and the space for contestation and teaching against the grain that are not easily found or created in most urban school contexts. They are working, increasingly, toward leadership, coherence, and authenticity, however, this is an authentic challenge of novice educators. Additionally, empathy for students is sometimes challenging for first year teachers (see midpoint evaluation, where 25% of candidates – two students – did not meet). This is also due to the fact that rubric candidates who are not successful as they would like or envision view their success as “instructors’ as impeded by the children that they serve. This problematic dispositional shift is a significant emphasis of our program and is a challenging one as it requires teachers to own what is in their locus of control, reconsider their view of what teaching and learning are for and look like, and construct and live into a different framework. This is challenging work and vulnerable, and often not achieved by first year teachers who, as research has shown, often blame their constituents rather than their lack of pedagogical strength or focus on community building. This is an emphasis of all of our courses, and a specific continued focus during the second year of our program.

M 5: M 5: Clinical Teaching Practice (O: 5)

Teacher candidates in the ECE MAT program are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performance and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all student in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in university coursework. Teacher candidates in the ECE MAT have supported field based coursework throughout two academic years in the program and are full time teachers of record throughout that time. The Clinical teaching Practice Project completed at the midpoint and endpoint of the program is completed by the university coach at the end of each academic year. The evaluation is a comprehensive review of the candidate’s competencies and the rubric is aligned to the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure as well as the Georgia Framework for Teaching, the PSC Rules for Early Childhood Education. The rubric used to assess this project is also aligned with PSC domains, the PCE rules for ECE 505-3-16 and the Conceptual Framework Standards of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) of Georgia State University. The university coach (supervisor) rates the candidate based on his/her teaching performance, assignments, and professionalism as demonstrated through field based clinical teaching practice. The 0-4 point rubric included: 4 (standard exceeded), 3 (standard met), 2 (approaching standard), 1 (standard minimally evidenced), and 0 (not observed). The teacher candidate is expected to receive at least ratings of 3 (standard met) on all indicators in order to complete ECE 505 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 encourage 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: Level 4=70%; Level 3=25%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O5: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, “standard met,” or 4, “standard exceeded,” on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (a rating of “standard met”). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric:
Levels 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

100% of Spring 2014 completers in the ECE MAT met (Achieving) (66%) or exceeded (Proficient) (33%) in the composite score of the Clinical Practice Assessment and in each of the constituent key domains of the Clinical Practice Assessment at the endpoint of their program. Data from these 2014 Endpoint Assessments indicate that those who complete our program meet standards for Clinical Practice across each of the ten domains on the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS) rubric used by the GA DOE for practicing teachers. MAT candidates are particularly strong in creating a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners (71% exemplary) and promoting student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key knowledge and skills (71% exemplary). Specific subscales in which less our candidates as a whole ranked slightly less strong (with the majority rated as “proficient” and fewer than 50% of our candidates exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary-- the highest rating candidates in 2014 Exemplary): (a) The teacher systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid
and appropriate for the content and student population (42% exemplary and 57% proficient). (d) The teacher exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession (42% exemplary and 57% proficient).

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 responsiveness 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 differentiatied 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 two year 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 of 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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M5: Clinical Teaching Practice | Outcome/Objective: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Implementation Description: See description above
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M 4: Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: SLO 4: Views and values professional and ethical dispositions

Implementation Description: Throughout the 2013-14 year, candidates were supported in the fostering and development of their dispositions by candidates and were mentored when helpful and/or appropriate by program graduates. The improved disposition scores from completers in 2014 from their midpoint was indicative of the achievement and focus on this action plan.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Field-Based Coaching Faculty

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 increase 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: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Impact on Student Learning focus. 2014

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: In-Progress  
Priority: High

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. This remains an important and ongoing priority as the candidate population we serve continues to shift and it is no longer the case that all candidates have taken the content area GACE tests upon entry to our program.

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and coaches

GACE Scores

In 2013-14, 77% of candidates completing in 2014 could have presented data which more clearly demonstrated that impact on student learning in the area of mathematics [25% exceeded, 62% met, 12%--one student was approaching this standard]. Additionally, while candidates are to provide a clear and evidenced description of use of data 37% could have demonstrated this more effectively (though only one student---or 12% failed to demonstrate that adequately). 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 77% of candidates completing in 2014 could have presented data that more clearly demonstrated that impact on student learning in the area of mathematics [25% exceeded, 62% met, 12%--one student was approaching this standard]. Additionally, while candidates are to provide a clear and evidenced description of use of data 37% could have demonstrated this more effectively (though only one student---or 12% failed to demonstrate that adequately). This is in part related to the longitudinal impact on individual learners across time: 37% of our candidates could have done so more effectively (meeting rather than exceeding the standard). This data has been used to inform our practices and pedagogy for 2014-15.

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 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 7576 and ECE 7585. 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 responsivity 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 workshops 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: Finished  
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: M2: Responsive Planning Project | Outcome/Objective: SLO2: Plans effectively for instruction

Implementation Description: In 2013-14, we focused significantly on aspects of this goal and made significant strides toward supporting candidates in this way. Additional data from completers in Spring 2014 revealed both the successful completion of this action plan and the need for a new, more clarified focus and action plan for 2014-15.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty Coaches

Impact on Student Learning focus, 2014

While all completing candidates from the 2014 MAT Met Standard (25%) or Exceeded Standard (75%) on the composite scores of the Impact on Student Learning Key Assessment, data indicated that 77% of candidates completing in 2014 could have presented data which more clearly demonstrated that impact on student learning in the area of mathematics [25% exceeded, 62% met, 12%--one student was approaching this standard]. Additionally, while candidates are to provide a clear and evidenced description of use of data 37% could have demonstrated this more effectively (though only one student---or 12% failed to demonstrate that adequately). This is in part related to the longitudinal impact on individual learners across time: 37% of our candidates could have done so more effectively (meeting rather than exceeding the standard). This data has been used to inform our practices and pedagogy for 2014-15. Specifically, monthly workshops revisiting of curriculum design and responsivity to students' needs and learning will occur 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. Particular emphasis will be placed on the collection of data demonstrating student learning in the areas of mathematics. Data from subscales of the Clinical Practice Key Assessment and Planning and Instruction Key Assessment have also confirmed this need. Additionally, in response to this evidenced need from data 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). 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.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: Medium

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) Focus on Dispositional Support: Authenticity, as defined in this rubric is “ 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. ” As beginning teachers, it is difficult to determine if you own your voice amidst the pressures and realities of schooling. These completers (and our midpoint candidates) are courageously advocating for learners and also worry about the role they have in their schools and the space for contestation and teaching against the grain that are not easily found or created in most urban school contexts. They are working, increasingly, toward leadership, coherence, and authenticity, however, this is an authentic challenge of novice educators. As second year candidates in our program, most candidates are completing their second year of teaching and generally have a clear sense of their state professional and personal strengths and limitations. As they 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 self-understandings and empathy for self and others. Data trends are mirrored by our midpoint candidates, who also seem to grapple more with Positive View of Self and Empathy. 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 disposition 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. (b) Revision of the Clinical Practice Rubric The ECE MAT is joining faculty in the rest of the unit, adopting a new Intern Keys for initial certification. It has been noted by faculty across the unit, that evaluating candidates with the rubric used for certified and master teachers sets a proficient score at a high level for novices. We are therefore shifting the rubric we have used to one that has been built by individuals across the University System of Georgia (USG), modifying the Teacher Keys (used here in 2013 in the MAT) to meet the expectations of candidates just completing their teacher certification program. We fully expect this change to indicate clearly the preparedness of our teachers for the roles they are already serving in as practicing teachers in our metropolitan community. (c) Individual coaching support Midpoint candidates with these lower scores on 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 2013-14 year and will be continued. Additionally, the 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 of them in the 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. (d) Intentional design of coursework 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 (immediately 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 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. (e) Revising our Responsive Planning Project guiding questions to align with these constructs more explicitly. Faculty will focus specifically on supporting candidates in engaging alongside of learners in “productive learning tasks” and their facilitation will occur through focus on self-studies and candidate support around subscales of the CLASS scoring system related to “Concept Development” and “Instructional Learning Formats,” and also to incorporate more language of the commentaries of edTPA. Faculty are collaborating during Fall 2014 to revise this commentary framework and to ensure that it, along with the CLASS Subscales of “Concept Development” and “Instructional Learning Formats” are significant emphases of our field based coaching collaborations in ECE 6575, 6585, 7575, and 7585.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

While all candidates completing in Spring 2014 met or exceeded the requirements of the key assessment, there are several aspects of program design that merit attention that have been illuminated through this data. Specifically of note is the need to replace the currently used rubric from the state used for Clinical Practice and move toward the new Intern Keys assessment created by faculty from across the University System of Georgia in order to note the development and trajectory of learning of candidates in initial certification programs using an instrument that is modified from the expectations of certified teachers working in classrooms. Findings from previous years has led to the implementation and completion of several action plans across the 2013-14 year, specifically noted and discussed in previous section of the report: The Clinical Practice Support Action Plan Dispositions Action Plan 2013-14 Focus on Demonstration of Student Growth in Math, Writing, and Longitudinal Impact on individual student growth Responsive Planning.
Goals

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science in Education Program in Elementary 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, train teachers of English Language Learners (ESOL), and special education. The theme of this program is to develop teachers as facilitators of learning. Coursework, extensive field experiences, and university faculty collaborate to develop a program that supports 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

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Progress toward all Action Plan goals for 2013-14 has been made. But all one of those goals (an in progress goal) as we continue to focus on and reconceptualize the role of the Content Knowledge GACE test for our candidates which has a different role in our program as our candidate pool changes from TFA to more school-based; non-TFA candidates) has been completed. New Action Plan goals for 2014-15 have been articulated, 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, all to be completed and facilitated by program coordinator and program faculty/coaches. (a) Focus on Dispositional Support: Authenticity, as defined in this rubric is “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.” As beginning teachers, it is difficult to continue to find your own voice amidst the pressures and realities of schooling. These completers (and our midpoint candidates) are courageously advocating for learners and also wary about the role they have in their schools and the space for contestation and teaching against the grain that are not easily found or created in most urban school contexts. They are working, increasingly, toward leadership, coherence, and authenticity, however, this is an authentic challenge of novice educators. As second year candidates in our program, most candidates are completing their second year of teaching and generally have a clear sense of their pedagogical and personal strengths and limitations. As they 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 self-understandings and empathy for self and others. Data trends are mirrored by our midpoint candidates, who also seem to grapple more with Positive View of Self and Empathy. 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), as part of their 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. (b) Revision of the Clinical Practice Rubric The ECE MAT is joining faculty in the rest of the unit, adopting a new Intern Keys for initial certification. It has been noted by faculty across the unit, that evaluating candidates with the rubric used for certified and master teachers sets a proficient score at a high level for novices. We are therefore shifting the rubric we have used to one that has been built by individuals across the University System of Georgia (USG) modifying the Teacher Keys (used here in 2013 in the MAT) to meet the expectations of candidates just completing their teacher certification program. We fully expect this change to indicate clearly the preparedness of our teachers for the roles they are already serving in as practicing teachers in our metropolitan community. (c) Individual coaching support Midpoint candidates with these lower scores on 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 2013-14 year and will be continued. Additionally, the 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 of 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. (d) Intentional design of coursework 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 (immediately 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 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. (e) Revising our Responsive Planning Project guiding questions to align with these constructs more explicitly. Faculty will focus specifically on supporting candidates in engaging alongside of learners in “productive learning tasks” and their facilitation will occur through foci on self studies and candidate support around subscales of the CLASS scoring system related to “Concept Development” and “Instructional Learning Formats,” and also to incorporate more language of the commentaries of edTPA. Faculty are collaborating during Fall 2014 to revise this commentary framework and to ensure that it, along with the CLASS Subscales of “Concept Development” and “Instructional Learning Formats” are significant emphases of our field based coaching collaborations in ECE 6575, 6585, 7575, and 7585.
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: Effects on 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: Professional and Ethical Dispositions
The teacher candidate is an educator who will have professional and ethical 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: 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
1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Plans effectively for instruction and assessment (G: 2) (M: 5)
Teacher candidates plan instruction and assessment based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

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

Strategic Plan Associations
1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice (G: 2) (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

1.0 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

1.1 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 impact student learning (G: 3) (M: 1)

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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: edTPA Portfolio Rubric (O: 4)
The edTPA is a national teacher performance assessment designed by Stanford Center for Learning and Equity, 2013, all rights reserved. The Bachelor of Science Program in Early Childhood Education has embedded this assessment in the program as a key assessment. It will be required for initial certification in Georgia beginning fall 2015. Currently, the edTPA portfolios are evaluated by GSU faculty and the scores attached are local rather than national scores. The overall edTPA portfolio score, as well as, the assessment components in Literacy and Mathematics will be analyzed for teacher readiness to impact student learning and for program improvement. The Literacy and Mathematics assessment components of the edTPA require teacher candidates to provide documentation and evidence of whole class understandings, specifically strengths and needs, as well as for individuals and for groups of students. Additionally, teacher candidates must describe and analyze strengths and misconceptions/errors made by their students in order to establish a plan for future instruction. This assessment provides evidence of the teacher candidate’s ability to bring students from diverse groups to higher levels of learning. A rubric is used to locally evaluate candidate readiness for teaching. A national score of “Proficient” - Level 3 OR locally evaluated score of “Proficient” - Level 2 on the Elementary Education edTPA handbook rubrics is the desired target.

Target for O4: Uses assessment methods to impact student learning
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 100%, will achieve at least a rating of 2, “Proficient”, on the edTPA three point local evaluation rubric. The following targets have been set at each level of the local evaluation rubric: Level 3 (Advanced) 75%, Level 2 (Proficient) = 100%, Level 1 (Emerging) = 0%. A national scoring five point rubric is equivalent to the local scoring rubric as follows: National scoring levels 4 and 5 = Local scoring level 3 National scoring level 3 = Local scoring level 2 National scoring levels 1 and 2 = Local scoring level 1 2 Local scoring level 1 edTPA portfolio scores reported using the five point scale have been collapsed to the three point local evaluation rubric as described above.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
The edTPA – Elementary Education Handbook (Literacy & Mathematics), a national performance assessment, was initially explored in the ECE BSE initial teacher preparation program in spring 2013 with only eleven (11) teacher candidates. Beginning fall 2013, all teacher candidates in the program were required to complete the edTPA. The data tables are delineated by semester fall 2013 and spring 2014, as well as, by program concentration: ESOL and Special Education. The target level – 3 or “Proficient” was identified to include scores ranging from 44 – 54 using recommended national cut scores of 44-50 as passing at the proficient level. Scored by local evaluators, who were locally trained, the aggregate pass rate for all Traditional ESOL teacher candidates was 65/70 or 93%, while 42/47 or 89% of Dual Special Education teacher candidates were meeting expectation at the proficient level or higher. The Dual Alpharetta Cohort, 16/18 or 89%, met expectations at the proficient level or higher. Furthermore, the number and percentage of teacher candidates at each assessment level are as follows by program concentration: Traditional ESOL Program - Advanced and Exemplary: 63%; Proficient: 30%; Emerging and Beginning: 7% and Special Education Dual Program - Advanced and Exemplary: 60%; Proficient: 30%; Emerging and Beginning: 10%. In review of rubric mean scores, the highest scores for the Traditional ESOL Program include “Learning Environment” (3.49) and “Subject-specific Pedagogy – Elementary Literacy” (3.52) both of which are Task 2 components. Highest mean scores for the Dual Special Education Program also include “Learning Environment” (3.61) and “Planning Assessment to Manage and Support Student Learning” (3.64) – Task 1 and 2 components. Areas where the mean scores were lowest for the Traditional ESOL Program include “Student Use of Feedback” (2.90) and “Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Literacy Learning” (2.97) both of which are Task 3 components. For the Dual Program the lowest mean scores include “Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning” (3.04) and “Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness” (2.98) – Task 1 and 2 components. All areas for growth will be targeted by program faculty in signature assignments embedded in coursework prior to Clinical Practice (Student Teaching).

M 2: Intern Keys: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (O: 3)
Teacher candidates value and display professional and ethical dispositions to meet the needs of all learners. They are reflective practitioners who continuously 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.
Teacher candidates in the ECE BSE Traditional and Dual Certification Programs are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performance and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all students in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in their clinical course work. Teacher candidates have three practicum field experiences prior to their clinical practice (student teaching) with up to 1300 hours of field experiences over the course of the program. The Intern Keys Final Student Teaching Evaluation is an overall evaluation of the candidate and is completed by the university supervisor at the end of student teaching, in the courses ECE 4661 (Dual ECE Program with special education concentration) and ECE 4662 (Traditional ECE Program with ESOL concentration). The evaluation is a comprehensive review of the candidate’s pedagogical content knowledge and skills and the rubric is aligned to the InTASC Model Core Teaching national standards for initial teacher licensure. The university supervisor rates the candidate based on her/his teaching performance, assignments and professionalism as demonstrated during student teaching, clinical practice. The 5 point rubric includes: 4 (“Exemplary”), 3 (“Proficient”), 2 (“Needs Development”) and 1 (“Ineffective”). The teacher candidate is expected to achieve at level 2 (Needs Development) with aspirations to achieve level 3 (Proficient) on all indicators in order to complete student teaching, ECE 4661 or ECE 4662, and be recommended for certification. Level 2 is an acceptable rating for a pre-service teacher as established by educators using the Intern Keys assessment associated with the new Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards embedded in the new Georgia Teacher Keys Evaluation System. If a teacher candidate receives a rating lower than 3, the university supervisor works with the candidate to develop an action plan and an additional opportunity to demonstrate competency. A grade of “C” or better in ECE 4661 or ECE 4662 is required in order to pass student teaching. This is an end of program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for 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, 100%, will achieve at least a rating of 2, “Needs Development”, with is appropriate for a pre-service teacher on this new Teacher’s Evaluation System for interns, a 1-4 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 level 3, “Proficient”. The following targets have been set for candidates at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 25%; Level 3 = 75%; Level 2 = 100%, Level 1 = 0%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Intern Keys Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2013-2014 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 100% or 108/108 aggregate pass rate. Across rubric levels 13% of the teacher candidates exceeded expectations (i.e., exemplary), 87% met expectations (i.e. proficient) and 0% fell below standards. All eighteen 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 100% of the candidates from each program or 61/61 and 47/47 respectively, passed the key assessment. The mean scores based upon the Overall Intern Keys Final Student Teaching Evaluation by program are identical at 3.13. Mean scores across all learning outcomes for each concentration are found in the table in the 2013-2014 attachment. In both concentration areas, outcome 1 (content knowledge) was rated the highest, while outcome 3 (assessment) was rated the lowest. We expected overall ratings to fall in the proficient area, the target. We will continue to monitor the area of assessment as we embed signature assignments in the methods courses and the assessment course in order to target this area in the coming year. While scores were not significantly lower, assessment continues to be the most difficult for teacher candidates.

**M 3: Five Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals Rubric (O: 5)**

The new Dispositions Survey (implemented fall 2010 and forward) called Five Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals is a university supervisor rating of candidates’ dispositions (values and actions) as observed in clinical practice in the following areas: Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful Purpose and Vision. Data presents mean scores across these five areas. The rubric levels are as follows: Level 4 (Strength or Exceptional), Level 3 (Developing or Acceptable), Level 2 (Emerging or Marginal) and Level 1 (Unsure or Unacceptable).

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions**

Since the ECE BSEd Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that all candidates, 100%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "acceptable," 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. The following targets have been set at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 75%; Level 3 = 100%; Level 2 =0%; Level 1 = 0%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

2013-2014 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 100% or 114/114 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 2013-2014 data show ratings for Traditional Program teacher candidates at 100% (66/66) as compared to 100% (48/48) for Dual Program candidates meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment. All Alpharetta External Delivery program candidates passed this assessment at 100% (18/18). See attached documentation for breakout across levels 3 and 4 of the rubric.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

GACE scores for 2013-2014 will received the following year. A review of 2012-2013 GACE scores for test 001 are up for all
M 5: Observation Field Performance Assessment Rubric (O: 1, 2, 5)

The Observation of Field Performance 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 Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS) and the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, April 2011. The assessor will enter observation ratings in LiveText across all indicators and domains for the final teacher candidate observation in each of the field experiences. This assessment is used as a key assessment mid-program (Practicum II) and end program (Student Teaching) to assess the teacher candidate's knowledge and performance and overall readiness for teaching. 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) – (8 weeks 4th/5th elementary, 5 weeks ESOL - elementary or Special Education - middle/high school) - ENDPOINT EVALUATION

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge

Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 100%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "achieving," on the 0-4 point rubric in the area of Content and Curriculum on the Observation Field Performance Rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address the area of deficiency with the goal of reaching an "achieving" rating. The following targets have been set at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 75%; Level 3 = 100%; Level 2 = 0%, Level 1 = 0%.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2013-2014 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 99% or 113/114 total program candidates (Traditional and Dual) meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Observation Field Performance Assessment. Disaggregated scores from 2013-2014 data show ratings for Traditional Program teacher candidates at 98% (65/66) as compared to 100% (48/48) for Dual Program candidates meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment. All Alpharetta External Delivery program candidates passed this assessment at 100% (18/18). In review of sub-indicator ratings of teacher candidate content knowledge, the ratings and percentages are as follows: Traditional Program (ESOL concentration): Level 4 - Proficient: 50/66 or 76% Level 3 - Achieving: 15/66 or 23% Level 2 - Developing: 1/66 or 1% There were not any candidates rated as Level 1 - Emerging or Level 1 - Beginning. Dual Program Special Education concentration): Level 4 - Proficient: 26/48 or 54% Level 3 - Achieving: 21/48 or 44% Level 2 - Developing: 1/48 or 1% There were not any candidates rated as Level 1 - Emerging or Level 1 - Beginning.

Target for O2: Plans effectively for instruction and assessment

Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 100%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "achieving," on the 0-4 point rubric in the area of Content and Curriculum on the Observation Field Performance Rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address the area of deficiency with the goal of reaching an "achieving" rating. The following targets have been set at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 75%; Level 3 = 100%; Level 2 = 0%, Level 1 = 0%.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2013-2014 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 99% or 113/114 total program candidates (Traditional and Dual) meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Observation Field Performance Assessment. Disaggregated scores from 2013-2014 data show ratings for Traditional Program teacher candidates at 98% (65/66) as compared to 100% (48/48) for Dual Program candidates meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment. All Alpharetta External Delivery program candidates passed this assessment at 100% (18/18). In review of sub-indicator ratings of teacher candidate planning, the ratings and percentages are as follows: Traditional Program (ESOL concentration): Level 4 - Proficient: 44/66 or 67% Level 3 - Achieving: 22/66 or 33% Level 2 - Developing: 0/66 or 0% Level 1 - Emerging: 0/66 or 0% There were not any candidates rated as Level 1 - Beginning. Dual Program Special Education concentration): Level 4 - Proficient: 34/48 or 71% Level 3 - Achieving: 14/48 or 29% Level 2 - Developing: 0/48 or 0% Level 1 - Emerging: 0/48 or 0% There were not any candidates rated at Level 0 - Beginning.

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 all candidates, 100%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "achieving," on the 0-4 point rubric in the area of Personal Practice (Dispositions) on the Observation Field Performance Rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address the area of deficiency with the goal of reaching an "achieving" rating. The following targets have been set at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 75%; Level 3 = 100%; Level 2 = 0%, Level 1 = 0%.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2013-2014 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 99% or 113/114 total program candidates (Traditional and Dual) meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Observation Field Performance Assessment. Disaggregated scores from 2013-2014 data show ratings for Traditional Program teacher candidates at 98% (65/66) as compared to 100% (48/48) for Dual Program candidates meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment. All Alpharetta External Delivery program candidates passed this assessment at 100% (18/18). In review of sub-indicator ratings of teacher candidate dispositions, the ratings and percentages are as follows: Traditional Program (ESOL concentration): Level 4 - Proficient: 57/66 or 86% Level 3 - Achieving: 6/66 or 9% Level 2 - Developing: 0/66 or 0% Level 1 - Emerging: 3/66 or 5% There were not any candidates rated at Level 0 - Beginning. Dual Program Special Education concentration): Level 4 - Proficient: 45/48 or 94% Level 3 - Achieving: 2/48 or 4% Level 2 - Developing: 0/48 or 0% Level 1 - Emerging: 1/48 or 2% There were not any candidates rated at Level 0 - Beginning. Candidates who did not meet the target for dispositions were monitored with Action Plans for Improvement. All candidates met this assessment following these additional embedded program measures.
Planning and Assessment; ELL & Special Education Focus

2010-2011 data from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation indicate "met" targets in all areas; however, it was noted that the lowest ratings were identified in the areas of planning and assessment for the Dual concentration program with the following mean scores 3.48 for planning and 3.53 for assessment compared to Traditional concentration program mean scores of 3.74 in planning and 3.78 in assessment. Additionally, data from end program candidate surveys indicate that Traditional and Dual concentration program candidates rate themselves lower in confidence in working with students with special needs and/or linguistic needs. As a result faculty will provide course inputs in ESOL for Dual program candidates and continued inputs in Special Education for Traditional program candidates. Also faculty will closely monitor assessments and note any differences in data, specifically outcome 2 (plans effectively for instruction) and outcome 4 (uses assessment methods to document student learning) as identified in the Final Student Teaching Evaluation. 2011-2012 data show similar results as planning and assessment are still rated the lowest areas on this assessment as follows: For planning, 3.62 Traditional Program and 3.89 Dual Program and for assessment, 3.69 Traditional Program and 3.62 Dual Program. Dual Program results for planning and assessment show a slight increase from 2010-2011 while Traditional Program results are slightly lower than the previous year’s scores. Overall scores on this evaluation for programs combined show an 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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Course inputs in Special Education 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.

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: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Intern Keys: Final Student Teaching Evaluation | 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: BSE 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 2011 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 state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. We expect to see improvement in this area due to course changes in ISCI 2001 fall 2011; such as, increased emphasis on content development in earth and life sciences and collaboration between College of Arts & Sciences and College of Education faculty who implement co-teaching models of delivery. (2011-2012 ISCI 2001 Course Changes included in report) We will continue with this action plan through May 2014.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood & Special Education | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge

Implementation Description: Current BSE faculty co-teaching in ISCI 2001 will monitor course changes. GACE scores will be reviewed in May 2014. One load has been assigned to BSE faculty to implement the GUMS supplemental instruction as well as the Writing Mentor BSED Program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: BSE 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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Two new measures: Observation on Field Performance; edTPA national assessment
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: ECE BSED Faculty and Supervisors
Additional Resources: None

Implementation of Assessment Strategies & Evidence of Feedback
Teacher candidates scored lowest on the edTPA Portfolio in the area of assessment; specifically, as follows: using assessment strategies, providing feedback to pupils, and demonstrating evidence of students’ use of feedback in order to support their language use. A signature assignment will be embedded in the following course to target the teacher candidate’s proficiency in using assessment strategies and feedback to support student learning: ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: edTPA Portfolio Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Uses assessment methods to impact student learning
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment course instructor & Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

While teacher candidates have opportunities in all of their courses to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs, there are specific courses identified where specific opportunities are identified and candidates are assessed. Please see attached a key assessment chart that identifies the specific courses. The key assessments described in this report are assessments at the program endpoint. Additionally, these end program key assessments are in bold on the attached chart.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The ECE BSED Program has reviewed teacher candidate performance scores across all five learning outcomes: (1) demonstrates content knowledge, (2) plans effectively for instruction and assessment, (3) applies content and pedagogy for effective clinical practice, (4) uses assessment methods to impact student learning, (5) values and displays professional and ethical dispositions. Candidates have met or surpassed all identified assessment targets except for those noted on the new assessment, the edTPA Portfolio. Results from this assessment reveal that targets were partially met, and plans will be discussed in the category, Effects on Student Learning. Content knowledge: Teacher candidates met targets on the Observation of Field Performance for demonstration of content knowledge. We will continue to review GACE content scores in science (reported as the lowest area in previous years). The key changes identified in previous action plans will continue: Key changes: collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences faculty via co-teaching in ISCI 2001 and ISCI 2002 (life/earth science and physical science courses); implementation of ESOL and Special Education course inputs via co-teaching Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions: Teacher candidates met the assessment targets for demonstrating pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional/ethical dispositions. As noted on the Observation of Field Performance and the edTPA Portfolio, our candidates were strong in the areas of planning and classroom management (learning environments category), two areas noted in previous years where improvement was needed. We will continue to monitor these areas by continuing implementation of the following key program changes: Key changes: three-course sequence revision ECE 3661, ECE 3662, ECE 3663 - Classroom Management; comprehensive lesson planning format; increased rigor and revised measure - Observation of Field Performance; GUMS - Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style Writing Program. Effects on Student learning: Some improvement in our teacher candidates’ ability to impact student learning was noted in the area of assessment in 2012-2013; however, edTPA Portfolio results for 2013-2014 show that improvement is still needed in this area. Improvement is needed in our candidates’ ability to use assessment strategies to assess student learning and to provide evidence of student learning in data collected and in analysis of effectiveness. We have outlined an action plan to address this area by offering a signature assignment embedded in ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education. Key change: A signature assignment will be embedded in ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

The program coordinator informs faculty regularly at program faculty meetings, and decisions for program improvement are made following fall and spring semesters. Additional data is reported to programs from the Unit level – College of Education. Faculty meet in content areas to make revisions to curriculum and assignments as needed based upon assessment data. If curriculum changes are needed, proposals are submitted each semester by October 1st (fall) and March 1st (spring). The program coordinator loads all key assessments each semester in the LiveText course management system. Program reports are run each semester, reviewed, and analyzed. All data is kept in LiveText and WEAVE, secure data management systems.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment
Changes in the educational program: The biggest change in the program is due to the implementation of the edTPA Portfolio, a key assessment that has helped to reveal our candidates’ abilities to have an impact on student learning. This key assessment will be consequential for teacher candidates’ initial certification beginning fall 2015. Because this is a new assessment and to be proactive, the program has created several signature assignments that will be embedded across the program and will target planning, instruction, and assessment in the following courses: ECE 3600: Language and Literacy Inquiry – (assignment: understanding the context for learning – rollout fall 2014) ECE 3400: Reading Methods in Early Childhood Education – (assignment: planning for literacy instruction and assessment – rollout fall 2014) ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education – (assignment: assessing students’ literacy learning – rollout fall 2014) ECE 3604: Mathematics Methods in Early Childhood Education – (assignment: assessing students’ mathematics learning – rollout fall 2015) ECE 3605: Social Studies Methods in Early Childhood Education – (assignment: planning for integrated instruction and assessment – literacy & social studies – rollout fall 2014) ECE 3606: Science Methods in Early Childhood Education – (assignment: planning for integrated instruction and assessment – literacy & science – rollout fall 2014) ECE 3390: Teacher as Responsible Practitioner in the 21st Century – (assignment: candidate analysis of teaching effectiveness as evidenced in a video-recording of teaching – rollout fall 2015) Changes in the assessment process: The assessment process has not changed. The key assessments identified this year will continue to be implemented, analyzed, and reviewed for effectiveness and program improvement each reporting year. Status of previous years’ action plans: Two action plans were completed regarding our candidates' pedagogical content knowledge & skills (Goal 2, Outcome 3): (1) Classroom Management Strategies (2) Technology for Student Learning We completed the revision of the Classroom Management course sequence. Additionally, we have a heavy emphasis on technology in ECE 3602: Writing and Composing in the Digital Age. Data from the Observation of Field Performance (Learning Environments & Technology) reveal some improvement in classroom management and technology for student learning. We will continue to review data next year to monitor progress in these areas. One action plan will continue to be active to target content knowledge (Goal 1, Outcome 1): GUMS – knowledge of grammar, usage, and mechanics/Writing Mentor Program and collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences, ISCI faculty, to co-teach in science. One new action plan was created for effects on student learning (Goal 3, Outcome 4): Implementation of Assessment Strategies and Evidence of Feedback – This plan will be embedded in ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education. It is based upon edTPA Portfolio data that indicated our candidates' needed improvement in using assessment strategies, providing feedback, and ensuring their students' use of feedback in supporting their literacy learning.
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### Mission / Purpose
The mission of Birth Through Five (B-5) is to provide an exemplary, interdisciplinary teacher preparation program for early care and education professionals, in order to positively impact the quality of programs for very young children in the urban metropolitan Atlanta region. The program prepares new teachers, current teachers or career changers for employment in varied settings with very young children (birth through Kindergarten) both typically developing and those with special education needs. Graduates of the program are well prepared for jobs as certified teachers, administrators, or early education specialists in the Birth Through Five and Preschool Special Education fields. Our program is committed to principles and practices that are respectful of the unique characteristics of the children, families, and teacher candidates with whom we work.

The B-5 program provides a unique collaboration with the Georgia System of Technical Colleges. A system-wide articulation agreement allows a pathway to the B-5 bachelor's degree completion for students with an Associates Degree in Early Care and Education from an accredited technical college program. As of September, 2012 sixty-six (69) students have declared the B-5 major, with 24 graduates during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years.

### Goals

**G 2: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**  
The teacher candidate will possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to plan and teach effectively.

**G 3: Student Learning**  
The teacher candidate will use varied instructional strategies, assessment techniques and critical reflection to document children's development and learning.

**G 4: Professional Dispositions**  
The teacher candidate will work collaboratively with diverse professionals and display professional and ethical behaviors.

**G 1: Content Knowledge**  
The teacher candidate will possess the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum they teach.

### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
This assessment target was met. All 11 program graduates (100%) received ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standards" on the evaluation of field performance, an assessment that demonstrates content knowledge as well as pedagogy. Approximately one-half (6 candidates) received ratings of "exceed" and the other half (5 candidates) received ratings of "meets." The mean overall rating on 19 indicators was 2.44 out of 3.0. Candidates received their highest ratings (2.72) on indicators such as, " Using Content Knowledge To Build Meaningful Curriculum 5c. Using knowledge, early learning standards, and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate curriculum for each child."

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
This assessment target met and exceeds student's performance from the previous year. 94% (16/17) of candidates received a rating of at least "developing" on all eight indicators of the IEP/IFSP project. In fact, ten (10) students received the highest rating of "mastery;" and five (5) received the next highest rating of "accomplished." Only 1 candidate received a rating of "developing" which is the target and another student received a rating of "beginning" (9/32 points) 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). In the case of the one student who received the below target rating of "beginning," she completed in her student teaching semester in a special education elementary school (Gwinnett County) and had daily opportunities to improve her skills in meeting the individualized needs of children receiving special education services.

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 review, 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
This assessment target was met, and in fact, candidates' performance of this assessment was improved over last year. 91% of candidates (10/11) received overall scores in the 93-100 range ("exceeds") with rubric ratings of "Proficiently Met" on this two week planning, teaching, assessment and reflection assignment. The other candidate received a score in the 72-90 range (satisfactory) along with a rubric rating of "Adequately Met." [Please note, an error appears on the LiveText rubric report showing only 9 overall ratings, rather than 11, due to a scorer not entering the overall rating for 2 candidates.] Candidates received very high ratings on sub-ratings for "assessment rationales and tools" confirming that this assignment was effective in supporting candidate's use of assessment methods to document student learning. For any candidate showing a "partially met" or "not met" on a sub-rating in the rubric report, this generally reflected that some minor feature of the assignment was of lesser quality, for example, the clarity of photos on a photo documentation board or failure to cite resources in proper format.

**M 4: Dispositions Survey (O: 4)**

The College of Education administers an online survey to assess all teacher candidate's professional dispositions. The measure is called "Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals." Candidates receive a rating from program faculty mid program and end of program. Ratings are as follows: Exceptional (4 pts), Acceptable (3 pts), Marginal (2 pts), Unacceptable (1pt).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions**

The achievement target is a mean rating of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. This rating would indicate that B-5 teacher candidates demonstrated professional dispositions at the "acceptable" level at the end of program.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The overall mean rating of 11 candidates' professional dispositions exceeded the target of 3.0 with a range of 3.3 - 3.8. 10/11 candidates displayed "exceptional" or "acceptable" levels of professional dispositions at the end of their program. This performance shows that most B-5 candidates are well prepared to meet the professional and ethical challenges of the profession. One candidate received a rating of "unacceptable" for the disposition of "authenticity." Unfortunately, this candidate made a poor choice that called into question her professional decision-making. Consequences included a Notification & Documentation report in the candidate's department file and course grade reductions. This candidate received ratings of "acceptable" on the other four professional dispositions.

**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.

**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.

**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 class 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.

**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.
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Annual assessments reveal that B-5 program candidates continue to meet or exceed rigorous targets. The IEP/IFSP project was recently the focus of an action plan to clarify the assessment for students and to report performance in raw scores as well as rubric ratings. This year (2013-14) student’s performance on this assessment was markedly improved with 10/17 receiving the highest rating. More

---

### Course assignment will be redesigned

There are three indicators on the IEP/IFSP project rubric where more than 85% of candidates received ratings of "beginning," which is below the achievement target. These indicators are: "provides statement of environments other than natural or general education classroom," "identifies the person responsible for implementation," and "provides for transition planning." Among these three indicators, over half of the candidates (61%) scored below expectation in "provides for transition planning." An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Redesign assignment materials and extend opportunities to work on the assessment over two courses.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** EXC 4530, EXC 4520 Course Instructor  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Revise assessment and extend assessment over two courses

There are three indicators on the IEP/IFSP project rubric where more than 85% of candidates received ratings of "beginning," which is below the achievement target. These indicators are: "provides statement of environments other than natural or general education classroom," "identifies the person responsible for implementation," and "provides for transition planning." Among these three indicators, over half of the candidates (61%) scored below expectation in "provides for transition planning." An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The instructor will revise the assessment template and students will have the opportunity to document their performance in developing an individualized educational plan for a young child with special learning needs over two semesters, rather than just one.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** EXC 4530 instructor  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Rubric revised to clarify minimum level of performance

Going forward from fall, 2012, the IEP/IFSP rubric will be revised to reflect clearer levels of proficiency and passing scores: Mastery (29-32 points); Accomplished (25-28 points); Developing (24 points); Beginning (23 points or fewer). An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The instructor will revise the assessment template and students will have the opportunity to document their performance in developing an individualized educational plan for a young child with special learning needs over two semesters, rather than just one.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** EXC 4530 instructor  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

### Additional Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio (Documentation of Learning)</td>
<td>Uses assessment methods to document student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description</td>
<td>Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date</td>
<td>06/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group</td>
<td>B-5 Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another assessment showing improvement over last year is the Documentation of Learning Project (DOL). This is a 10 day unit of study implemented during the student teaching semester emphasizing the candidate’s skill in planning, teaching, assessing children's development and learning and reflecting on professional practice. While the measure and achievement targets are the same as last year, students excelled in performance, particularly in their ability to select and use appropriate and varied assessment tools in their units. Our program faculty frequently discuss how to strengthen candidates’ knowledge of instructional assessment. New teacher certification requirements for fall 2015 will focus on national external review of candidate’s performance on three tasks: planning, teaching (with video-recorded documentation), and assessment. Our B-5 program will take another look at our WEAVE assessments in light of these future mandates.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

No changes in the educational program or the assessment process are planned in response to this year’s assessment findings. However, new teacher certification requirements beginning fall 2015 will focus on national external review of teacher candidate’s performance on three tasks: planning, teaching (with video-recorded documentation), and assessment. Our B-5 program will take another look at our WEAVE assessments in light of these future mandates. Prior years action plans have been successfully implemented resulting in more streamlined measures and clearer performance rubrics for students that have led to improved student performance on these measures.
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: CF.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) think systematically about their practice and learn from performance (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.2, 1.3, 2.3 and NBPTS Standard: 4 (e) participation in a learning community (Conceptual Framework standard: 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and NBPTS Standard: 5).

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

Target for O3: Educators reflect on their practice.

Benchmark The Benchmark is a mid-program personal written reflection that: (1) identifies three ways the program has altered personal conceptions of teaching and learning (2) provides specific examples which demonstrate the change, and (3) reflects on how these changes have impacted personal conceptions of teaching and learning. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

M 2: Capstone (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)

The “Impact of Program Rubric” assesses the candidate’s perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment of candidate’s occurs twice during the program—end of Spring semester, via Benchmark assignment, and then at the end of the second summer semester, via a Capstone assignment. The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework and the NBPTS graduate teaching standards. Specifically, the rubric assesses the candidate’s: (a) knowledge of child-centered pedagogy (Conceptual Framework standard: CF.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) think systematically about their practice and learn from performance (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.2, 1.3, 2.3 and NBPTS Standard: 4 (e) participation in a learning community (Conceptual Framework standard: 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and NBPTS Standard: 5).

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

Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.

The Capstone is similar to a Showcase Portfolio in that it includes written reflections, samples of educator’s work while in the program as well as 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)

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)

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)

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)
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 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.
The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. For the mid-program assessment cycle, educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid Program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

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).

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).

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.
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.

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: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.

Increase focus on Professional Writing

Action Plan: The following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Benchmark identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision session.

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

Implementation Description: The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini less

Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program Directors

Status of Program

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.

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

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). 3.4 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 on 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 advisor 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. Demonstrates appropriate convergence/consistency/fit among theories and methodological approaches. Demonstrates social responsibility/critique of existing research. COMMENTS

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/endor-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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

A total of seven (N = 4) 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, two students "surpassed" expectations while two students "met" expectations. Each of the four 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, the other two "met" this indicator. All three "met" the indicator 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 2 students were evaluated as having "met" the criteria. Finally, for the indicator Demonstrates social responsibility/critique of existing research, three students were rated as having "surpassed" the indicator, while 1 students was evaluated as having "met" the indicator. These findings indicate a 100% pass rate for this indicator.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

A total of seven (N = 3) students completed comprehensive exams during the 2013-2014 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, while one student "surpassed" expectations. On the indicator Demonstrates thoroughness of research synthesis for the defined topic and the two students "met" expectations. One student was rated as having "surpassed" the criteria for demonstrates "fit" (e.g., validity, credibility, etc.) of research methods to the nature of the problem and/or research questions, while the other two "met" this indicator. All three "met" the indicator 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 2 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 1 student was evaluated as having "met" the indicator. These findings indicate a 100% pass rate for 2013-2014 for all students on the measure of Comprehensive Exams.

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.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Indicator Met. All students (100%) who sat for comprehensive exams in 2013-2014 passed on their first 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.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

All students (100%) in 2013-2014 passed their comprehensive exams on their first 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 by the major advisor, with input from the PhD candidates' committee during his/her completion of comprehensive exams. 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. 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. Demonstrates engagement 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
Target for **O4: Knowledgeable teachers**

All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A total of eight (N=6) students were evaluated on the quality of their teaching experiences during the 2013-2014 academic year. According to faculty evaluations of their teaching skills, five of the students &quot;surpassed&quot;, while 1 student &quot;met&quot; the criteria of: &quot;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.&quot; and &quot;Demonstrates engaging instruction through enthusiasm and by supporting caring teacher/student and peer relationships. Promotes respect for different and diverse perspectives. Promotes collaboration.&quot; Faculty evaluations of student progress on the third indicator on the rubric, &quot;Adapts instruction for learners by being responsive, offering timely feedback, and presenting materials in different ways, and encourages various means for students to express what they have learned. Offers content that is relevant to students' contexts and needs,&quot; demonstrates that two PhD candidates &quot;surpassed&quot;, while the other four students &quot;met&quot; the indicator. A similar finding was evident in faculty evaluations of students' progress toward the item: &quot;Uses a variety of high-quality formative and summative assessments to inform teaching. Grades fairly. Criteria&quot;. One student &quot;surpassed&quot;, while five students &quot;met the criteria. Finally, for the last indicator, &quot;Course evaluations demonstrate that course goals are met. Instructor is responsive to feedback from students and peers.&quot; Two PhD candidates &quot;surpassed&quot; and four &quot;met&quot; the criteria. A summary of student progress on this indicator suggests that PhD candidates &quot;met&quot; the criteria for becoming knowledgeable teachers at a rate of 100% for 2013-2014 as evidenced by the average score of students across indicators. This percentage is higher than in last year's report of 91% pass rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for **O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers**

We want 100% of our eligible PhD students to have rigorous dissertations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three students completed their dissertations during the 2013-2014 academic year. Evaluations of these PhD candidates performance on their dissertation presentations, as determined by their faculty advisors and dissertation committee, reveal that all three students &quot;met&quot; expectations on all criteria as evaluated by the rubric. A closer examination of individual indicators reveals that all three PhD student were rated as having &quot;surpassed&quot; the criteria of: &quot;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 &quot;Met&quot; to &quot;Not Met&quot;: 1. Demonstrates thorough knowledge or 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.&quot; and &quot;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.&quot; and &quot;Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study.&quot; &quot;Met&quot;. 2. Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings). 3. 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 &quot;Met&quot; to &quot;Not Met&quot;: 1. Demonstrates thorough knowledge or 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.&quot; and &quot;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.&quot; and &quot;Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study.&quot; Two of the three students also &quot;surpassed&quot; on the indicator &quot;Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings)&quot; while the third student &quot;met&quot; the criteria. All students met the indicators assessing their understanding of ethical research practices and in working with the diverse and vulnerable populations. Finally all students met the criteria for &quot;Demonstrates academic honest through original scholarship.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Target for **O4: 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 comprehensive and the PhD students' residency exam committee before comprehensive examinations 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 4 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.
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Six PhD candidates were evaluated on this objective during the 2013-2014 academic year. According to faculty ratings of these students, students, on average, met the criteria for this indicator. However, a closer examination of the individual indicators demonstrates variability in student performance, particularly in the area of grant writing and submitting work for publication. For example, on the indicator “Attends and presents scholarly work at a research conference, two students were rated as having “surpassed” the indicator, while 4 "met the criteria (100% met rate). Regarding Students “Submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals”, one student "surpassed" the indicator, four "met", one "partially met" the criteria (83%).

On the indicator designed to assess their "Service to Department, University or Profession," five students "met" the criteria while 1 partially met the criteria (83% pass rate). Finally, for the last dimension, “Participates in identifying and applying for a grant, scholarship or fellowship”, 4 students were rated as having “surpassed” and 2 students were rated as having “met” the indicator (100% met rate). Overall, these data suggest that students were, generally, performing as well as one would hope on the metrics used to determine whether students were active seekers of knowledge (overall = 92%).

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 continue to focus on the academic needs and opportunities of our part-time students in order to assist them in participating in research(writing) and service activities that will help them become productive scholars.

**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
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

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

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
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

(1) Significance of Findings in Light of the Desired Results Findings from the 2013-2014 academic year suggest that the majority of students are meeting program requirements with many of them surpassing expectations on key indicators. This is the second year that we have used detailed rubrics to evaluate our students experiences toward their doctoral degrees and we find the information provided from these analyses useful. The goal of the PhD in Early Childhood and Elementary Education (ECEE) is to prepare scholars to function as researchers and teacher educators in a variety of roles including basic and applied research, curriculum development, and teacher education. To accomplish this goal, we provide students with a strong foundation in educational theory, research methodology and a specialized program of study of their choosing to participate in empirical and systematic research that examines educational principles, strategies, and practices related to educational processes and outcomes for children in a variety of Birth to 5th grade settings. We believe that data from the 2013-2014 school year reveal that we are being successful in obtaining our goals. Two areas in which our students did not meet our expectations with 100% accuracy relate to the indicator “Candidates are active seekers of knowledge.” Although students met our criteria on the total indicator, one student only partially met the indicator in relation to the criteria “Submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals” and “Service to Department, University or Profession.”
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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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. Demonstrates knowledge of elementary mathematics content and curriculum (G1): Candidates appropriately use knowledge of mathematical content and curriculum emphasized in national, state, and local standards for grades K-5 in preparing learning experiences for children.

SLO 2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 4, 5)
Demonstrates research-based pedagogical content knowledge (G2): Candidates use instructional strategies based on current research and applicable standards and use appropriate technology and a variety of physical and visual materials for exploration of mathematical concepts and procedures and development of children’s thinking, understanding, and problem solving across the strands of the elementary mathematics curriculum.

SLO 3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness (G: 3) (M: 2)
Assesses student learning and program effectiveness (G3): Candidates understand and use multiple, appropriate assessment methods to assess student learning and improve program effectiveness.

SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity (G: 4) (M: 2)
Demonstrates knowledge of student diversity (G4): Candidates demonstrate knowledge of student diversity (e.g., gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, language, special needs, etc.) and use this knowledge to affirm and support the learning of mathematics by all students.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

Given that this student is a full time teacher and attends school part-time, it is understandable that the candidate was unable to take a leadership role in our program or in the university via service. It is also important to note that although he student did not submit a paper as first author for publication to a peer-reviewed journal, the candidate did make a significant contribution to a faculty lead research manuscript. (2) Significance of Findings in Light of Findings from Previous Years, PhD faculty in the Department of Early Childhood Education have spent considerable effort during the past academic year analyzing areas of weakness in our program and providing students with support aimed at ameliorating areas of weakness from the previous year. Compared to the 2012-2013 school year, PhD students performed at a much higher level of performance on all indicators. One particular area of improvement is in the area of grant writing, a sub-indicator on the dimension “Candidates are active seekers of knowledge.” Only 43% of students in 2012-2013 were meeting this indicator, while 100% met this indicator this year. PhD faculty made a concerted effort to ensure opportunities this past academic year to expose PhD candidates to grant writing opportunities and many wrote for and obtained internal funding for their dissertation research. A final area of improvement on this indicator is in relation to "Attending and presenting scholarly work at a research conference". In 2012-2013, only 71% of students met this criteria compared to 83% this academic year. (3) Significance of Findings in Light of Recent Changes to Programming Findings from 2012-2013 provided data for us addressing weakness in our program around research experiences and grant writing. In order to assist our PhD students in these two areas, we instituted a more stringent and defined annual review process for students. This annual review process more clearly articulates our expectations for students completion of key research experiences as they achieve residency requirements. In addition to a more formal and clearly articulated annual review process, we have encouraged our students to take a course in becoming scholarly writers. This course allows students to apprentice with a faculty member over the course of an academic year and assists them with conceptualizing and writing toward a scholarly publication. We believe that both of these recent changes to our program have assisted us in meeting our students’ needs in ways that are demonstrated on our annual assessments of student progress.
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, ECE 7395). These assignments provide a model for student-centered teaching. Instructions to candidates for these assessments 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 student, and the ways in which students learn mathematics." (pp. 25-26) Stein, Smith, Henningsen, and Silver (2000) encourage the analysis of mathematics instructional tasks as follows: "The kind and level of thinking required for the students in order to successfully engage 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 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 understand what types of tasks are being used for student learning. Such analysis of the tasks the students are solving can provide a record of the tasks that 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; and adapt a variety of 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 way of learning mathematics but also a major means of doing so. Students should have frequent opportunities to formulate, graphically manipulate complex and solve new problems that require a significant amount of effort to reflect on their thinking." (NCTM, 2000, p. 51) Tasks and Rationales: Select, adapt, or generate (and organize) ten (10) worthwhile mathematical tasks across grades P-5 focusing on developing understanding of the major concepts of elementary mathematics emphasized in this course. For each task collected, provide a rationale/cover page that identifies the following (refer to Stein, Smith, Henningsen, & Silver, 2000, pp. 16, 21): Anticipated students (age, grade level, and prior knowledge/experience); Goals for student learning (from GPS or NCTM Standards); Mathematical features of the task, including what students are asked to do, in what context, with what tools (including the 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.

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). This assessment is 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 student, and the ways in which students learn mathematics." (pp. 25-26) Stein, Smith, Henningsen, and Silver (2000) encourage the analysis of mathematics instructional tasks as follows: "The kind and level of thinking required for the students in order to successfully engage 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 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 understand what types of tasks are being used for student learning. Such analysis of the tasks the students are solving can provide a record of the tasks that 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; and adapt a variety of 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 way of learning mathematics but also a major means of doing so. Students should have frequent opportunities to formulate, graphically manipulate complex and solve new problems that require a significant amount of effort to reflect on their thinking." (NCTM, 2000, p. 51) Tasks and Rationales: Select, adapt, or generate (and organize) ten (10) worthwhile mathematical tasks across grades P-5 focusing on developing understanding of the major concepts of elementary mathematics emphasized in this course. For each task collected, provide a rationale/cover page that identifies the following (refer to Stein, Smith, Henningsen, & Silver, 2000, pp. 16, 21): Anticipated students (age, grade level, and prior knowledge/experience); Goals for student learning (from GPS or NCTM Standards); Mathematical features of the task, including what students are asked to do, in what context, with what tools (including the 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.
At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the child's understanding of geometry or measurement. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student in Grade Three with the purpose of determining what the child understands about base ten concepts. Most of the problems for this interview should be grouping and partitioning problems that use groups of ten and addition problems that encourage the use of invented algorithms to deal with carefully selected number combinations. Provide for your selection of the number sizes during the interview, depending on the as yet unknown needs of the child. The problems must make sense with all of the alternate number sizes. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be engaging yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about 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 understanding of grouping and partitioning, the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, and the types of strategies they demonstrated. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one word problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing the student's understanding of base ten concepts. 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. Provide for your selection of the number sizes during the interview, depending on the as yet unknown needs of the child. The problems must make sense with all of the alternate number sizes. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be engaging yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about 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 understanding of grouping and partitioning, 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. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. Interview #4: Children's Understanding of Equality (both the concept and the symbol) and explore the extent of children's understanding. b. Interview a small group of children (or an individual child) with the purpose of coming to know what each child understands about equality. Provide appropriate materials for the children to use in solving the problems. Record in as much detail as possible what the children do and say in trying to solve the problems. On the basis of the children's responses, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the children's understanding while continuing to encourage and support the children's success with the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problems 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 children's relational thinking while continuing to encourage and support the children's success with the problems you pose. Target for O3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).
### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity**

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.

### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.

### 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 Grubric.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / Satisfactory (80%).

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.
M 5: Selected Course Grades (O: 1, 2)

Course grades from the four courses in the program integrating content and pedagogy in elementary mathematics classrooms reflect candidate knowledge of major concepts of mathematics content appropriate for grades K-5. These courses are as follows: ECE 7393: Number and Operation in the Elementary Classroom; ECE 7394: Geometry and Measurement in the Elementary Classroom; ECE 7395: Algebra in the Elementary Classroom; ECE 7396: Data Analysis and Probability in the Elementary Classroom.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum

GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.

Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge

GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

2013-2014: This program was de-activated, and these key assessment data were reported in the previous year.

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

Increase Pedagogical Emphasis and Tools

The qualitative data from program key assessments has indicated a need for greater emphasis and support for implementing standards-based pedagogy. We have introduced a standards-based lesson plan format for use in each of the math content/pedagogy courses that supports teachers' attention to important elements of standards-based pedagogy. This increased emphasis will be continued through the current cycle of four math content/pedagogy courses that concludes in May 2012. Results from key assessments for 2011-2012 will be analyzed for improvement in attention to these pedagogical details.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Program Co-Coordinators (Dr. Smith and Dr. Swars)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 2013 in the context of ECE 7393 (Minimester I).

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Stephanie Smith and Dr. Susan Swars
Additional Resources: None

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Economics Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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).

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 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%.

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

**discuss with faculty**
The assessment results were shared with the instructors of each of the core courses and they were asked to make note of the concepts in which the department fell short of our targets and to plan to spend more time focusing on those concepts this year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Multiple Choice Questions on Exams
  - **Outcome/Objective:** social science (area E) goal - econ
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Economics Undergraduate Program Committee

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Economics BA,BBA,BS**

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

**Mission / Purpose**
Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. As at most universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and to disseminate that knowledge with policymakers and leaders in the public, nonprofit, and business communities, here and abroad. The Department of Economics is committed to the broad goals of Georgia State University and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The University Strategic Plan 2000 states the “[t]he overarching goal of the Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premiere research universities located in an urban setting”. As stated in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Strategic Plan 2002-2007, the School “intends to be the highest rated policy school in the South and one of the highest ranked in the nation by 2007”. The Department of Economics shares both of these goals. We intend to contribute to these goals by continuing our efforts to better serve the needs of our undergraduate majors, our graduate students, and GSU students more broadly, by engaging in such activities as improving our curricula, introducing innovative course features, and creating new degree programs. Finally, we will continue to expand our service and outreach activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.

**Goals**

**G 1: goals**
The goals of the Department of Economics's undergraduate program include teaching students the "economic way of thinking", and helping them appreciate and understand the global economy in which we live today. We wish to send out students that are prepared for the competitive job market with skills that are valued by employers.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Economics Basic Theories (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

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

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

**SLO 2: Apply to specific fields (G: 1) (M: 1)**
To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.

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

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

**SLO 3: Benefits and costs (G: 1) (M: 1)**
To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.

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

**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.

**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.

**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.
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.

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

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Economics MA
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The Master of Arts in Economics program is designed to train students for careers in local, state, and federal government and in the private sector. The program emphasizes basic analytical skills, micro- and macro-economic theory, and mathematical statistics, at a level necessary for contributing to and assessing policy research. Microeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8100. Macroeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8110. Statistical skills are taught in Economics 8740 and 8840. Students' mastery of these skills is assessed with midterm and final examinations in the respective courses. The program also emphasizes advanced understanding of selected topics. Students must take seven additional economics courses, chosen in consultation with their advisors. They must demonstrate mastery of this course material through midterm exams, final exams, and research papers. A final high-quality research paper chosen by the student must demonstrate that the student has the ability to examine an economic problem at a level consistent with advanced graduate course work.

Goals

G 1: Theoretical and applied background.
To equip the MA program graduates with wide-ranging and in-depth knowledge of theoretical and applied economics. Graduates should be able to perform applied economic analysis based on sound theory and data analysis.
G 2: Professional success and continued education.
To facilitate the continued academic and professional development of the MA program graduates. Graduates should possess the necessary theoretical and analytic background to perform successfully in the job market and to be able to pursue further graduate level education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: Analytical Skills. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Applying Economic Models. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 3)
To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

O/O 2: Economic Disciplines. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

O/O 4: Economic Data. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Core exams. (O: 2, 3)
All graduating Master of Arts in Economics students will be assessed on their basic learning of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics (e.g., Master of Arts in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The assessment will be based on the performances of their final examinations in microeconomics, macroeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In microeconomics, the overall average was similar to last year's at around 4.0. Also, looking into the particular categories, performance was very similar to last year's. In macroeconomics there was a small decrease in the applications and Math sections. Yet the average was at around 4.2 which is quite good. In macroeconomics, the average across each category was about 3.7, which is also very similar to last year's. Overall, goals are being met and students have maintained strong performance.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In microeconomics, the overall average was similar to last year's at around 4.0. Also, looking into the particular categories, performance was very similar to last year's. In macroeconomics there was a small decrease in the applications and Math sections. Yet the average was at around 4.2 which is quite good. In macroeconomics, the average across each category was about 3.7, which is also very similar to last year's. Overall, goals are being met and students have maintained strong performance.

Target for O3: Analytical Skills.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In microeconomics, the overall average was similar to last year's at around 4.0. Also, looking into the particular categories, performance was very similar to last year's. In econometrics there was a small decrease in the applications and Math sections. Yet the average was at around 4.2 which is quite good. In macroeconomics, the average across each category was about 3.7, which is also very similar to last year's. Overall, goals are being met and students have maintained strong performance.

Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.
Target not set in this cycle.

M 2: Essay. (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
All students will submit a research paper to demonstrate their learning in a chosen subject of their own and to show their understanding, usage, and analysis of economic data. The Essay will typically be a product of the interaction with at least one faculty member in the Department of Economics, and will be assessed by the faculty member(s) involved. The Essay will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Forty-four essays were submitted in this cycle. Applying economic models were judged by the following two categories: Ability to Cervice the Research Question and by Economic Analysis. The average grade for these sections was 3.7, which was just about the same as last year's average score.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Forty-four essays were submitted in this cycle. Applying economic models were judged by the following two categories: Ability to Cervice the Research Question and by Economic Analysis. The average grade for these sections was 3.7, which was just...
about the same as last year’s average score.

### Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.

Target not set in this cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category was measured by Comprehension of the Literature. The average grade was 3.73 which was a slight increase over last year’s average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O3: Analytical Skills.

Target not set in this cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category was measured by the Theoretical Skills and Overall Contribution rankings. The average score in Overall Contribution was 3.43 which we would like to raise as it is somewhat lower than the past couple of years. The average score in Theoretical Skills was 3.6, which meets the target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Economic Data.

Target not set in this cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category was evaluated by Data Collection, Measurement and Computation. The average score was 4.08, which meets targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year we received 12 responses to the alumni survey. The responses were generally favorable. On the question if faculty were available and accessible to students, respondents strongly agreed with a 4.3 average. They also strongly agreed with the question about the degree “expanding their job opportunities.” One respondent pointed out that the expanded offering of econometrics courses that the department implemented in the last 5 years is the “best feature of the program.” In terms of areas that need improvement, respondents suggested expanding the econometrics options even more and a more even offering of Fall vs. Spring courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We have a database of alumni, though this is an ongoing effort, especially with recent graduates that tend to be in flux in their early years in the work force.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2014
- **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: Finished  
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. AYSPS Career Services office has created a host of job market related activities for our students.

**Recruitment**

Compile a large dataset of contacts where we can advertise the program.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Finished  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: The data set was completed in Fall 2013. There is a regional data set covering schools in Georgia and neighboring states. Also, there is an international data set covering many countries world-wide.

**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: Finished  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Our new website has been completed.

**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

**More guidance in year 2**

This has two components. First, we need to get students started in the process of the MA Research Paper sooner. We will require them to identify a topic and advisor earlier in the process. This should ensure an early start and should improve the quality of the eventual contribution. Second, many students have expressed a desire to learn more about PhD studies. We will hold one of our regular MA symposiums in the Fall about this topic.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: First, we need to get students started in the process of the MA Research Paper sooner. We will require them to identify a topic and advisor earlier in the process. This should ensure an early start and should improve the quality of the eventual contribution. Second, many students have expressed a desire to learn more about PhD studies. We will hold one of our regular MA symposiums in the Fall about this topic.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**2. Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Several changes made in the past 5 years are yielding positive results. For example, expanding the econometrics courses requirements has received a positive feedback as indicated in our alumni survey. Employers want graduates from an MA in economics to have good quantitative skills and we have tried to provide that by expanding the number of courses in this area that students take. In addition, the establishment of our school's own Career Services office has played a positive role in preparing our
3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

The assessment is written by the Director of the program. The findings are initially shared and discussed with the department chair and with our leading administrative specialist. If major changes are agreed upon, then the assessment can be shared with the graduate committee and the whole department.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

There are two planned changes that we plan to implement in the short term. First, we need to get students started in the process of the MA Research Paper sooner. We will require them to identify a topic and advisor earlier in the process. This should ensure an early start and should improve the quality of the eventual contribution. Second, many students have expressed a desire to learn more about PhD studies within our discipline. We will hold one of our regular MA symposiums every the Fall about this topic. Third, we will explore starting a quantitative sub-field of specialization given the observed student interest and increased employer demand for these skills.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Economics PhD

(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 theoretical and applied policy-relevant economic research. The program equips students with foundational knowledge of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometric theory, as well as further specialized knowledge in one field out of Environmental and Urban Economics, Experimental Economics, Health Economics, Labor Economics, and Public Economics. Additionally, the program trains students to carry out independent research, teach at the university level, and present papers and reports. These skills enable students to successfully compete for positions as professional economists in academia, industry, or government. The necessary foundational 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 homework, 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. 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. Proficiency in research is accomplished through collaboration with faculty members, 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 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 a dissertation proposal and an oral examination on the subject of the student's dissertation. Proficiency in teaching and presenting is demonstrated through assisting professors with teaching-related activities, passing a teaching examination, teaching one's own courses, and presenting research at seminars and conferences.

Goals

G 1: Knowledge
Ph.D. students will become economists with wide-ranging knowledge of the theoretic and applied advances in the discipline, particularly in their chosen field of study.

G 2: Research
Ph.D. students will become scholars with a high level of proficiency in conducting independent and original research.

G 3: Communication
Ph.D. students will become effective verbal and written communicators with the ability to present research and teach classes.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analytical Skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
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: 1, 2)
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: 1, 2)
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: 2, 3, 5)**

To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics.

**SLO 5: Marketability (M: 4)**

Students should be able to successfully compete for research and teaching jobs in academia, industry, and government.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Field Examination (O: 1, 2, 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. Students are given a second chance to take the exam if they fail in the first attempt.

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

**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**

Achieve a 3-yr moving average of an 80% pass rate on field examinations by the second attempt, among all students who passed their comprehensive examinations.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The Public Finance field exam was given to five students. All passed the exam with an average grade of 3.8. The Labor Economics field exam was also taken by five students who all passed the exam (one of them on a second attempt) with an average grade of 3.9. One student took (and passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam in Spring 2014. Four students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Three students passed the exam (one on a second attempt) with an average grade 3.1. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 88%.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The Public Finance field exam was given to five students. All passed the exam with an average grade of 3.8. The Labor Economics field exam was also taken by five students who all passed the exam (one of them on a second attempt) with an average grade of 3.9. One student took (and passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam in Spring 2014. Four students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Three students passed the exam (one on a second attempt) with an average grade 3.1. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 88%.

**Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods**

Achieve a 3-yr moving average of an 80% pass rate on field examinations by the second attempt, among all students who passed their comprehensive examinations.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The Public Finance field exam was given to five students. All passed the exam with an average grade of 3.8. The Labor Economics field exam was also taken by five students who all passed the exam (one of them on a second attempt) with an average grade of 3.9. One student took (and passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam in Spring 2014. Four students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Three students passed the exam (one on a second attempt) with an average grade 3.1. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 88%.

**Target for O3: Field Specialization**

Achieve a 3-yr moving average of an 80% pass rate on field examinations by the second attempt, among all students who passed their comprehensive examinations.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

The Public Finance field exam was given to five students. All passed the exam with an average grade of 3.8. The Labor Economics field exam was also taken by five students who all passed the exam (one of them on a second attempt) with an average grade of 3.9. One student took (and passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam in Spring 2014. Four students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Three students passed the exam (one on a second attempt) with an average grade 3.1. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 88%.

**M 2: Dissertation (O: 1, 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

**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**

Achieve average score (from 1 to 5, where 1 is worst and 5 is best) on “the research is publishable” of 4 or higher, as computed by a three-year moving average.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2013-2014. The range of the average scores across different evaluation categories is 3.86 to 4.92. The dissertation committee judged that in six (out of the total of 7 students) research work was interesting enough to be considered for publication in reputable academic journals (such as Journal of Public Economics, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization and International Tax and Public Finance). The average score for
the likelihood of the research in the dissertation being published is 4.10. The 3-year moving average score on "the research is publishable" category is 4.68.

**Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods**

Achieve average score (from 1 to 5, where 1 is worst and 5 is best) on "the research is publishable" of 4 or higher, as computed by a three-year moving average.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2013-2014. The range of the average scores across different evaluation categories is 3.86 to 4.92. The dissertation committee judged that in six (out of the total of 7 students) research work was interesting enough to be considered for publication in reputable academic journals (such as Journal of Public Economics, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization and International Tax and Public Finance). The average score for the likelihood of the research in the dissertation being published is 4.10. The 3-year moving average score on “the research is publishable” category is 4.68.

**Target for O3: Field Specialization**

Achieve a 3-yr moving average of an 80% pass rate on field examinations by the second attempt, among all students who passed their comprehensive examinations.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2013-2014. The range of the average scores across different evaluation categories is 3.86 to 4.92. The dissertation committee judged that in six (out of the total of 7 students) research work was interesting enough to be considered for publication in reputable academic journals (such as Journal of Public Economics, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization and International Tax and Public Finance). The average score for the likelihood of the research in the dissertation being published is 4.10. The 3-year moving average score on “the research is publishable” category is 4.68.

**Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research**

Achieve average score (from 1 to 5, where 1 is worst and 5 is best) on “the research is publishable” of 4 or higher, as computed by a three-year moving average.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Seven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2013-2014. The range of the average scores across different evaluation categories is 3.86 to 4.92. The dissertation committee judged that in six (out of the total of 7 students) research work was interesting enough to be considered for publication in reputable academic journals (such as Journal of Public Economics, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization and International Tax and Public Finance). The average score for the likelihood of the research in the dissertation being published is 4.10. The 3-year moving average score on “the research is publishable” category is 4.68.

**M 3: 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**

1. Each Senior student has two or more working papers 2. Sixty percent of students teach at least one class at GSU, as computed on a three-year moving average

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Five Ph.D. students participated in the online survey this year. They have written a total of 16 working papers. All five report having had teaching experience and four of them had taught at GSU. Two of them had presented their work in international conferences. Fifty-six percent (19 out of a total of 34) of our students have taught at least one class at during the 2011-2013. Target: 1. M Met for the most recent year (data not available for computing 3-year MA) 2. 2 2. Partially met (the attention to teaching experience is a recent event as a response to the feedback we received from the alumni survey; the target is met for the most recent year.) Subjective Evaluations (not part of measurable outcomes): The range of scores were from 4.8 (willing to recommend the program to peers) to 3.6 (improved analytical skills). A follow up on the low score reveals one student whose score was 1 to this question; however, this appears to be an outlier as that same student gave a 5 for willingness to recommend the program and the other students gave 4s and 5s to this question. Consistent with alumni responses, they highly value what our program offers with respect to improving their ability in conducting independent research (4.6). Among the skills our students perceive as most valuable are working with faculty on research projects and having strong fields in the program. This group of students suggests that further work should be considered in allocating more time and resources in: (i) teaching wider range of applications of the theory, (ii) academic writing and (iii) increasing the number of research seminars. Other specific suggestions include: (i) having graduate students teach, (ii) having internal research seminars and (iii) increase financial support.

**M 4: Job Placement (O: 5)**

During the final year of the dissertation, students apply for academic or non-academic jobs, usually beginning the process in the fall and completing the process in the spring. The Department trains and helps students through this process.

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

**Target for O5: Marketability**

1. Seventy-five percent of students obtain a job within the first year of going on the "job market," as computed by a three-year moving average. 2. At least 50% of students who graduated in the last three years obtain a job in a research center or university.
In most recent year, seven of our nine graduates landed academic positions as Assistant Professor or Post-Doctoral Researchers; academic institutions they placed in include Columbia, Wake Forrest, Stony Brook, Southern Missouri, Truman State and College of Charleston. One of our students was placed at USDA. This great performance of our graduates in the job market is a strong indicator that our program is on the right track and there is a demand for its graduates in the highly competitive market for academic research. Similar results were achieved in other recent years. Eighty-four percent of our students (26 out of a total of 31) who went to the job market during the last three years obtained a job within the first year.

**M 5: 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 contributed to the performance in their current jobs. One part of the survey includes questions on 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Seven alumni responded to the online survey. These alumni are performing quite successfully. Although they have recently graduated (2011-2013) they have: (i) published a total of 29 papers in peer-reviewed journals, (ii) 35 book chapters, (iii) 16 papers under review, (iv) 12 policy reports and (v) 27 working papers. They also are frequently attending a wide-range of conferences and professional meetings. Subjective Evaluations (Not part of measurable outcomes): The range of scores varied between 3.71 and 4.57. The highest score (4.57) went for the program's value with respect to improving oral communication of ideas. All alumni who responded to the survey would highly (4) recommend the program to their peers. Among the skills our alumni perceive as most valuable are econometrics, writing and oral communication. This group of alumni suggests that further work should be considered in allocating more time and resources in teaching more statistical programs and coding skills as well as academic writing. Other specific suggestions include: (i) having graduate students teach, (ii) more support from faculty and (iii) fewer term papers.

**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: 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

**Job market preparation**

Job market preparation: (i) offer a CV writing course for Ph.D. students; (ii) ran 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.

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

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

Measure: Job Placement | Outcome/Objective: Marketability
Measure: Senior Ph.D. Student Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research

**Job market presentation**

We continue to require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag during the Fall semester. As reported in findings this change has been shown to improve job market outcomes.

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

**Micro sequence**

The microeconomics sequence was reorganized from three semesters to two semesters. This change eliminated the overlap in material from previous courses. It also allows students to have their first summer course free; students can focus solely on preparing for their comprehensive exams. We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams. As we had expected, students' performance on those exams improved significantly. All first year students passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam. In comparison with the previous year, the percentage of students who passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam on the first attempt increased from 81% to 100%, with
respect to the Microeconomics comprehensive exam, the percentage of students who passed the exam on the first attempt went up from 53% to 67%.

Re-organization of the summer semester I
We moved ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from the summer of the second year to the spring of the first year. This change eliminated mandatory courses in the summer of the second year. This allows students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This also helps with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course.

Re-organization of the summer semester II
We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams.

Additional dissertation workshop
Students are required to take an additional dissertation workshop (ECON 9515) in which they will present research and give peer feedback. Particular attention is paid to presentation skills and the substance of the research; students will be videotaped while presenting.

Econometrics sequence
To help differentiate the Ph.D. level courses from the MA level courses, we have proposed renumbering the courses in the econometrics curriculum. These proposed changes are in line with the policy of using course numbers starting with 9 for PhD level courses. ECON 8730 was re-numbered to Econ 9710. ECON 8750 was re-numbered to Econ 9720. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8760 was re-numbered to Econ 9730. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8790 was re-numbered to Econ 9740. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8770 was re-numbered to Econ 9750. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum.

Students’ characteristics and success in the program.
We are working on creating a database with students’ individual characteristics, their academic performance during the years in the program, placements in the job market and their subsequent research activates. The purpose is to identify determinants of what students’ characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

Summer support
Development of an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support.

Tutoring Experience
We continue to rotate all 3rd year students through the tutoring lab. Last year this helped with staffing the tutoring lab and provided graduates with valuable teaching experience.

Coordination of tutoring assignments with research schedules
Coordinating rotation of tutoring lab assignments with research schedules. All 3rd year students will continue to be rotated through the tutoring lab. This will continue to help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market. Coordination of the tutoring lab assignments with sponsored research grant support from faculty and students’ own research grants will minimize conflicts between program objectives.
Further Development of procedures for summer support
Further development of the administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support. Develop specific procedures for inclusion of research and educational activities carried out at non-university sites with approval by faculty advisers.

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

New Course on Casual Inference
We added a new course: ECON8899/PMAP8899: Causal Inference and Evidence-based Policy. The causal inference course was added to our course offerings to provide a rigorous policy orientated 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.

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

More active supervision of students.
We are paying special attention to students' awareness of the deadlines, the graduation process and enforcements of the rules. We are developing and implementing an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students.

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

Improvement of the recruiting procedures.
Improving the recruiting procedures via utilization of the gradschoolmatch.com and by coordinating with other graduate programs. The number of applications we received this year was 127, 15 more than the last year. We have added information about fields and faculty in fields to the PhD page for recruitment.

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

Revisiting the role of Comprehensive Field Exams.
We redefined the role of comprehensive exams as a selection criterion for student continuation in the program. We are 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.

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

Faculty Feedback
Based on suggestion and feedback we received from the faculty the following items were added to the action plan: 1) 1. Communicate to students and faculty the goals for the program as outlined above. 2) 2. Consider a graduation within 7 years target. 3) 3. Communicate with students the importance of participating in the surveys and providing feedback. 4) 4. Expand recruiting efforts by relying on current students and alumni.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
A new field in the program: Health Economics.
We have added a new field in the program: Health Economics. The health economics field was added to the program in response to a high demand for this field from our previous and current students. Many of our former students were taking these courses at Emory University and we as a department felt we should be offering these courses for our students at Georgia State University. The field was also created to leverage the faculty resources that existed within in our department as well as those recently obtained under our 2CI hiring in the health field.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Field Examination | Outcome/Objective: Field Specialization

Data management class
Based on the feedback from students and faculty we have created a data management class that is taught during the summer semester. During the last two years this course has been well received by students and faculty commented that students are better prepared for applied research.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods
Measure: Field Examination | Outcome/Objective: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods
Measure: Senior Ph.D. Student Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research

Dissertation Proposal
Mandating 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.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Dissertation Proposal Defense
We have revised requirements for dissertation proposal defense. Previously, for each dissertation proposal defense we required three readers in addition to the committee members. We decided to relax the requirement of having readers. There was a general agreement that 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 was the only one in AYSPS that had this requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and can be attached to the report.

The necessary foundational 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 homework, 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. 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. Proficiency in research is accomplished through collaboration with faculty members, 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 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 a dissertation proposal and an oral examination on the subject of the student's dissertation.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The information we collected during the assessment process of this year reconfirms that the program is well established and students show strong performance. Specifically we have learned the following: 1) All of the targets for our program are met; 2) Based on the information that students who have taught classes got better jobs we increased the emphasis on teaching. 3) Based on the feedback from students and faculty we added a data management class. In addition, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. We need to maintain high requirements in terms of the quantitative component of the program.
Mission / Purpose

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.

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, and convey research-based information, (c) write proposals for funded projects, (d) collaborate with colleagues at the school level 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.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment Findings were shared and discussed with the members of the graduate committee who revised the program's mission, objectives and targets. After that the assessment was sent to all faculty members for feedback. Based on suggestion and feedback we received from the faculty the following items were added to the action plan: 1) 1. Communicate to students and faculty the goal of the program as outlined above. 2) 2. Consider a graduation within 7 years target. 3) 3. Communicate with students the importance of participating in the surveys and providing feedback. 4) 4. Expand recruiting efforts by relying on current students and alumni.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The information (as reported above) we collected during the assessment process of this year reconfirms that the program is well established and students show strong performance. Specifically we have learned the following: 1) All of the targets for our program are met; 2) Based on the information that students who have taught classes got better jobs we increased the emphasis on teaching. 3) Based on the feedback from students and faculty we added a data management class. In addition, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. We need to maintain high requirements in terms of the quantitative component of the program, expand efforts to provide our students with teaching opportunities and a good training for this as well as assisting them become successful in the job market. Based on feedback we received from the faculty the following items were added to the action plan: 1) Communicate to students and faculty the goals for the program as outlined above. 2) Consider a graduation within 7 years target. 3) Communicate with students the importance of participating in the surveys and providing feedback. 4) Expand recruiting efforts by relying on current students and alumni.
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**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.
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will have the knowledge and skills to teach at the university level, including university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.

**G 3: Engage in professional development**

Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will engage in professional development experiences, including collaborating with colleagues at the university and K-12 levels, and with community organizations.

**G 4: Develop content expertise**

Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will develop content expertise in special education.

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Students will design and conduct investigations (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 findings to refereed journals. Students will also develop skills in grant writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Students will teach at the university level (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop expertise in teaching at the university level through teaching (or assisting in teaching) university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey- Teaching Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Students will participate in presentations (G: 3) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will participate in professional development activities, including presentations and participation in professional organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey- Professional Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: The student will meet course/program requirements (G: 4) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Doctoral Indicator Survey- Research section (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014 we had a total of 24 doctoral students and all students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Additionally, 44 manuscripts were submitted since the start of their program by 15 students (with students being the senior author on 14 of these); 7 articles were published by 5 students (with students being the senior author on 5 articles); 6 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 6 students since the start of their program while 1 was published during this past year, and 15 grants were prepared since the start of their program with the assistance of 1 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Evidence of teaching college courses (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Students will teach at the university level**

By candidacy, 100% of the students will have completed their requirement of assisting or teaching a university course.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014, all students who had reached candidacy had assisted or taught a university course. A total of 23 out of 24 had taken EXC 9660 with 22 having completed or in the process of completing their teaching internship. Of those who completed their teaching internship all received a positive evaluation by their professor. Since the start of the program, 77 courses were assisted by the current students (range 1 to 9). Since the start of their program, 50 university courses had been taught as a GTA by 14 of these students with a total of 20 courses being taught by 12 students as a GTA during the previous year. A total of 18 students had conducted 72 guest (range 1 to 27 guest lectures) lectures since the start of their programs and 42 guest lectures were completed during the previous year by 10 students (range of 1 to 24 guest lectures).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Evidence of professional development (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O3: Students will participate in presentations
100% of the students will have made at least one conference workshop presentation by candidacy.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of the students will have made at least one conference workshop presentation by candidacy. Sixty-six national conferences were made by 21 students since the start of their program. In 2013-2014, all students who had reached candidacy had made at least one conference or workshop presentation 19 students made 66 national conference presentations since the start of their program while 14 had made 28 presentations this past year; 18 students made 43 state conference presentations during the previous year; 6 students made 14 workshop presentations; and 5 students held office in professional organizations since the start of the program and 3 during the current year.

M 4: Successful rating on annual evaluation (O: 4)
The student will demonstrate content expertise through successful rating on annual evaluation consisting of a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exam scores, and prospectus (as appropriate).
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: The student will meet course/program requirements
Students will rate a satisfactory or higher on annual evaluations which include a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exams, and prospectus (as appropriate) and is determined by PMA faculty.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In 2013-2014, there were a total of 24 doctoral students. One student graduated. All 24 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.

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) (M: 3)
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) (M: 5)
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 no 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 (O: 1)
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 for focus in Chapter 1 of the dissertation project. Submitted papers will be evaluated based on a rubric. Student presentations will be evaluated using an acceptable/uncacceptable scale. Additional feedback will be given through peer feedback regarding the topic selection, literature review, and the research questions developed.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Literature Review
100% of students taking the assessment will score an "acceptable" rating
M 5: The Dissertation (O: 2)

Dissertation The dissertation study 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 credit hours of dissertation credit (typically dissertation hours) each 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 successfully. Degree requirements include a dissertation using the “Review and Research Format,” 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 review manuscript Table of Contents provided in Part 10 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 appendices (e.g., additional tables, information regarding computer programs, details on coding, information about primary sources) so that the research document will be fully documented. The organization of the research manuscript will follow the 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 indicates the method of inquiry. This chapter links the review manuscript to the research manuscript. The student's committee may establish additional requirements. These requirements may change depending on the nature of the questions being investigated or the field of study, the nature of the student's methodology, or the nature of the results of the investigations. In summary, this format requires: 1) a comprehensive literature review manuscript that addresses a current issue, in this case in educational leadership policy and/or practice, prepared according to the style requirements of a scholarly journal so that the manuscript is suitable for publication. The literature review manuscript should avoid extreme brevity and be understandable to the members of the candidate's Doctoral Advisory Committee even if this necessitates some elaboration of the standard article format, and 2) a research manuscript that describes the results of an original, applied research project informed by the comprehensive literature review, described above. The two manuscripts will be integrated into the dissertation format. Oral Defense: The purpose of the oral defense of the dissertation is to enable the Doctoral Advisory Committee to judge the quality of the investigation and the students' ability to defend their work. The student, in consultation with committee members, is responsible for setting the date and time of the oral defense. Once the Doctoral Advisory Committee agrees upon the date and time, the student should notify Jeff Stockwell at jstockwe@gsu.edu and request the date, time, room, and equipment needs. When the dissertation is completed, a public announcement of the oral defense of the dissertation is disseminated via the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions to the College of Education faculty. The announcement must be submitted to the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions at least ten business days prior to the scheduled defense. Additionally, the dissertation must be defended between the first day of classes and the last day of final examinations; it cannot be defended between academic terms. Students should consult the current deadlines for doctoral candidacy to plan the timely announcement of the dissertation defense. At the same time the announcement of the oral defense is submitted, two copies of the completed dissertation are made available for faculty review in the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions. The announcement of the oral defense includes the date and location of the defense and an abstract of the dissertation of no more than 350 words. The oral defense is scheduled during regular dates of operation (i.e., between the first day of classes and the last day of final examinations each term, excluding official holidays). The oral defense must be attended by no fewer than two 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 candidates' committee members following the period of questioning the Chairperson of the defense will invite the candidate and all visitors to leave the room while the committee deliberates. Upon returning, he/she learns of the committee's decision. The committee shall decide if the candidate passed or failed and in either case, what revisions, if any, are required. After the candidate has been asked to return to the room, it is the responsibility of the major advisor to inform the candidate of the expected revisions and determine if committee members are to be involved in reviewing the revisions. Revisions must be completed and approved 2 to 4 weeks after the defense. It is the responsibility of the committee as a whole to judge the quality of the candidate's work and recommend approval of the dissertation. All differences of opinion shall be handled by the committee as a whole with the major advisor guiding the candidate through agreed upon required changes. In cases where consensus is not possible, dissenting members have an option of not signing the dissertation approval form. This option shall be exercised very rarely; it is anticipated that differences will be resolved within the committee. In special cases, the Coordinator of the Ed.D. program may be consulted for assistance in resolving committee conflicts. The dissertation will be evaluated using a rubric. Because the program is in its first year of existence, there are not data to report at this time.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Dissertation Study

100% of students defending the dissertation during each reporting cycle will score an "acceptable" rating on the assessment and as a result, will successful pass the defense.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

There are no findings to report in this cycle as the first cohort is scheduled to defend the dissertation in Spring 2015.
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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Educational Leadership Unit
Additional Resources: None

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.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Annual Review of Program Scope and Sequence
Responsible Person/Group: The Educational Leadership and Research, Measurement, and Statistics Units
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Because the program is still relatively new (with no projected graduates until Spring 2015), the findings are still incomplete. As far as the data presented during this reporting cycle, the assessments demonstrate that students are at the level of mastery desired at this point in the program.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Because the program is still relatively new (with no projected graduates until Spring 2015), there are only minor changes to report. These include the change to the programmatic sequence referenced in the action plan. Analysis of this change, while ongoing, will not be fully executed until Cohort II reaches the third year of the program during the next reporting cycle.

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

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Specialist in Educational Leadership at Georgia State University is to prepare candidates to be effective instructional leaders who positively impact student achievement.

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.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Equity Audit (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)
Students in the program will be able to identify and draft a comprehensive plan to address an issue of equity within their schools or school systems. 100% of program completors will score an "acceptable" rating on the assessment.

**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.

**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)

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

#### SLO 2: Portfolio Assessment (G: 1) (M: 4)
Students will be able to comprehensively present and tie to state and national standards, their work throughout the program by way of an online portfolio. 100% of program completors will successfully complete this assessment.

**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**
- 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.
- 4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

#### SLO 3: Dispositions Assessments (G: 3) (M: 6, 7)
100% of program completors will be able to clearly demonstrate dispositions that support their ability to serve as school, system, and community leaders.

**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**
- 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).
- 4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Equity audit
Students will initiate and facilitate an equity audit using key stakeholders with their school or districts in order to determine the
school's or district's status regarding diversity (i.e. whether the school or district is a monolithic, diverse, or multicultural organization). Students will help school and/or district stakeholders identify diversity issues related to school policies, curriculum, instruction, culture, management, and operations, personnel, and parent involvement and then apply those issues toward the audit. (EPEL 8020). EQUITY AUDIT RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations: Student presents a thorough, holistic report of multiple diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving significant stakeholders. Student is able to help stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization. Meets Expectations: Student submits an acceptable report of multiple diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving significant stakeholders. Student achieves moderate success in helping stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization. Does Not Meet Expectations: Student submits a report that omits significant diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving a subset of significant stakeholders. Student achieves little success in helping stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization.

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

### M 2: Equity Audit Outcome Measure (O: 1)

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on all areas of the assessment.

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

#### Target for O1: Equity Audit

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on all areas of the assessment.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

| 7 of 7 students completing this assessment in the EdS/Add-on program met or exceeded expectations on all areas assessed including articulation of the issue, supporting literature review, planning for change, and overall writing style. |

### M 3: 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 address all six Goals of the Ed.S Educational Leadership Program. 3) Data reported for 2012-2013 indicate all students meet or exceed expectations on the Portfolio Assessment (see attachment).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

### M 4: Portfolio Assessment Outcome Measure (O: 2)

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the portfolio assessment.

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

#### Target for O2: Portfolio Assessment

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on all areas of the assessment.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

| 7 of 7 students in Section 1 of the program exceeded expectations on the assessment as articulated by the completion of the Major Project Revision assessment. 8 of 8 students in Section 2 of the program exceeded expectations on the assessment as articulated by the completion of the Major Project Revision assessment. |

### M 5: 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### M 6: Dispositions Assessment Outcome Measure (O: 3)

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the dispositions assessment.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

#### Target for O3: Dispositions Assessments

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the assessment.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

| 7 of 7 students in section 1 of the program met or exceeded expectations on the measure. 8 of 8 students in section 2 of the program met or exceeded expectations on the measure. |

### M 7: Dispositions Assessment (O: 3)

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the dispositions assessment.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

#### 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).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We are currently working to align the current assignments to the standards. Next steps will be to look at all of the assignments to determine overlap and modify accordingly.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Educational Leadership Unit
- **Additional Resources:** None

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The assessment findings for this cycle indicate that program completors are meeting or exceeding articulated standards in all areas. Additionally, the seamless transition to the newly designed course structure coupled with this meeting/exceeding of standards would suggest that the new program has been successfully implemented.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The major planned change to this program for the coming reporting term is the realignment of the program to the new certification standards (to be implemented in 2016). Essentially, once these standards are released, the unit will work together to make sure the program is aligned to those standards.

---
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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
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2 Student promotion and progression
- 3 Timely graduation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.
- 5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

### SLO 2: Successfully complete prospectus (G: 1) (M: 2)

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 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 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
One student in the program completed the comprehensive examination during this reporting cycle. The student met or exceeded on all areas as indicated by the following: 1. Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology (ies). = Exceeded 2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. = Met 3. Document adheres to the standard of quality writing. = Exceeded 4. Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. = Exceeded

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program presented a prospectus during this 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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O3: Successfully defend dissertations

95% of students will successfully prepare and defend their dissertations.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Two students in the program successfully defended their dissertations during this reporting cycle and met or exceeded expectations as indicated by the following: 1. Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology (ies). = Both MET 2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. = Both MET 3. Document adheres to the standard of quality writing. = One MET and One EXCEEDED 4. Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. = Both MET 5. Potential for contribution to the discipline. = Both MET

M 4: Advisor review of disposition assessment (O: 4)
Students will be assessed based on the College of Education's Disposition Assessment and 4 point rubric. The characteristics assessed are: empathy, positive view of others, positive view of self, authenticity, and meaningful vision and purpose.

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

Target for O4: Develop effective dispositions

95% of students will score 3 or higher on the post assessment. Measure will be used when admissions to the program are reactivated.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The dispositions assessment was not administered during this reporting period as new candidates were not admitted into the program.

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

Establishment of unit procedures for Comprehensive Examinations
Because there has been some variation in how advisors have handled the Comprehensive Examinations, there is a need for the members of the EDL unit to discuss and determine if more consistency would be beneficial. Therefore, prior to re-activating the readmission process for the EDL, PhD (which is currently on hold), the unit will discuss and possibly establish a consistent set of procedures within the parameters of the department's revised Comprehensive Examination policy.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: 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

---
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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
1. 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. (Draft / In Progress)

G 2: Methodological Expertise
2. Students who graduate from Research Measurement and Statistics program will be experts in the areas of quantitative and or qualitative research methodologies. (Draft / In Progress)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Design a research study
Students will design a research study to address educational questions using an appropriate methodological framework

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
### 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 social foundations of education, research, measurement, and statistics, and educational leadership. 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 and policy. Students prepare to become policy makers and examiners of policy and its effects on education. The broader requirements of the Department of Educational Policy Studies offer students the opportunity to link their programs of study with broader social and educational issues in such areas as race, gender, urban reform, and leadership.

### 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)**
As planned for 2013-2014, Educational Policy Studies implemented an updated assessment tool to measure the quality of 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 rating sheet and analytical rating guide for dissertations of Social Foundation (SF) students.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O3: Students will write high quality dissertations**
100% of students successfully passed their dissertation defenses.

### 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

**2. Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The Social Foundations Doctoral Program in Educational Policy Studies (EPS) desires the following result: doctoral candidates who meet and/or exceed the academic standards of the department. In the last cycle, 95% of students successfully passed their dissertation defenses. In the current cycle (2013-2014), EPS implemented a new and more detailed assessment, with students rated on five key dimensions of performance: appropriate methodology; knowledge of relevant literature; quality writing; oral presentation; and contribution to the discipline. Students were rated according to the following scale: (1) does not meet standard, (2) meets standard, and (3) exceeds standard. This provided EPS with a refined data set, one that revealed doctoral students not only successfully passing, but exceeding the standards. Only three Social Foundations doctoral students defended dissertations in the current cycle; for these students, the assessment revealed that two of the three met but did not exceed the standard for quality writing. Meeting the standard is satisfactory, but EPS aspires for students to exceed the standard.
4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

As a result, the faculty will work with the newly formed EPS Graduate Student Association during the next cycle (2014-2015) to host a series of workshops focused on professional development. Topics include but are not limited to crafting the curriculum vitae; writing and submitting conference proposals as well as attending and presenting at conferences; and drafting and revising dissertation chapters for publication. Additionally, students are encouraged to participate in peer writing workshops in which graduate students share work and provide feedback to one another. In this way, doctoral students will be presented with various structured opportunities to discuss and refine writings-in-progress, both for presentation and publication. All of this enhances the scholarly culture of the department, preparing students to continue exceeding the standards that have been set.

---
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#### 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 18 students (including two concurrent students) in the MS program as of summer 2014; of these 3 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students completed their Masters theses (2) and projects (2).

**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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed coursework related to research expertise prior to beginning work on their project or thesis

**M 5: Educational Psychology Seminar (O: 5)**

All EPY students are required to enroll in EPY 8961 during the first semester of their first year. As part of this seminar, students discuss current issues and topics in Educational Psychology.

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

**Target for O5: Exposure to the field of EPY**

All students will complete this professional development seminar.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed coursework related to research expertise prior to beginning work on their project or thesis

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

**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
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

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 reviews and proposal, and 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.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

No changes in the Educational Psychology MS program or assessment program are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will receive a satisfactory or better on their annual reviews, indicating their developing abilities to communicate professionally, orally and in writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Exposure to the field of EPY (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will attend EPY 8961 to obtain exposure to major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Educational Psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation (G: 3) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully write and defend their dissertation, indicating that they understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 4) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop competence in college teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities (G: 5) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Annual review (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This review includes all students who have not completed the comprehensive examination. The evaluation of each student includes a review of academic progress, residency progress, professional growth, and professionalism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing**

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

- All students received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All EPY doctoral students are required to enroll in EPY 8961 during the first semester if their first year. As part of this seminar, students discuss current issues and topics in Educational Psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O3: Exposure to the field of EPY**

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

- All doctoral students will complete this professional development seminar during the first semester of their first year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Dissertation (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must defend a dissertation based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation**

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

- All students who attempt, will successfully defend their dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Teaching Internship (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teaching internship includes attending class sessions, teaching a specified unit of the class under supervision of the instructor, assessing students on the material taught during the unit, and providing feedback to the class regarding their performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O5: Develop competence in college teaching**

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

- All students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

| M 5: Presentations and Publications (O: 6) |
All students in EPY are expected to present papers at professional organizations and publish in professional journals.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities**

Students will present, publish and write grant proposals related to their areas of interest.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

During this reporting period, approximately 20 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

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

**EPY 9660**
The teaching residency will become an official course, called EPY 9660: Internship in Educational Psychology.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The course became available in August of 2009.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

**Remedial Plan**

When a student receives a rating of unsatisfactory, students are informed in writing about areas in which they are not meeting goals of the program, and a remediation plan is prepared and signed by both the student and the advisor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing process.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Remediation Plan**

When a student receives a rating of unsatisfactory, students are informed in writing about areas in which they are not meeting goals of the program, and a remediation plan is prepared and signed by both the student and the advisor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing process and no longer needs to be included in our action plan.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Tracking of Applicants**

Applicants' demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores) will be tracked for the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected. We will also keep records in the same excel file for each applicant in regards to evaluations of the different sections of their applications.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This was conducted during this past year and will continue as an action plan. A new addition that we started this year, is to also record our evaluations of the different aspects of their application, such as their essays, vita, letters of recommendation, etc.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** none

**PhD Handbook**
The PhD handbook will be continuously reviewed and updated to reflect new requirements and URL address changes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing action
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPY coordinator and faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Improve our Recruitment efforts to the Ph.D. program**

We have established a recruitment committee with the focus attracting more highly qualified students to our program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We will design additional recruitment materials and strategies.
- **PhD Handbook was updated**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

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.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

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. We made it mandatory that all of our students gain teaching experience and encouraged students to teach an undergraduate course (both online and face to face) prior to graduation. Finally, we are continuing to monitor our acceptances in terms of GRE scores and demographic characteristics.
Student is able to formulate and effectively articulate alternative view points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Thesis (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Evidence (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will show demonstrate effective use of reasons in support of stated position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Reading Comprehension (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Written assignment assessing writing skills (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Identification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>We expect 50% of our students to receive at least a 3 or 4 on the identification portion of the rubric.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Written assignment assessing reading comprehension (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Reading Comprehension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>We aim to have 80% of our students receive 3 or 4 on the reading comprehension exam.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Written assignment assessing reading comprehension | Outcome/Objective: Reading Comprehension
- Measure: Written assignment assessing writing skills | Outcome/Objective: Alternative Viewpoints

Responsible Person/Group: Lower-Division Studies
Additional Resources: RA for LDS to collect and report data.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2013-2014 English Concentration in Creative Writing

As of: 12/13/2016 06:08 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

SLO 1: Demonstrate Knowledge of Literary Composition (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate a knowledge of literary composition, including aesthetics, vocabulary, and a variety of techniques.

SLO 2: Demonstrate Progress (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate progress from Introduction to Creative Writing through the Senior Seminar.

SLO 3: Demonstrate Authentic/Engaging Writing (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate authentic and engaging writing.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 2: Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3)

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. 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. Starting in the 2013-2014 cycle, the Creative Writing concentration developed new assessment criteria focused on three outcomes: demonstration of knowledge of literary composition, demonstration of progress from the Introduction to Creative Writing course through the Senior Seminar, and demonstration of authentic and engaging writing.

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

Target for O1: Demonstrate Knowledge of Literary Composition

The target for this outcome is 4.2 out of 5.0.
Rewrite mission, goals, and objectives to better suit the particulars of the Creative Writing concentration

Now that the department has decided to break down the assessment work into the four different concentrations, faculty members in each concentration will examine the mission, goals, and objectives to see if they want to make changes in order to better match the specific skills and knowledge their students are expected to gain and the particular types of assignments they are expected to produce.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Faculty reviewed these documents and were satisfied with them.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator

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 Progress

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Additional Resources: Assessment Coordinator

Lower the target for this outcome (Content Knowledge Related to Creative Writing) on the poetry portfolios

Since the poetry faculty have had a harder time norming their grades, the poetry portfolios often do not meet the targets. Therefore, the poetry target for this outcome (Content Knowledge Related to Creative Writing) will be set at 4.0 for poetry in the next assessment cycle while the target of 4.2 for fiction portfolios will remain the same.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Knowledge of Literary Composition

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Address concern over diminishing student numbers in poetry specialty

For the past few 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 has met regularly with the poetry faculty to address this concern.
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Director of Creative Writing met with Creative Writing faculty discuss 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. The faculty agreed to change the timing of the portfolio to coincide with work due at the end of the semester in order to coordinate assessment with the larger goals of the seminar.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

This year all the targets set for Creative Writing B.A. students were met. Since it is the first year measuring some of the outcomes, we can’t yet compare these results with other years, but Creative Writing faculty have worked together to rewrite the outcomes and to clarify expectations for students working in both genres, fiction and poetry. They also identified the need to advise students better regarding their required sequence of courses and to adjust the timing for the Senior Portfolios to serve students in the Senior Seminar better. These new advising and portfolio procedures will be in effect for the next cycle.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Now that the new outcomes and new schedule for portfolio submissions have been established, the Creative Writing program should be in a better position to measure student progress in general and to monitor the status of the poetry concentration in particular; previous action plans have focused on addressing the discrepancy in scores between students in fiction and students in poetry. Faculty plan to consider other assessment tools as well that might work better for students in these concentrations.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 English Concentration in Literature
(As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

Advising 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  
**Implementation Description:** The Director of Undergraduate Studies organized workshops to advise students about preparing their portfolios and addressed questions about portfolios during advising sessions. Faculty now include information about portfolios on their syllabi.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Literature Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 1, 3, 4)**

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. 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. This was revised in 2013-2014 to include ability to think critically and interpret texts, mastery of the basic elements of writing, and imaginative understanding/engagement with text.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

There were 17 students assessed. The average evaluation for this outcome is 4.38, up from 4.23 and 4.30 in the previous two cycles. The target was met. Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 53%, up from 38% last year, which was the first year the % of high scores was assessed.

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

There were 17 students assessed. The average evaluation for this outcome is 4.32, in between last cycle’s 4.24 and the previous cycle’s 4.48. The target was met. Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 47%, up from 31% last year, which was the first year the % of high scores was assessed.

#### Target for O4: Imaginative understanding/engagement with text

4.2 of 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

There were 17 students assessed. The average evaluation for this outcome is 4.38. The target was met. This is the first year this target has been assessed, so there is no comparative data. Additionally, the % of students who rated a 5 on a 5 point scale was 53%.

---

**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 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) (M: 1)**

This outcome gauges student’s imaginative understanding of and engagement with the world of a literary text by determining his/her an awareness of the history, biographical, and/or literary context.
Add an initial measure
We have now added this measure by introducing assessment in our gateway courses, English 3040 and 3050.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
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. However, after consulting with others on the assessment committee, we decided to keep the portfolio but adjust the terms of the evaluation to make it a more useful tool for assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Changing the assessment form to reflect the new criterion.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator

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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Assessment coordinator made this change in WEAVE online.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Michael Galchinsky

Revise portfolio assessment form
For all four undergraduate concentrations, the portfolio assessment forms will be revised to include only three criteria (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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator revised all of the portfolio assessment forms, and the department will now grade portfolios online.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Michael Galchinsky

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

All students met our targets for mastering critical thinking, basic elements of writing, and understanding of and engagement with texts. Portfolios in the literature concentration showed marked improvement overall this year and more students ranked very highly: there was an increase from 38% to 53% in the students who rated 5 on a 5 point scale. The focus on three outcomes, in place for a few years, combined with active advisement of students and faculty regarding expectations for portfolios, might account for the improvement.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Our assessment process has worked well this year, so we are not planning any significant changes. We have been working steadily to address shortcomings identified in previous years by introducing an initial assessment measure for all majors, advising students about portfolio contents, and revising learning outcomes to reflect the focus of our courses better. We will, however, be shifting to an online reporting system for 2014-15.
### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Rhetoric and Composition concentration in the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote critical inquiry, creative endeavor, reflective writing, and professional training in rhetoric and composition as well as technical and professional writing through the study and application of rhetorical theory, history, and practice. We strive to promote traditional contexts for writing as well as new publication and information technologies to expand students' knowledge of rhetorical contexts. Our students will develop strong critical thinking and written communication skills in a variety of mediums and genres, and for a variety of audiences in both academic and non-academic settings.

### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge of language and rhetorical history and theory**

Students will demonstrate an awareness of the centrality of language to human experience as well as an understanding of the role of rhetorical history and theory in the use of language over time.

**G 2: Effective Written Communications**

Students will be able to apply knowledge of the elements of rhetoric for effective communications in writing; to write for a variety of forms as appropriate to audience, purpose, and occasion; to recognize a range of social, academic, and professional situations and adapt language accordingly; and to comprehend the grammatical and syntactical patterns of the English language and use them as tools in writing and revising.

**G 3: Interpretive Skills**

Students will be able to interpret rhetorical theories and models, to identify rhetorical patterns, to read for multiple meanings, to apply knowledge of conventions from different periods in rhetorical history, to read and use scholarly and theoretical works in the discipline, and to evaluate critical arguments and construct alternative positions when necessary.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Knowledge of language and history of rhetoric (M: 1)**

Students will use the specialized terminology and analytic tools of the discipline in appropriate ways, will demonstrate familiarity with key theories, figures, and themes from rhetorical history and contemporary theory.

**SLO 2: Effective written communications (M: 1)**

Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

**SLO 3: Ability to think critically and interpret texts (M: 1)**

Students will be able to interpret rhetorical theories and models, to identify rhetorical patterns, to read for multiple meanings, to apply knowledge of conventions from different periods in rhetorical history, to read and use scholarly and theoretical works in the discipline, and to evaluate critical arguments and construct alternative positions when necessary.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Rhetoric and Composition senior exit portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3)**

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. 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. In 2009-2010, the Rhetoric and Composition concentration chose to continue to focus on the following three outcomes: knowledge of the language and history of rhetoric; ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage; and the ability to think critically through writing.

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

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and history of rhetoric**

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014, 27 students were assessed. The average evaluation on this outcome was 3.83, which exceeds the target, and is the highest score to date. 85% of scores on this outcome received a 4 out of 4, up from 50% in the previous (the first in which this data was kept.)

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In 2013-2014, 27 students were assessed. The average evaluation on this measure was 3.69, which exceeds the target for this outcome and is virtually the same as the previous cycle (3.70). 70% of the scores were given a 4 out of 4, up from 54% last year.

**Target for O3: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In 2013-2014, 27 students were assessed. The average evaluation on this measure was 3.78, up from 3.63 last year, which substantially exceeds the target for this outcome. 78% of the scores were given a 4 out of 4, up from 50% last year.

**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 worked to revise the mission, goals, and objectives so that they are more relevant to the particulars of their program. This work was completed in Fall 2014.

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

**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
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2011

**Early measure**

We have assisted in crafting a new assessment to be used in the 3050 Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition course to provide critical thinking through writing data (CTW) and some comparative data between students’ entry into the concentration and their exit (with the portfolio). This initial measure primarily provides comparative data for Goal 3 and Student é (earning a outcome 3 as noted above. We are piloting this assessment in our 3050 courses in the 2014-2015 year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This course is now being piloted as part of the Rhet/Comp curriculum.

**Reduce 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
- **Implementation Description:** The rhet/comp faculty agreed on three learning outcomes to use in evaluating Senior Portfolios and will use the new form in the 2014-2015 cycle.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Students in Rhetoric and Composition scored the highest to date on the first outcome, knowledge of language and linguistics, with an increase in the percentage of students receiving the highest score from 50% to 85%. The increase for the outcome linked to critical thinking was almost as impressive, with the percentage of students receiving top scores up from 50% to 78%. The average evaluation for outcome 2, connected to effective writing, was stable, but again significantly more students received the highest score. This substantial improvement shows the effects of careful curriculum revision and excellent teaching in all classes in the concentration.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

There is now a new assessment tool for the gateway course being tested for the current academic year, and this tool should help identify areas students need to concentrate on early in their program. This is the final change to be made in this program for a while; it follows extensive and detailed revision of the curriculum and sequencing in response to earlier assessment findings.
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 (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate an awareness of the centrality of language to human experience as well as an understanding of some of the structures and functions of language.

SLO 3: Effective Written Communications (M: 1)
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 2, 3, 4)
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. 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.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
There were 18 students assessed this year. The average evaluation for this outcome is a 4.38; therefore, the target was met. This represents the second highest 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 42%. In the last cycle the average number of 5s was 12%, so this represents a large increase.

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.
There were 18 students assessed this year. The average evaluation for this outcome is a 4.33; therefore, the target was met. This represents a normal score 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 47%, up from 32% last year, which was the first year the % of high scores has been assessed.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Knowledge of language and linguistics</th>
<th>O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching</th>
<th>2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</td>
<td>There were 18 students assessed this year. The average evaluation for this outcome is a 4.67; therefore, the target was met. However, this represents the highest 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 47%, down slightly from 53% last year, which was the first year the % of high scores has been assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported this cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Source of Evidence: Writing Exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
<th>O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching</th>
<th>2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2010-2011</td>
<td>Implementation Status: In-Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 08/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: Funding needed to provide one course release for an instructor to direct this specialized internship program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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), 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Knowledge of language and linguistics</th>
<th>O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching</th>
<th>2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2010-2011</td>
<td>Implementation Status: Finished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 12/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Finished
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.

Add 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: In-Progress
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: Finished
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: Finished
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

Coordinate measure in Engl 3040
Secondary English faculty will work with other concentrations to implement a measure for student success in 3040 to gauge student learning early in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman
**Devise other measures for senior seminar**
Secondary English faculty will consider other measures that could be used in the senior seminar to determine student understanding of pedagogy and effective strategies for transferring English content to the middle or secondary classroom.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman

**Plan English 4200**
Concentration will finalize plans for the English 4200 course (Teaching in English Studies) so this course can be offered on a regular basis as a complement to the Senior Seminar in Secondary English and the Internship in Teaching.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**2. Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Students in this concentration met the targets established last year for all three outcomes, showing significantly better performance this year in their knowledge of language and linguistics and the highest average reported in seven years in the measure of their ability to reflect on teaching.

**4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Faculty in this concentration will continue to develop a new course, Teaching in English Studies, to help students in this concentration develop a better understanding of teaching in history and in practice. They will also work to implement an initial measure in the gateway course required for Literary Studies majors, English 3040. These areas seem to promise a more coherent program for students than some other plans proposed in previous cycles, such as adding assignments related to teaching philosophy to existing courses.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 English Creative Writing MFA**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST

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

**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 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)**
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**

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

There were no M.F.A. 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.

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator worked with the Director of Creative Writing to develop this form. It will go into effect fall 2014.
- **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  
**Implementation Description:** The document has been created and will now be included with all assessment forms.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Creative Writing

**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The revision has been completed.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Creative Writing in collaboration with other Creative Writing faculty

**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 discussed this issue with the Director of Creative Writing and they agreed to limit the number of outcomes in Spring 2014.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** the Assessment Coordinator and the Director of Creative Writing

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

There were no M.F.A. students in creative writing this year.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
Creative Writing faculty have created a new document for assessing M.F.A theses and will use it in the next cycle.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 English Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Content knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates will pass the required GACE II tests for English language arts education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Content knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Dispositions (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Target for O5: Dispositions**
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

### Assessment Action Plan

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students’ knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure (Key Assessment): Effects on P-12 Student Learning  
- Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical 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:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

### Community Action Plan

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are now embedded within our coursework that link communities and schools to student learning. In the future, we would like to keep this curriculum change unchanged.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge GACE Scores  
- Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge  
**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

### Diversity Action Plan

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure (Key Assessment): Planning performance  
- Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student Learning  
**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

### Student Learning Action Plan

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand a student’s intellectual, social, and personal development and to plan instruction that will support such development.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge via Coursework  
- Outcome/Objective: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)  
**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for
Program Assessment for 2010-2011

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge, Planning, Effects on P-12 Learners, Pedagogical Knowledge, Dispositions, and Clinical Practice.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2011 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 terms.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Michelle Zoss, Mary Deming, and Ewa McGrail
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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-Progress
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-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge GACE Scores | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge
Implementation Description: Faculty will obtain scores from data manager.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: English education faculty

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 English MA: Literature
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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 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: Able to 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)**
Student's prospectus will demonstrate knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, and movements in American, British, or World literatures, as relevant to the student's proposed area of study.

**SLO 4: Knowledge and Application of Theoretical Approaches (M: 1, 2)**
Student's prospectus will demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical approaches to reading literature and effectively apply them to the proposed area of study.

**SLO 5: Valid and Original Research Question (M: 1, 2)**
Student's prospectus will demonstrate a valid and original research question.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Assessment of work in the Pro-Seminar (O: 1, 4, 5)**
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
In 2013-2014, ten students developed MA thesis prospectuses, which were assessed in the pro-seminar. The average rating on the criterion of content knowledge was 4.9 out of 5, so the target was met. In previous cycles, this target has also been comfortably met.

**Target for O4: Knowledge and Application of Theoretical Approaches**
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The average for the ten students in the Pro-Seminar classes this year was a 4.7 for this outcome related to the knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature. The target was met. This was up from 4.0 in the previous cycle. In addition, 80% of the students received the highest score of 5.0 (the first time this has been measured).

**Target for O5: Valid and Original Research Question**
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The average for the ten students in the Pro-Seminar classes this year was a 5.0 for this outcome related to asking a valid and original research question. The target was met. This was up from 4.5 in the previous cycle. In addition, 100% of the students received the highest score of 5.0 (the first time this has been measured).

**M 2: M.A. Thesis in Literary Studies (O: 1, 4, 5)**
The literature theses have been assessed since 2009-2010. During that first year, only 5 theses were assessed because the department did not yet have a fully working system in place. During 2010-2011, that problem was sorted out and 21 theses were assessed. According to the system, students who finish their thesis are assessed collectively by their thesis committee members who fill out a form (with a 5-point scale) that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes (see attached assessment form). It their are disserting opinions about the scores, those different scores can be indicated on the assessment form. The committee chair is responsible for making sure that the assessment form is completed and turned into the assistant to the Graduate Director after the thesis work has been submitted. A student cannot be advanced for graduation if this assessment step has not been done.
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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

In 2013-2014, the six MA theses assessed earned an average score of 4.0 for this outcome related to content knowledge, down from 4.5 in the previous two cycles. The target was not met. In addition, only 17% of the theses received the top score of 5.0, down from 50% in the previous cycle.

Target for O4: Knowledge and Application of Theoretical Approaches

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

In 2013-2014, the average score for the six theses evaluated on this outcome was 4.0. The target was not met. In addition, 33% of the theses earned the top score of 5.0, the same percentage as in the previous cycle.

Target for O5: Valid and Original Research Question

In 2013-2014, the department added a target for the outcome related to a student's ability to ask a valid and original research question, so that the same questions are asked at both the prospectus and thesis stages, for better comparative data. The target is set at 4.5.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

The average score for the 6 theses assessed in 2013-2014 was a 4.0 for this learning outcome related to asking a valid and original research question. This score does not meet the target. In addition, 17% of theses achieved the high score (5.0) on this outcome. Since this is the first year the department is gathering information on the percentage of top scores on this finding, we do not yet have comparative data on this.

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 has worked with the Graduate Director to create this document. It is now part of our assessment process.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

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

Revise the mission statement and goals

Faculty associated with the Literature M.A. program will revise the mission statement and goals so that they reflect the particular concern of the M.A. in this concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Director of the Graduate Program

Apply the assessment tool for the Pro-Seminar to the prospectus instead of the class

Since the Pro-Seminar class was initiated five years ago, the assessment measure has always been used to evaluate student work in the entire course. To gain a better assessment of the primary work of the Pro-Seminar--the draft of the prospectus of the thesis--the assessment form will be retooled to be directed towards the particulars of that work. Ideally, this will give a more direct measure of student success in the class.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
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
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Graduate Director
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: the Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director

Make 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
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Director of Graduate Studies will convene Graduate Committee.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies/Graduate Committee

Strengthen the MA Pro-Seminar
DGS and Graduate Committee will continue to 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
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: DGS implements
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: DGS/Graduate Committee

Review expectations for M.A. thesis
Because the M.A. thesis failed to meet our targets this year, the literature studies faculty will meet to discuss expectations about the length and scope of the thesis, advising practices, and assessment criteria. With more coherent advisement and assessment, we will be able to prepare students to write better theses and be in a position to decide whether to adjust our targets.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Meetings needed to coordinate efforts of literature studies faculty.
Responsible Person/Group: DGS and Assessment Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The six theses evaluated this year failed to meet the target of 4.5 out of 5 in all three learning outcomes by substantial margins. In previous years there has also been a persistent trend of theses not meeting the targets. By contrast, the MA prospectuses easily met their targets (and are assessed according to the same outcomes as the theses). This persistent pattern suggests a weakness in student preparation and faculty advising. To address this weakness, Literature Studies faculty plan to meet to discuss expectations and strategies for mentoring students. Since the problem seems to lie not in starting the thesis but in completing it successfully, we have to find better ways to guide students and to help them to finish with more knowledge and assurance.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We think that the Proseminar for M.A. students works well, but we plan to revise our practices of advising students at the stages of drafting and completing the M.A. thesis.
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Rhetoric and Composition concentration in the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote critical inquiry, creative endeavor, reflective writing, and professional training in rhetoric and composition as well as technical and professional writing through the study and application of rhetorical theory, history, and practice, as well as composition theory, history, and pedagogy. We strive to promote traditional contexts for writing as well as new publication and information technologies to expand students' knowledge of rhetorical contexts. Our students will develop strong critical thinking and written communication skills in a variety of mediums and genres, and for a variety of audiences in both academic and non-academic settings. Our students will develop professional skills appropriate to the academic discipline of rhetoric and composition, digital media, and technical writing.

Goals
G 1: Encourage a scholarly engagement with theoretical frameworks
The department will strive to produce M.A. students who demonstrate a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in masters work, in particular in the thesis writing.

G 2: Assure mastery in content knowledge
The department strives to graduate MA students in this concentration who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of Rhetoric and Composition studies as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

G 3: Effective Written Communications
The department will strive to produce M.A. students who can demonstrate effective written communication skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Knowledge of the History, Theory, and Practice of Rhetoric (G: 2) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history, theory, and practice 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 4: Mastery of Writing (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in journals and publications devoted to Rhetoric and Composition.

SLO 5: Communicates Arguments and Results (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
M.A. students in Rhetoric and Composition will be able to communicate the argument and results of their thesis research effectively.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: M.A. Thesis in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 2, 4, 5)
Starting in the fall of 2007, students who entered the M.A. Program were required to complete a thesis by the end of their program. While we had hoped to develop and begin using the thesis assessment tool by the spring of 2009, more time was needed to create a system for this assessment process that will guarantee that each thesis is evaluated in this manner. Starting in the spring of 2010, students who finish their thesis will be assessed by their thesis committee, using a form (with a 6-point scale) that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes. The committee chair will be responsible for calling an assessment meeting after the thesis work has been submitted, and the assistant to the Graduate Director will be responsible for checking to see that the assessment forms are completed. A student will not be advanced for graduation if this assessment step has not been done.

Target for O2: Knowledge of the History, Theory, and Practice of Rhetoric
In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Four M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended in 2013-2014. The average score for the outcome related to the knowledge of the history, theory, and practice of rhetoric was a 3.75, down from 4.7 the previous year and 4.3 in the year before that. The target was not met. Additionally, no students earned the top score in the area, down from 67% of students in the previous year.

Target for O4: Mastery of Writing
In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Four M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended in 2013-2014. The average score for the outcome related to mastery of writing was a 4.5, meaning that the target was met. This did represent a decrease from the previous cycle average of 4.7. Additionally, 75% of students earned a rating of 5.0 in this area, up from 67% in the previous cycle.

Target for O5: Communicates Arguments and Results
In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.
### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Four M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended in 2013-2014. The average score for the outcome related to the ability to communicate the argument and results of the research was a 4.75, meaning that the target was met. This represented a slight increase from the previous cycle (average of 4.7). Additionally, 75% of students earned the top score of 5.0 in this area, up from 67% in the previous cycle.

### 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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** We have created a form to assist raters with the rankings on the MA thesis. This form, modeled after our PhD form currently in use during the 2013-2014 cycle, will be in use in the 2014-2015 cycle for thesis projects.
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** We have labeled this course course as our proseminar and use this course, in tandem with our 8125 Research Methodology course, to assist in student training for the thesis prospectus and project. In the 2014-2015 cycle, we are using an assessment for the thesis prospectus to assist in determining the effectiveness of this preparation.
- **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

#### Revise target for M.A. thesis

We suggest moving our thesis assessment from 4.5 to 4.0 or 5.0 to account for the compressed timeline many of our MA students work under to accomplish this task.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rhet/Comp faculty.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

   Two of the three outcomes measured for M.A. student in Rhetoric and Composition were met, but the average score for the outcome related to the knowledge of history, theory, and practice of rhetoric was down substantially (from 4.7 last year to 3.75). Faculty learned from this result that students need more preparation for the thesis, particularly in this area, and have since designed a required sequence of courses to address this shortcoming (see analysis question 4, below).

2. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their
Rhetoric/Composition faculty revised their mission statement and goals to clarify the purpose of the program for students. In addition, they created a form to assist raters with rankings on the M.A. thesis to create more consistent system of evaluation. The program also has identified a core course, 8120 Writing for Academic Publication, as the proseminar for new students and designated 8125, Research Methodology, as the necessary next course to assist in student training for the thesis prospectus and project. These courses were created in direct response to findings from earlier assessment cycles that some students lacked the skills necessary to write a solid thesis.

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

2013-2014 English PhD in Creative Writing

As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Exemplary writers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the PhD are exemplary writers, both in terms of communication skills and imaginative expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 2: Knowledgeable about history of genre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of PhD are experts in the history of the significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, and literary vocabulary of their chosen genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 3: Experienced teachers of the workshop method of Creative Writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the PhD are experienced teachers in the use of the workshop method of teaching the craft of Creative Writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 4: Able to produce publishable work of high quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the PhD have a working understanding of the writing profession and are able to produce publishable work of high quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Knowledge of Form, Theory, and Aesthetics (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student will write a dissertation that creates meaningful literary work, which draws upon the knowledge of form, theory, and aesthetics, and is deemed worthy of publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Progress in Composition (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student's dissertation demonstrates progress in literary composition from early workshop manuscripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Knowledge and Use of Technique (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student's dissertation demonstrates the student's knowledge and use of a variety of literary techniques in poetry or fiction, depending on the student's genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Valid and Original Creative Project (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student proposes a valid and original creative project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Ph.D. students in Creative Writing are assessed on the work of their dissertation. This assessment is facilitated by the Graduate Director at the student's dissertation defense, and the form is completed by faculty members on the student's committee. The dissertation assessment form, which uses a 6-point scale, rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes. In the summer, the Graduate Director meets with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. Those suggestions are brought to the Graduate Studies Committee in early fall for review, and an action plan is formulated and presented to the entire faculty at an early fall department meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Form, Theory, and Aesthetics**

In the 2013-2014 assessment report, a 4.7 target out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to knowledge of form, theory, and aesthetics.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Three students defended their dissertations in creative writing in this cycle. The average rating for this outcome was 6.0, or 100%, so the target was met. This is the first time this outcome has been assessed, so no comparative data is available.

**Target for O2: Progress in Composition**

In the 2013-2014 assessment report, a 4.7 target out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to progress in composition.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Three students defended their dissertations in creative writing in this cycle. The average rating for this outcome was 6.0, or 100%, so the target was met. This is the first time this outcome has been assessed, so no comparative data is available.

**Target for O3: Knowledge and Use of Technique**

In the 2013-2014 assessment report, a 4.7 target out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to knowledge and use of technique.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Three students defended their dissertations in creative writing in this cycle. The average rating for this outcome was 6.0, or 100%, so the target was met. This is the first time this outcome has been assessed, so no comparative data is available.

**M 2: Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 4)**

The Creative Writing concentration decided to begin assessing the dissertation prospectus in Spring, 2014. The outcomes to be assessed are the degree to which the prospectus proposes a valid and original creative project; demonstrates proficient knowledge of genres and forms, major works and writers, and specific aspects of creative process; and proposes a clear and effective plan for completing the creative project described, including submitting the finished project for publication.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Form, Theory, and Aesthetics**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This measure was added in Spring, 2014. Data will be reported starting in 2014-2015.

**Target for O2: Progress in Composition**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This measure was added in Spring, 2014. Data will be reported starting in 2014-2015.

**Target for O4: Valid and Original Creative Project**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This measure was added in Spring, 2014. Data will be reported starting in 2014-2015.

**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
- **Implementation Description:** The revision is complete.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of the Creative Writing program in collaboration with the Creative Writing faculty.

**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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assistant to the Graduate Director

**Implement poetry exam advisement for fiction students**

Since fiction students often have difficulty with the poetry secondary exam, poetry faculty who write 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:** Finished
| Priority: Medium | Implementation Description: With the change to a single Ph.D. exam, this advisement is no longer necessary. | Projected Completion Date: 08/2011 | Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing and poetry faculty |

**Provide fiction PhD students with examples of successful poetry exams**

The Director of Creative Writing will ask the poetry faculty to keep examples of successful poetry secondary exams that can be used as models for students who are taking the exam.

| Established in Cycle: 2010-2011 | Implementation Status: Finished |
| Established in Cycle: 2011-2012 | Implementation Status: In-Progress |

| Priority: Medium | Implementation Description: With the change to a single Ph.D. exam, this plan is no longer necessary. | Projected Completion Date: 08/2011 | Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing and poetry faculty |

**Consider limiting the outcomes used in assessing Creative Writing dissertations**

In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work. The department has decided it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

| Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers |
| Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings? |

Three students defended their dissertations this year, and all not only met the target but achieved the highest score in knowledge of form, theory, and aesthetics and knowledge and use of technique. This is the first time the three outcomes have been used, so no comparative data is available.

| 4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans. |

Creative Writing faculty will continue to use the three outcomes developed for the last cycle to measure the progress of their Ph.D. students.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 English PhD in Literature**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The English Department prepares its graduates with a PhD in Literary Studies to demonstrate expertise in the history and genres of literature, facility to incorporate and elaborate on critical and theoretical frameworks, experience in teaching composition and literary studies, and ability to produce significant critical writing, including a doctoral dissertation that asks an original and significant research question and contributes to the development of the relevant field.

**Goals**

**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 employ critical, theoretical, and contextual frameworks**

The dissertation effectively employs critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and cultural contexts appropriate to the research agenda.

**G 6: Poses a significant, valid, original research agenda**

The dissertation poses a significant, valid, and original research agenda, and draws ground-breaking conclusions and implications that contribute to the given field.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies (M: 1, 4)**

This learning outcome for the English Ph.D. in Literary Studies is comparable to that for the M.A. in literary studies with crucial differences in terms of specificity. Generally speaking, the goal of the master's program is broad-based knowledge of the aspects of literary study and an ability to evaluate a work of literature with an understanding of its various contents. Doctoral study aims for graduates to have greater mastery of content than masters level work.

**SLO 2: Posed a valid, significant, and original research question. (M: 1, 2, 4)**

The dissertation posed a significant, valid, and original research agenda, and drew groundbreaking conclusions and implications that contribute to the given field.

**SLO 3: Employed critical, theoretical, and contextual frameworks (M: 1, 3, 4)**

The dissertation effectively employed critical approaches/theoretical frameworks/cultural contexts appropriate to the research agenda.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3)

Graduating Ph.D. students in literary studies are assessed on the work of their dissertation. This assessment is facilitated by the Graduate Director at the student's dissertation defense, and the form is completed by faculty members on the student's committee. The dissertation assessment form, which uses a 6-point scale, rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes. (See the assessment form for the literature dissertation as well as the description of the ratings found in the document repository.) In the summer, the Graduate Director meets with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. Those suggestions are brought to the Graduate Studies Committee in early fall for review and an action plan is formulated and presented to the entire faculty at an early fall department meeting.

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

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies**

A target of 4.5 was set for this learning outcome related to content knowledge.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

Five literature dissertations were completed in 2013-2014, and they received average 4.2, so the target was not met. This is the first time students have been scored using this outcome, so there is no comparative data. In addition, 40% of the students received the top score (5) for this outcome.

**Target for O2: Posed a valid, significant, and original research question.**

A target of 4.5 was set for this outcome related to posing a valid, significant, and original research question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

Five literature dissertations were completed in 2013-2014, and they received average 3.6 on this outcome, so the target was not met. This is the first time students have been scored using this outcome, so there is no comparative data. In addition, no students received the top score (5) for this outcome.

**Target for O3: Employed critical, theoretical, and contextual frameworks**

A target of 4.5 was set for this outcome related to employing critical, theoretical, and contextual frameworks.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

Five literature dissertations were completed in 2013-2014, and they received average 4.00 on this outcome, so the target was not met. This is the first time students have been scored using this outcome, so there is no comparative data. In addition, 20% of the students received the top score (5) for this outcome.

#### M 2: No description (O: 2)

Please disregard this measure. I put it in the wrong place and have moved it to the correct place.

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

**Target for O2: Posed a valid, significant, and original research question.**

Please disregard.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Please disregard.

#### M 3: No description (O: 3)

Please disregard this measure. I put it in the wrong place and have moved the data to the correct place.

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

**Target for O3: Employed critical, theoretical, and contextual frameworks**

Please disregard.
**M 4: Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The Literature Studies concentration decided to assess the dissertation prospectus in Spring, 2014. The assessment evaluates the degree to which the prospectus demonstrates proficient knowledge of literary figures, genres, periods, and movements in the area of study; prospectus poses a valid and original research question; and proposes an effective plan for employing critical approaches/theoretical frameworks/cultural contexts appropriate to the research question.

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 4.5 was set for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Posed a valid, significant, and original research question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target of 4.5 was set for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Employed critical, theoretical, and contextual frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target of 4.5 was set for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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:** Finished
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** The Director of the Graduate Program planned to meet with the Graduate Studies committee to work out the details for this course. Although the seminar has not yet been organized, they will continue to discuss and possibly develop this seminar for the next cycle.
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator discussed this issue with the Graduate Director. Because scores this year were significantly lower, they decided to wait and see how students perform in the next cycle.
- **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
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings** (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Lit Studies faculty established three learning outcomes for Ph.D. dissertations, and this year students failed to meet the target for all three. The significance of this dip in scores is not clear, and the sample was small. It is the first year students failed to meet the target for content knowledge, and the other two outcomes are new this year. This year's students may have been weaker than in the past. Lacking conclusive data, we are going to observe for another year and see if the results are repeated.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement**: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
Since we think our educational program and assessment process are sound, we are going to observe students in the next cycle before determining whether we need to make any changes. We expect that by providing additional funding to Ph.D. students and reducing their teaching responsibilities, as the Department hopes to do this year with the College's support, students will have more opportunity to focus on their research and perform better on their dissertations.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 English PhD in Rhetoric/Composition**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Rhetoric and Composition concentration in the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote critical inquiry, creative endeavor, reflective writing, and professional training in rhetoric and composition as well as technical and professional writing through the study and application of rhetorical theory, history, and practice, as well as composition theory, history, and pedagogy. We strive to promote traditional contexts for writing as well as new publication and information technologies to expand students' knowledge of rhetorical contexts. Our students will develop strong critical thinking and written communication skills in a variety of mediums and genres, and for a variety of audiences in both academic and non-academic settings. Our students will develop professional skills appropriate to the academic discipline of rhetoric and composition, digital media, and technical writing.

**Goals**

**G 1: Assure mastery in content knowledge**

The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of Rhetoric and Composition Studies as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

**G 2: Apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts**

The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who are able to successfully apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in their examination of topics related to rhetoric and composition.

**G 3: Foster effective written communications**

The department strives to graduate students who have effective written communication skills that they can use successfully for any specific purpose and any particular audience.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of History, Theory, and Practice of Rhetoric (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history, theory, and practice 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 4: Mastery of Writing (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in journals and publications devoted to Rhetoric and Composition.

**SLO 5: Communicates Arguments and Results (M: 1, 2)**

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, 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 History, Theory, and Practice 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Four 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 5.7 which met the target. This score was up from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.3. Additionally, 50% of dissertations scored an outstanding (6) in this area, up
from 29% in the previous cycle.

**Target for O4: Mastery of Writing**

In the 2009-2010 action plan, a target of 4.7 was set for all outcomes related to the Rhetoric and Composition dissertation.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Four 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 is the first year this measure was assessed. Additionally, 25% of dissertations scored an outstanding (6) in this area.

**Target for O5: Communicates Arguments and Results**

In the 2009-2010 action plan, a target of 4.7 was set for all outcomes related to the Rhetoric and Composition dissertation.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Four 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 5.0, which met the target. This is the first year this measure was assessed. Additionally, 25% of dissertations scored an outstanding (6) in this area.

**M 2: Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 4, 5)**

The Rhetoric and Composition concentration decided to begin assessing the dissertation prospectus as of Spring, 2014. The outcomes to be assessed are: whether the prospectus demonstrates knowledge of the history, theory, and/or practice of rhetoric and composition, demonstrates mastery of writing, and communicates arguments, and results.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Knowledge of History, Theory, and Practice of Rhetoric**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Assessment of this outcome will begin in the 2014-2015 academic year.

**Target for O4: Mastery of Writing**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Assessment of this outcome will begin in the 2014-2015 academic year.

**Target for O5: Communicates Arguments and Results**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Assessment of this outcome will begin in the 2014-2015 academic year.

**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

Revise 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This revision has been completed.
- **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.
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: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

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: 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

Early measure

In the coming year the concentration will be instituting an early measure in Engl 8120, Writing for Academic Publication.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Rhet/comp concentration will implement, coordinating the M.A. and Ph.D. early measure in English 8120.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Rhet/comp faculty.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

This was the first year that dissertations in Rhetoric and Composition have been assessed. Overall, Ph.D. students in Rhetoric and Composition met the expectations set by the faculty. The mission statement and curriculum were revised recently, and students seem to be benefitting from the clarity established in this program.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Starting in Spring 2014, Rhetoric and Composition faculty will begin assessing the prospectus as well the dissertation, providing an early measure as well as a final measure. This new process should help faculty to target areas where students need more guidance early in the dissertation process.
international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

**Goals**

**G 1: Problem Solving**
Exercise science students will become better problem-solvers.

**G 2: Critical Thinking**
Exercise science students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking skills.

**G 3: Content Knowledge**
Exercise science students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline.

**G 4: Preparation for relevant positions**
Students will be prepared for positions in the discipline including corporate, community, commercial, and clinical centers.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Safety, Injury Prevention, Emergency Procedures (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

1. Students will be able to identify, describe and demonstrate proper safety techniques, injury prevention, and emergency procedures for those who engage in physical activity and exercise programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2 Student promotion and progression

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

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

**SLO 2: Program Administration (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 5, 6)**

1. Students will be able to identify the components of effective exercise program administration including quality assurance and outcome assessment procedures.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2 Student promotion and progression

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

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

**SLO 3: Case Study (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 7, 8, 9)**

Students will be able to identify critical information from a health history/case study and use this information to determine risk classification, proper exercise test selection and testing supervision

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2 Student promotion and progression

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

**SLO 4: Exercise Physiology and Related Exercise Science (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 10, 11, 12, 13)**

Students will be able to identify, discuss, and apply the concepts of anatomy, physiology, exercise physiology, biomechanics as they
apply to the proper conduct of physical activity and exercise programs

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

---

**SLO 5: Pathophysiology and Risk Factors (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 14, 15, 16, 17)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the risk factors that underlie the major chronic diseases.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

---

**SLO 6: Health Appraisal, Fitness and Clinical Exercise Testing (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25)**

1. Students will be able to properly assess the current fitness levels of apparently healthy individuals as well as those who have controlled metabolic, pulmonary, or cardiovascular disease.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Student retention
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.

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 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.

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

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.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Strategic Plan Associations

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

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

M 2: ACSM Domain Score (O: 1)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 3: Practical Exam score KH 3500 (O: 1)
Practical Exam Score in KH 3500 Athletic Training
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 4: Practical Exam KH 4630 (O: 1)
Practical Exam Score in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 5: KH 4350 Project (O: 2)
Performance on KH 4350 Fitness Center Management Project (CTW)
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 6: ACSM Domain score (O: 2)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 7: KH 4630 Case Study Presentation (O: 3)
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: KH 3650 lab scores (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab scores in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: KH 3600 Lab scores (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab scores in KH 3600 Biomechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: ACSM Domain Score (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Pre Post Test KH 3650 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Post test KH 3650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Studies in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Studies in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: KH 4360 Final Exam (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Final Examination in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: KH 4630 Practical Exam (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on practical exam in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Study in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Study in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: KH (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on lab practical in KH4630 Lab Practical 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: KH 4360 Lab practical (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on lab practical in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 25: KH 3650 Lab assignments (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on lab assignments in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 26: KH 4360 Exam (O: 7)
Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology examination
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

M 27: KH 4360 Practical Exam (O: 7)
Performance on practical exam in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 28: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 7)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 29: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 8)
Performance on case study presentation in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 30: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 8)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 31: KH 4630 Case Study (O: 9)
Performance on KH 4630 Case Study
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 32: KH 4630 Exercise Prescription Project (O: 9)
Performance on exercise prescription project in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 33: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 9)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 34: KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Exam (O: 9)
KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology exam.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

M 35: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 10)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 36: Exams KH 2520, KH 3000 (O: 10)
Performance in KH 2520 Performance and Analysis: Fitness and Aerobics, and KH 3000
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

M 37: KH 4280 Exam (O: 11)
Performance on take home assignments in KH 4280 Psychology of Physical Activity
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 38: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 11)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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

ACSM Examination Procedures
Students will begin taking the required ACSM examination during the Fall of 2009. Meetings will be held with all students registered for KH 4750 Practicum in Exercise Science to inform students of the examination requirements and to conduct a review session. Practice examinations have been posted on ULearn that allow students to check their readiness for the examination.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Jeff Rupp, Program Coordinator Other exercise science faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Implementation of new Objectives
During the past academic year (2010-2011) faculty in the exercise science program identified and adopted all new program objectives for the B.S. in Exercise Science program. These new objectives better reflect the knowledge skills and abilities that students must exhibit in order to successfully pass the American College of Sports Medicine professional certification program. Because this was an extensive revision of the current objectives, the process was very time consuming and performance data was not collected during this time period.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: During the 2011-2012 academic year faculty will be determining achievement targets and measures as well as collecting performance data on each objective. This data will be compiled and reported during the next evaluation cycle.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: KH Exercise Science faculty. Dr. Andy Doyle, program coordinator.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Exercise Science MS
As of: 12/13/2016 06:08 PM EST
(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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science**  
  75% scoring at or above 80% on exam |
| **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. |
| **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. |
| **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 |
| **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. |

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

**Monitor and maintain current strengths**

We will continue to monitor future achievement in order to maintain standards due to the finding that all achievement levels were met.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
- **Measure:** Case Studies and Labs  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Understands research and human subjects issues
- **Measure:** GXT practical exam  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing
- **Measure:** Practical Exams  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Apply knowledge to practical situations

**Implementation Description:** 2009-2010

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science Faculty

**Review and/or Revise Outcomes/Objectives**

Review and/or revise outcomes/objectives to insure they best reflect outcome requirements associated with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs and/or industry best practice standards

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
- **Measure:** Case Studies and Labs  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Understands research and human subjects issues
- **Measure:** GXT practical exam  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing
- **Measure:** Practical Exams  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Apply knowledge to practical situations

**Implementation Description:** Exercise Science faculty will review outcomes/objectives during the 2011-2012 period

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science Faculty

**Compare ACSM exam content with course content**

Compare ACSM exam content with course content and add deficient material to appropriate courses.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Exercise Science Faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
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
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Students will be allowed to take CSCS exam to satisfy the M.S. Exercise Science program requirement.
Responsible Person/Group: KH faculty
Additional Resources: none

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Film & Video BA**

*(As of: 12/13/2016 06:08 PM EST)*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The film program at Georgia State multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are focused on student development beyond the academic unit. The program promotes a broad appreciation of both artistic, creative endeavors and intellectual, critical traditions in the study of film and media. It is the program's belief that a graduate's success will largely be determined by a developed sense of critical thinking, aesthetic contemplation, and the intellectual cultivation. Our program seeks to enhance the Department of Communication's mission of participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: understand and interpret**

Students will be able to understand and interpret ideas presented in media involving moving images.

**G 2: identify structures**

Students will be able to identify narrative structures in stories using moving images.

**G 4: spectator/textual pleasure**

Students will be able to recognize a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure in media involving moving images.
G 3: fundamental concepts
Students will understand fundamental visual production and post-production concepts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: understand and interpret (G: 1) (M: 1)
Understand and interpret ideas presented in media and can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.

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.

SLO 2: narrative structures (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students will be able to identify and discuss various narrative structures in media using moving images employed for story delivery.

SLO 3: prod/post-prod concepts (M: 3)
Students will understand the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scene, editing and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning.

SLO 4: spectator/textual pleasure (G: 4) (M: 4)
Students will be able to recognize and articulate a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: writing assignment (O: 1)
Students in the senior capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will write analytical papers and will be assessed using the following rubric: 1. Can understand basic filmic ideas expressed by others. 2. Can fully understand, comment on, and discuss the ideas and theories of others. 3. Has the ability not only to understand and interpret the ideas of others but to use that as the groundwork to begin establishing unique ideas. 4. Can fully establish, develop, and communicate logical, coherent, and engaging ideas on specific topics.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: understand and interpret
70% of students will score 3 or above on the writing rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
SP14 assessment of Film4750 finds that greater than 70% of students earned 3 or higher using departmental 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.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Findings from one section of Film4750 finds that greater than 70% of students were ranked at 3 or higher using departmental rubric for assessing students’ understanding of filmic narrative structures.

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.)

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Surveyed student papers in SP14 reveals fewer than 70% (59%) of students earned 3 or higher using the departmental rubric measuring their abilities at recognizing the production of cinematic pleasure.

**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)

**To improve student understanding of film generating spectator pleasure.**  
Film 4750 seems to need a closer focus on how films produce (or don't!) pleasure in viewers. The particulars—how films anchor viewers into ways of seeing/reacting—deserve more focus in this class so that students can understand how films direct viewer attention and reaction.  
**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** We will develop a section of the course, probably early in the semester, that focuses exclusively on the ways that films suture (or not) viewers into the narratives in order to elicit specific responses (like pleasure) so that students can carry this focus forward as they come to understand moving images more specifically.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty and GTAs who teach this course under the course supervisor, Greg Smith.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2013-2014 Finance BBA**  
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**  
Description: The mission of the undergraduate BBA-Finance program is to prepare students to succeed in entry-level positions in finance and business in general. To achieve this goal, our graduates should have proficiency in three general areas: (1) Communication skills. Students should be able to write and present financial business reports and presentations that are concise, to identify and evaluate key issues, and to reach supported conclusions. (2) Critical thinking skills. Students should be able to think critically. (3) Technical knowledge. Students should possess a strong technical knowledge of finance.

**Goals**  
**G 1:** Students will become proficient in use of quantitative skills for financial analysis.  
**G 2:** Students will be equipped with a very broad knowledge base in finance.  
**G 3:** Students will become prepared for financial practice  
**G 4:** Students will employ critical thinking in financial decision-making

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: The development and application of foundation knowledge (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)**  
The BBA-Finance student will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macro-economic theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of micro-economic 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: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)**  
The technical skills that we would like the BBA-Finance student 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
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-Fall 2013: Direct Assessment of Course Performance” for findings from Fall 2013 and “Exhibit 1b-Spring 2014: Direct Assessment of Course Performance” for findings from Spring 2014. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in “Exhibit 2-2014:BBA Assessment Plan and Alignment” (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**
Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially 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 lower and that their foundation knowledge thus partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**
Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially 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 lower and that their development and application of technical skills thus partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**
Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets being met indicates improvement.

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. Since the Fall of 2013, due to a mismatch between the ETS questions and what we would emphasize at the Robinson College as student learning outcomes the college has decided to pilot an internal test as an alternative. The results of this pilot testing will not be available until the next cycle. Therefore, we are not reporting the findings on this measure for this cycle.

**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 representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map well onto program learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) should be aligned with and map completely onto program learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map completely onto program learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should have opportunities to engage in practical training in specialized areas of finance such as investment management, corporate finance, and financial institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Systematic course-level assessment initiated during the Spring 2014 term indicates that students are using the opportunity to engage in practical training via the Field-studies in finance (FI 4391) course at or above desired levels of performance as indicated in the document. "Practical training: Field-studies in finance Spring 2014" uploaded with the related measure. A total of 23 undergraduate BBA-Finance students participated in the FI 4391 course in conjunction with practical-training received via internships during Spring 2014 in Atlanta area corporations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Systematic course-level assessment initiated during the Spring 2014 term indicates that students are using the opportunity to engage in practical training via the Field-studies in finance (FI 4391) course at or above desired levels of performance as indicated in the document. "Practical training: Field-studies in finance Spring 2014" uploaded with the related measure. A total of 23 undergraduate BBA-Finance students participated in the FI 4391 course in conjunction with practical-training received via internships during Spring 2014 in Atlanta area corporations.

**M 5: Selected questions for foundation knowledge (O: 1)**

The selected questions that pertain to foundation knowledge from courses are assessed to see how well the targets for foundation knowledge are met across different sub-topics such as micro-theory of finance, macro-theory and policy, and general knowledge outside finance. To examine student performance in select courses (FI4000, FI 4040 and FI 4300), the course-instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exam] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to foundation knowledge. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 2a-Fall2013: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2013. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2014: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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1:</strong> The development and application of foundation knowledge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency in foundational knowledge. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance in the case of some learning objectives, but lower for others. Thus, student performance in regards to their foundation knowledge partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Selected questions for technical skills (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selected questions that pertain to technical skills from courses are assessed to see how well the targets for foundation knowledge are met across different sub-topics such as micro-theory of finance, macro-theory and policy, and general knowledge outside finance. 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 selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to technical skills. In the Document Repository see &quot;Exhibit 2a-Fall2013: Selected Questions&quot; for findings from Fall 2013. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in &quot;Exhibit 2-2014:BBA Assessment Plan and Alignment&quot; (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2:</strong> The development and application of technical skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for the development and application of technical skills necessary for effective engagement in financial decision-making. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance in the case of some learning objectives, but lower for others. Thus, student performance in the development and application of technical skills partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: Selected questions analytical, conceptual, integrative skills (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selected questions that pertain to analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills from courses are assessed to see how well the targets for foundation knowledge are met across different sub-topics such as micro-theory of finance, macro-theory and policy, and general knowledge outside finance. 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 selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills. In the Document Repository see &quot;Exhibit 2a-Fall2013: Selected Questions&quot; for findings from Fall 2013. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in &quot;Exhibit 2-2014:BBA Assessment Plan and Alignment&quot; (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for the development and application of conceptual, analytical, and integrative skills necessary for effective financial decision-making. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets being met indicates improvement. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
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: Professor Rasha Ashraf, course coordinator for FI 4000
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: Professors Rich Fendler
Additional Resources: student assistants

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: High

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.

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

Emphasize use of sophisticated technical capabilities
Students have the necessary conceptual and technical skills. Technical capability via computer and software use for analyzing financial issues need emphasis.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
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: In response to Finance majors need to have greater technical abilities, the Department has taken the important step of having recently developed a dedicated course to financial modeling (FI 4080). This course was recently launched and each semester the Department will plan to offer two sections to students.

Emphasize use of sophisticated technical capabilities
Students have the necessary conceptual and technical skills. Technical capability via computer and software use for analyzing financial issues need emphasis.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Selected questions for technical skills | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills

Implementation Description: In response to Finance majors need to have greater technical abilities, the Department has taken the important step of having recently developed a dedicated course to financial modeling (FI 4080). This course was recently launched and each semester the Department will plan to offer two sections to students.
Use applications outside finance to improve general knowledge

Students are demonstrating sound knowledge of micro-theory, macro-theory and related policy implications. General knowledge of business practices outside finance should improve. At the representative course level, instructors will progressively use applications outside finance to improve general knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Representative questions from courses | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of foundation knowledge

Implementation Description: The performance of students on this dimension of possessing a general knowledge of business practice outside finance may have been an aberration unique to this specific set of students in this course. Student performance on this dimension is well-traced by student performance on the national ETS test where our students continue to perform highly on business subject matter outside of finance. Still, we will monitor this closely and take appropriate future steps if necessary.

Use applications outside finance to improve general knowledge

Students are demonstrating sound knowledge of micro-theory, macro-theory and related policy implications. General knowledge of business practices outside finance should improve. At the representative course level, instructors will progressively use applications outside finance to improve general knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Selected questions for foundation knowledge | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of foundation knowledge

Implementation Description: The performance of students on this dimension of possessing a general knowledge of business practice outside finance may have been an aberration unique to this specific set of students in this course. Student performance on this dimension is well-traced by student performance on the national ETS test where our students continue to perform highly on business subject matter outside of finance. Still, we will monitor this closely and take appropriate future steps if necessary.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

After performing the assessment for the prior five years the Department has decided to raise the targets for student performance for the first time. In prior years, the Department used a target of having fifty percent (median performance) of the students achieve a minimum performance of 70 percent. Having successfully achieved this standard, this year we have raised the target to 80 percent in the spirit of continuous improvement. As a result, we now see that some targets are now only partially met. As indicated in the action plan tracking, wherever the targets are now only partially met, action plans have been developed. For example, to enhance technical capabilities of students, we have developed a new course on financial modeling are plan to offer two sections per semester going forward. On the dimension of knowledge about business practice outside of finance, we have seen over the last several year that our students have performed well demonstrating strong knowledge in areas such as marketing, management, accounting, and international among others. We therefore concluded that it is likely that the course-embedded performance may be an aberration. Even so we will closely monitor this. Together with the field studies program we earlier initiated in the past to enhance practical training, the Department has recently introduced a new course FI 4210 "Portfolio Management Practicum". The introduction of this course was in response to earlier assessment findings that students needed greater opportunities to engage in practical training. This new course provides students with hands on experience managing an equity portfolio of funds held in the university foundation. Based on the early success of this initiative, we are in preliminary discussion with university foundation officials to allow students to also manage a portion of the foundation’s fixed income portfolio. Another major initiative commencing with the Fall 2014 semester involves the core business class Fi 3300 "Corporation Finance". Faculty in the Department received a Provost grant connected to the University’s Center for Instructional Innovation to conduct a pilot program summer 2014 in which Fi 3300 would be taught on a "flipped" basis. Based on the success of the pilot program, we are now teaching all sections of Fi 3300 using this method of instructional delivery. Studies will be conducted to assess the impact on student learning following the completion of the semester. A final initiative that was recently launched to enhance the quality of education and student learning for top students, the Department launched the Finance Honors program. This program is unique in undergraduate business education in that it provides high-performing students a cohort experience to explore subject matter in greater depth than that presented in a typical class. Further, students are expected to engage in a variety of signature experiences outside of the classroom to increase their business knowledge and are provided enhanced career advisement and guidance. We plan to assess the success of this initiative in future cycles. We do not believe that there are any significant weaknesses in the assessment process but still we continue to work closely with college assessment officials to review and improve processes. A strength of the assessment process over the last few cycles has been to provide enough information to motivate us to several innovations in the BBA Finance program as discussed above. As a result of some of the changes and innovations made, we have seen that newly raised target levels of performance have been reached in some cases and partially met in other cases. This has been encouraging and we will continue to seek improvement so that all targets are fully met at the raised levels.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

During the prior year, three new courses were launched in the BBA Finance program. These courses are (1) FI 4080 "Financial Modeling with Excel", (2) FI 4210 "Portfolio Management Practicum", and (3) FI 4260 "Hedge Funds, Mutual Funds, and Trading Strategies". These courses were introduced in response to previous assessment findings; specifically they were developed to provide students with stronger technical skills and greater knowledge and experience in the investment and asset management discipline. In
addition, a new Honors Tract for Finance majors was initiated during the year to provide our stronger students with the opportunity to learn subject matter at greater depths. Because of their very recent development, we will trac the student learning in these initiatives during future assessment cycles. In regards to prior year actions plans, important objectives that were noted included (1) careers and professionalism in finance, (2) practical training, and (3) critical thinking through writing. The new Honors Tract in Finance discussed above has a special component that focuses specifically on careers and professionalism. During several special Friday sessions, students spend significant time with leaders from the College's Career Management Center. In addition, we bring in several high level finance executives from industry to meet with students to discuss career opportunities and expectations following graduation. Also as previously discussed the introduction of new courses is in part response to the need to provide students with enhanced technical skills and with practical training experiences. Finally, the critical thinking through writing initiative will be continued but based on its success, the University has decided that it will no longer be assessed.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Finance MS

Mission / Purpose
Description: The Master of Science degree program with a major in Finance is designed for students 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 degree 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 other business practices.

G 2: Conceptual and technical skills development
Students will be equipped conceptually and technically for financial model building and related analyses.

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 and related issues.

G 5: Professional leadership skills
Students will become adequately prepared to reach 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, 5)
The MS-Finance students will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macroeconomic theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: The development and application of technical skills (G: 2, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
Technical skills the MS-Finance students will develop and apply include: (i) Proficiency in capabilities in information technology as they relate to finance. (ii) Technical capabilities for analyzing the financial condition and performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) The necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building. (iv) Computer and technology skills, including (but not limited to) spreadsheet capabilities, familiarity with those software packages employed in analyzing financial issues, and general operating procedure capabilities.

O/O 3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills (G: 3, 5) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)
The MS-Finance students will: (i) Possess knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization from corporate finance, investments, or financial institutions and markets. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.
## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)
To examine student performance in select courses (FI 8020, FI 8310 and FI 8320), 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-Fall2013: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2013 and "Exhibit 1b-Spring2014: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2014. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2014: 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. Please see this document for details showing how student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8310, and FI 8320) 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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - 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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially 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 lower and that their development and application of technical skills thus partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met.

### Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially 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 lower and that their development and application of analytical, conceptual and integrative finance skills partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met.

### 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 2013, Summer 2013 and Fall 2013 Fast Track MS-Finance semesters. On ‘Satisfaction about quality of program’, 100% agree or strongly agree the program quality is satisfactory. On ‘Importance in employment opportunities’, 87.5% agree or strongly agree the program is important in seeking employment opportunities. The weak link is ‘Pleased with career services’ where only 75% 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.

### 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.

### 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.
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Systematic course-level assessment initiated during the Spring 2014 term indicates that students are using the opportunity to engage in practical training via the Field-studies in finance (FI 8391) course at or above desired levels of performance as indicated in the document, "Practical training: Field-studies in finance Spring 2014" uploaded with the related measure. A total of 5 graduate MS-Finance international students participated in the FI 8391 course in conjunction with practical-training received via internships during Spring 2014 in Atlanta area corporations.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Systematic course-level assessment initiated during the Spring 2014 term indicates that students are using the opportunity to engage in practical training via the Field-studies in finance (FI 8391) course at or above desired levels of performance as indicated in the document, "Exhibit 2a-Fall2013: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2013. This measure has one related finding that represents core learning in these courses. The selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to technical skills. In the most recent cycle, the Department's former target was at or above 80 percent. The change reflects the Department's ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.

M 5: Selected questions for foundation knowledge (O: 1)

The selected questions that pertain to foundation knowledge from courses are assessed to see how well the targets for foundation knowledge are met across different sub-topics such as micro-theory of finance, macro-theory and policy, and general knowledge outside finance. To examine student performance in select courses (FI 8020, FI 8310 and FI 8320), 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 selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to foundation knowledge. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 2a-Fall2013: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2013. This measure has one related finding that represents core learning outcome objective as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2014: 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 or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency in foundational knowledge. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department's former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department's ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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.

M 6: Selected questions for technical skills (O: 2)

The selected questions that pertain to technical skills from courses are assessed to see how well the targets for foundation knowledge are met across different sub-topics such as micro-theory of finance, macro-theory and policy, and general knowledge outside finance. To examine student performance in select courses (FI 8020, FI 8310 and FI 8320), 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 selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to technical skills. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 2a-Fall2013: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2013. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2014: 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 O2: The development and application of technical skills

Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a level of proficiency for the development and application of technical skills for financial decision-making. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department's former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department's ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance in the case of some learning objectives, but lower for others. Thus, student performance in regards to their technical skills partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department's former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department's ongoing efforts to improve
The selected questions that pertain to analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills from courses are assessed to see how well the targets for foundation knowledge are met across different sub-topics such as micro-theory of finance, macro-theory and policy, and general knowledge outside finance. To examine student performance in select courses (FI 8020, FI 8310 and FI 8320), the course-instructors selected 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 selected questions in this measure are those pertaining to analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills. 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. The development and application of technical skills

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses (with links provided). These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance in the case of some learning objectives, but lower for others. Thus, student performance in regards to their conceptual, analytical, and integrative skills partially meet our targets. The target of 80 percent is replacing the old target of 70 percent and hence this year the targets are partially met. Up to the most recent cycle, the Department’s former target was at or above 70 percent. The change reflects the Department's ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.

**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.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2008-2009} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Status: Finished} \]
\[ \text{Priority: High} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Description: In January 2010 we successfully launched a one-year Executive MS in Finance program at the Robinson College’s Buckhead Executive Center. In January 2011 we changed the name of the program to Fast Track MS in Finance. This program name was maintained for the 2012 cohort and appears to be developing a brand to be used for cohorts in future years.} \]
\[ \text{Responsible Person/Group: Professors Milind Shrikhande and Alfred Mettler} \]

**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. For the cohorts of 2014 and 2015 cohorts, based on a review of students needs in today’s market place, the Department has selected for the special topic to be “Banking in the Global Economy.” In additional, FI 8060 "Current Topics in Finance" continues to innovate and provide students with knowledge related to current practice in corporate finance settings. To facilitate the Department has developed relations with several high level finance executives in the Atlanta area who frequently serve as guest speakers in the classroom. Further, these executives are able to show how firm activities outside of the traditional finance function influence financial-decision making. This point also addresses a program learning objective regarding business practice outside of finance, which was partially met.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2012-2013} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Status: In-Progress} \]
\[ \text{Priority: High} \]

**Curriculum Review**

The Department has initiated a review of two key courses in the first semester of the program--MBA 8135 Corporation Finance and FI 8000 Valuation of Financial Assets. These two courses, which serve as the pre-requisites for the remaining finance courses, will be better integrated and further strengthened to incorporate more advanced material. This will enable students to be exposed to more challenging and advanced materials in subsequent semesters. As a result of these changes, some more introductory material will have to be eliminated to make room for the new material. In consideration of this, the committee will also explore the development of materials (including online modules) that students will be able to access prior to the start of the program. Longer term, the committee will consider the broader curriculum and make recommendations as to changes in other courses.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2013-2014} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Status: In-Progress} \]
\[ \text{Priority: High} \]

**Emphasize applications requiring integrative skills**

Emphasize directing their skills, analytical, conceptual, and technical, towards solving real world financial problems. Applications requiring the use of integrative skills are to be progressively emphasized.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2013-2014} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Status: Planned} \]
\[ \text{Priority: High} \]
\[ \text{Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):} \]
\[ \text{Measure: Representative questions from courses | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills} \]

**Emphasize applications requiring integrative skills**

Emphasize directing their skills, analytical, conceptual, and technical, towards solving real world financial problems. Applications requiring the use of integrative skills are to be progressively emphasized. For the next cohort the Department will conduct a review of the business modeling course with a view of redesigning it to better meet the needs of students. If this is not successful, the Department is also considering the introduction of a boot camp to be attended by students prior to the start of their courses where key financial and business modeling skills are developed.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2013-2014} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Status: In-Progress} \]
\[ \text{Priority: High} \]
\[ \text{Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):} \]
\[ \text{Measure: Selected questions analytical, conceptual, integrative skills | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills} \]

**Emphasize use of sophisticated technical capabilities**

Students have the necessary conceptual and technical skills. Technical capability via computer and software use for analyzing financial issues need emphasis.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2013-2014} \]
\[ \text{Implementation Status: Planned} \]
\[ \text{Priority: High} \]
\[ \text{Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):} \]
\[ \text{Measure: Representative questions from courses | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills} \]

**Emphasize use of sophisticated technical capabilities**

Students have the necessary conceptual and technical skills. Technical capability via computer and software use for analyzing financial issues need emphasis. The Department is considering the introduction of a boot camp to introduce students at the outset of their program of study to those financial and business modeling skills that will be useful throughout the program. This initiative will enhance their technical capabilities for analyzing financial issues.

\[ \text{Established in Cycle: 2013-2014} \]
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**Program innovation**
Currently, the MS-Finance program features a specialization in the area of corporation finance. To meet the needs of students seeking expertise and career opportunities in other areas of finance, a study is planned where additional specializations will be developed in the areas of (1) Banking and Financial Services, and (2) Asset and Wealth Management. In addition, the Department will continue to review the curriculum of the corporation finance specialization. Given the importance of risk management in the corporate setting, consideration will be given to innovating the curriculum to include a course related to corporate risk management.

**Program marketing and student support**
The College is planning to introduce its Student Transformation Model (STM) to provide added student support for the MS-Finance program. Key features of this innovation will be the hiring of a integrated student success professional, an enrollment management coaching, and a student career coach. With these positions, the program will be in a better position to identify and support the needs of students throughout their time in the program. This innovation will also address an issue raised in the MS-Finance exit survey by students who expressed a desire to have greater student support in career planning.

**Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

After performing the assessment for the prior five years the Department has decided to raise the targets for student performance for the upcoming year. A select group of students (median performances) who achieved a minimum performance of 70% have been targeted. Having successfully achieved this standard, this year we have raised the target to 80 percent in the spirit of continuous improvement. As a result, we now see that some targets are now only partially met. As indicated in the action plan tracking, wherever the targets are now only partially met, action plans have been developed. For example, to enhance technical capabilities of students, we will in the short-term revisit the delivery of the business modeling course. For the longer term, we will consider whether to introduce a boot camp that students would attend before the program starts where business and financial modeling skills are introduced so that students have such skills for use throughout the entire program. On the dimension of knowledge about business practice outside of finance, the FI8060 Current Topics in Finance course will provide the opportunity to introduce diverse topics of interest coming from areas such as operations, economics, and accounting that interface with finance. Senior managers from industry (e.g., CEOs and CFOs of prominent businesses in the Atlanta area) will engage the students in discussions and presentations on public-private partnerships, global supply chain logistics and finance, federal reserve guidance of monetary policy, the power and energy sector, and valuation of private businesses that complement and expand the students' familiarity with business practices outside the finance function. The field studies program we earlier initiated in the past to enhance practical training will be offered by the instructors to the MS-Finance students to provide them opportunities for practical training experience in Fall and Spring semesters. The MS-Finance students also get a summer break for four weeks which can be utilized to add practical experience. In the spirit of continuous improvement, student learning objectives that were only partially met (partly as a result of introduction of new, higher targets), will be strengthened by implementing the following changes: a) Revisit the curriculum covered in the two basic courses, MBA8135: Corporation Finance, and FI8000: Valuation of Financial Assets. This review will be done with a view of ensuring that foundational knowledge is further strengthened preparing the students for more advanced learning. b) The Department will consider the introduction of FI8200: Derivative markets, as a potential new course in the MS-Finance program in order to equip students in identifying and assessing the inherent valuation and risk attributes of a security, a real asset, or a portfolio of securities and derivatives. c) The Department will consider revising the delivery of the business modeling course. d) The Department will continue to review the curriculum of the corporation finance specialization.

**4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

In terms of changes in the assessment process, during recent prior years the Department offered both a flex MS-Finance and a cohort MS-Finance program. During the current 2014 year, the flex program was phased out and only the cohort program is now offered. As a result, the assessment for this year focused on representative courses in the cohort program and include FI 8020 Financial Analysis and Loan Structuring, FI 8310 Investment Banking, and FI 8330 Corporate Finance Strategy. During 2015 these three courses will again be used as part of the assessment process for continuous improvement. The Department is considering a number of changes to the current program in light of this year’s assessment findings. In order to provide students the opportunity to possess advanced knowledge and capability in different specializations, we will initiate plans to expand the specializations that students may take to include those in the areas of (1) Banking and Financial Services, and (2) Asset and Wealth Management. The introduction of these new specializations would provide students with training and expertise in a broader set of career alternatives in the field of finance. These additional specializations will provide students with career alternatives in industry sectors that are growing in the Atlanta area such as banking, financial services, and wealth management. They will provide incentives to broaden the curriculum by adding new courses from the financial intermediation and international or global finance areas. Further,
the introduction of these specializations will in turn result in the availability of new courses not previously offered within the MS-Finance degree program. The Department will also consider the introduction of F8200: Derivative markets, as a potential new course in the MS-Finance program in order to equip students in identifying and assessing the inherent valuation and risk attributes of a security, a real asset, or a portfolio and derivatives designed based on such underlying assets. Further, such a course will fill a need for students to learn more about and become proficient in corporate risk management.
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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.
### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of France and French speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department’s mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in French, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of French and Francophone literatures and cultures, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

### Goals

**G 1: Goals for 2010-11**  
In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)**  
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**SLO 2: Research and Data 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**

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

Adding Courses

The French section has added one new course for the new concentration in French Studies, and more are under consideration.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Planned
Responsible Person/Group: French Faculty
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Mission / Purpose
The Geography 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
### Improve critical-thinking skills of Geography majors

Critical-thinking learning outcomes had the lowest scores among all the outcomes; therefore, critical-thinking skills of Geography majors need to be improved.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

### Improve scores on Outcome 10 in GEOG 4764

In order to improve scores on Outcome 10 (Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation) in Geography 4764 (Urban Geography), the instructor will provide students with solid examples of appropriate evaluations of claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

### Increase the number of measures for certain outcomes

It has been determined that the program needs at least six measures per learning outcome. There were 82 outcome/measure combinations for the 2008-2009 assessment, thereby yielding a mean value of six measures per outcome. To reach the minimum number of six measures per outcome, the following is needed: at least five additional measures for Outcome 4 (Communication – Visual) and Outcome 5 (Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations); at least three additional measures for Outcome 6 (Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving), at least two additional measures for Outcome 8 (Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)), Outcome 9 (Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection), and Outcome 11 (Technology); and one additional measure for Outcome 3 (Communication – Oral), Outcome 12 (Collaboration), and Outcome 13 (Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines). Therefore, a high-priority area is increasing the number of measures for outcomes linked to quantitative skills, visual communication, and critical thinking.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

### Actions

Geosciences is proposing to combining B.A (GEOG) and B.S. (GEOL) degree programs. All new assessment will be developed reflecting goals and outcome of a new combined degree B.S. degree program.

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

### Combining disciplines

This year the department will combine Geography and Geology into one major. We will discuss ways to combine our goals and objectives and find ways to measure these.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
# Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition (G: 1) (M: 2)**  
Student demonstrate knowledge of key geological concepts.

**SLO 6: Critical Thinking - Evidence Collection (G: 3) (M: 2)**  
Student collects appropriate evidence.

**SLO 7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)**  
Student evaluates claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

# Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: "LOESS" Exit Survey**  
The Learning Outcomes Exit Survey for Seniors (LOESS) was given to six graduating seniors. The test consisted of 90 questions, 10 questions from each of nine geology courses. The courses are Geol 1121 (Introductory Geosciences I), Geol 1122 (Introductory Geosciences II), Geol 3002 (Introduction to Earth Materials), Geol 4006 (Sedimentary Environments and Stratigraphy), Geol 4013 (Structural Geology), Geol 4015 (Crystallography and Optical Mineralogy), Geol 4016 (Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology), Geol 4017 (Environmental Geology), and Geol 4007 (Hydrogeology). Geol 1121, 1122, 3002, 4006, 4013, 4015, and 4016 are required for the BS degree; Geol 4017 and 4007 are not required but are taken by almost every graduating student.

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

**M 2: Problems (O: 4, 6, 7)**  
Students complete homework problems that require them to practice concepts discussed in class. For example, students may be asked to interpret geological maps and cross sections.

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

**Target for O4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition**  
75% of students should score 3 out of 5, or proficient, in foundation knowledge acquisition. 50% of students should score 4 our of 5, or high, on foundation knowledge acquisition. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on foundation knowledge acquisition.

**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 our 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

---

Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section
**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.

**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.

**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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Geosciences MS
As of 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The primary mission of the Geoscience MS degree is to produce well-educated students in Geology and Geography. That mission includes delivering courses at the MS level relevant to what students in Geology and Geography need to know and providing stimulating research opportunities in both concentrations at the MS level.

Goals
G 1: Students will be knowledgeable Geoscientists
Students will learn research and practical knowledge toward success in their respective fields of Geography and Geology.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Quality Thesis Research (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
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, documentation, and thesis defense. 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
There were 11 theses. The mean score for the overall thesis was 4.0. This outcome was met.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
There were 11 theses. The mean score for outcome 2 was 4.0. 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 =
### 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
There were 11 theses. The mean score for the thesis introduction was 3.8. This outcome was not 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
There were 11 theses. The mean score for thesis information was 4.0. 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
There were 11 theses. The mean score for thesis organization was 3.9. This outcome was not 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
There were 11 theses. The mean score for language conventions in the thesis was 4.2. 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
There were 11 theses. The mean score for documentation in the thesis was 4.2. This outcome was met.

### M 8: Thesis - Defense (O: 1)

The defense 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 the measure equals or exceeds 4.0.
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Theses in the Department of Geosciences are still relatively weak in the following areas: introduction, evidence support, and organization. These areas all involve substantial critical thinking by students. Theses are strongest in the less complex areas of language conventions and documentation. We added one more measure (thesis defense) to the assessment process, and our students performed well for that measure. After the 2012/2013 assessment, we did alter the curriculum in our graduate-only research-methods seminar to focus mostly on the introduction section, discussion section, and organization of theses, but the potential impacts of that curriculum alteration will not be seen until the 2014/2015 cycle.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The Department of Geosciences already has altered Geosciences 8002, which is a required course for all incoming M.S. students, so that it focuses solely on the thesis, especially the introduction section, discussion section, and the organization of the thesis. The course has been redesigned to stress the importance of the literature review in any thesis and the use of the literature in the introduction and discussion sections. In addition, thesis-committee members will be advised to provide more comments in the introduction and discussion sections of thesis drafts. The action plan resulting from the 2012/2013 assessment was too vague, and that is one reason why an improvement in thesis quality was not seen from the last assessment to this assessment.

---

### 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

#### Thesis Improvement

The areas of weakness in many theses are the introduction section, the organization of the thesis, and the use of supporting evidence in the thesis. Therefore, the parts of the theses that are associated the most with critical thinking are where our students performed the worst. We already have a required course (Geos 8002) in place to provide training in writing introduction sections to all beginning M.S. students. Thesis committee members will be asked to do the following on thesis drafts: (1) provide students with completed rubrics that are identical to those used for the eventual assessment of the theses; and (2) make detailed comments on thesis drafts, with more attention placed on the introduction section, the discussion section, and the over-all organization of the thesis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy E. Diem
- **Additional Resources:** None

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 German BA**
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*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to give students 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
Goals

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%).

Target for O6: Knowledge of German Literature
Students will achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 German MA
(As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Germany and German speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in German, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of German literature and culture, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

Goals

G 1: Goals for 2010-11
In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Effective writing, communicating and 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
2013-2014 Gerontology MA
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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 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.
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**

**2013-2014 Health & Physical Education BSED**

(As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST)

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 3: Goal 3: Effects on P-12 Student learning**

Objective #1: Students will demonstrate ability to use assessment data from students to alter lesson emphasis and/or unit plans

**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 86-98% pass rates and have pass rates within 2 percentage points and above on all 6 subareas on tests 115 and 116. In addition, HPE candidates have a content core average GPA of 2.97, 3.1 and 3.24 for the last three years, respectively. Steps taken to use information from assessments. The HPE faculty as a group are reflective and responsive to candidate performance. Last year, in response to faculty perceptions regarding the sequencing of course content, the HPE faculty developed a content matrix for the initial preparation program (BSED and MED non-T4) to better determine in which courses specific content was taught. This information serves two purposes; the first is to improve student performance, and the second, to ensure the program effectively addresses the dual curriculum of health and physical education across P-12. Changes planned for the preparation program. The current plan is to maintain and monitor both GACE and average GPA. Candidates’ subscores will be shared with program faculty responsible for teaching related content so they can improve or add additional time for developing content in existing classes. Scores also will be shared with HPE faculty so we can revise curriculum sequencing and/or add new courses to ensure content is effectively addressed. Lastly, the HPE faculty plan to review core content average GPA at each transition point in the program. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, skills and Dispositions (including planning, clinical practice and dispositions) Summary of principal findings. There are multiple assessments for analyzing HPE candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions. These include a contextual analysis, lesson planning, learning goals and objectives, lesson reflections, task presentation, analysis of student learning, and dispositions. After analyzing the data from the contextual analysis, lesson planning, and learning goals and objectives between 84-92% of candidates were very good or outstanding in their performance across these three assessments at the end of student teaching suggesting that HPE candidates have a readiness to teach and a confidence and clarity to meet their teaching goals, ensure continuity of learning from lesson to lesson, provide for individual differences and strive to adapt learning material to the needs of the students. On lesson reflections, 84% of candidates were rated very good or outstanding at the end of student teaching suggesting that candidates developed the ability to engage in self-evaluation not only on what they did as teachers but on the reasons their decisions may or may not have been effective. Following student teaching, 81% of candidates were very good or outstanding in task presentation highlighting the importance of full time teaching with full classes of students to strength teaching skills. Data from dispositions (100% rated as very good by faculty) are strongly supportive of the professional expectations and behaviors demonstrated by candidates at the end of student teaching. Steps taken to use information from assessments. The information from these assessments e.g., goals and objectives, has been used, where appropriate and relevant to adjust assignment directions and the grading rubric for the models project conducted during the second half of student teaching this Spring 2011. Changes planned for the preparation program. The current plan is to maintain the assignment selection and to review the expectations and directions...
The Health and Physical Education Program seeks to develop competent leaders who provide and promote standards-based 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 in Health and Physical Education.

**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.

**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 participate in professional associations.

**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 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 personal 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 health and physical education instructional units for P-12 students.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

SLO 4: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models (G: 1, 2) (M: 4)
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to plan and teach using a variety of health and physical education 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 format.

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 health and physical education to 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**| |
|100% of our program completers scored Acceptable on at least 6 of the 9 indicators in the Unit Plan Project.| |

|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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**| |
|In Spring 2013 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 2013 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**| |
|Of the 4 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

80% of our MED program completers scored at least 30 out of the 40 available points on the KH 7250 models project assignment.

**M 5: Research synthesis (O: 5)**

The purpose of this assignment is to develop teacher candidate ability to develop a professional portfolio. The candidate completes the portfolio and then presents it to other students in KH 7790.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students who completed this assessment scored at least 40 (out of 45) on this assessment, thus meeting the objective.

---

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

#### Assessing planning skills and knowledge

Five areas have been identified in which at least one student was assessed as "Not Met": Needs assessment, Instructional analysis, Arrangement of resources, Monitoring system, and Evaluation system. However, in most areas, only 1 or 2 students did not meet the stated criterion, so the deficiencies are not deemed to be severe. The course instructor will provide added emphasis on these areas in the future, and monitor students with formative assessments during each course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** KH 7240 Unit plan
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan
- **Implementation Description:** This plan will go into effect in the fall of 2009, and remain in effect for all subsequent offerings of this course
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Gurvitch (Course instructor)
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### Assessing Unit planning

While this standard was "Met" by all but one student, there was a scattering of "Not met" by a few students on some parts of this major project. The action plan is to conduct additional guidance as students plan this project, and to use formative assessments as they develop this project—rather than use summative assessments only. Starting in the spring of 2010 (next time this course is offered), the instructor will have developed rubrics for "progress reports" and assessments on this major project.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** KH 7250 Instructional models project
  - **Outcome/Objective:** should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models
- **Implementation Description:** This plan will go into effect with the next time this course is offered, in spring of 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Metzler (Course instructor)
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### Assessment of supervison knowledge and skills

Students are performing well in this area. The action plan is to maintain this level of performance while monitoring students in subsequent course sections.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Project to demonstrate supervision competence
  - **Outcome/Objective:** should be able to systematically supervise other teachers
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. gurvitch (course instructor)
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### Assessment of teaching

In several assessed areas at least one student was rated as "Not met": Knowledge of growth and development, Communicative skills, Use of class time, Instruction, Evaluation of students, Self evaluation, Planning/preparation, Teacher/Student interaction in class, and Class climate. While the number of areas is substantial, in most areas it was only one student who did not meet the standard; and it was almost always the same student. In the future the course instructor will conduct more formative assessments during the course, to identify students who are not meeting this standard at those times. Additional monitoring and interaction with the instructor will be planned for those students, as needed.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teaching experience | Outcome/Objective: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching

Implementation Description: This plan will start with the next offering of this course and continue indefinitely.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

Summary of 2008-2009 Assessment data
Using the selected assessments in 2008-2009, it was determined from the Faculty end-of-program ratings that 100% of all students were meeting each of the five NBPTS Standards. The data were essentially the same for the 2007-2008 program completers, indicating consistency over time. Nonetheless, the HPE graduate faculty have begun discussions to revise the major research project in the program, away from the Collaborative Action Research (CAR) Project, to participation in ongoing faculty research efforts. Those discussions will proceed through the 2009-2010 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Graduate faculty members, led by Mike Metzler, HPE graduate program coordinator.

Maintain and monitor
The assessment used to measure this outcome appears to be appropriate, and all completers met the stated objective. There is no need for change at this time.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: KH 7250 Instructional models project | Outcome/Objective: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models

Implementation Description: maintain and monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (course instructor)

Maintain and monitor
The assessment used to measure this outcome appears to be appropriate, and all three completers scored above the stated criterion, demonstrating their ability to conduct a research literature synthesis. There is no need to change at this time.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Research synthesis | Outcome/Objective: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document

Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

Maintain and monitor
These assessments appear to be appropriate for this outcome, and the program completers in this cohort all met the objective. There is no need for any changes at this time.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Project to demonstrate supervision competence | Outcome/Objective: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers

Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)

Re-calibrate the rubric used in this assessment
The rubric currently used in this assessment appears to be too stringent, as many more of the indicators should have been scored as "Target" but going by the definitions in the rubric had to be scored as "Acceptable."

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: KH 7240 Unit plan | Outcome/Objective: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan

Implementation Description: Revise the scoring rubric for this assessment in KH 7240
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund
Additional Resources: none

Refine supervision project
Instructor will go back to the course assignment and refine the supervision assignment to reflect a better supervision project that allows more students to be successful in completing it.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Project to demonstrate supervision competence
- **Outcome/Objective:** should be able to systematically supervise other teachers

- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Gurvitch

**Develop new course elective offerings**
Develop new elective offerings that will attract students to degree.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2015

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Program needs to find its niche - a strength to increase student applications. Program has been divided into MEd and MAT for easier clarification for students. Certification Only option included for master's students in other KH programs.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Added MAT as a program option for initial certification Master's level students.

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most important accomplishments for year**—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Increase in students applying to the master's 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.

Need to re-image the program to make the course offerings more attractive to current teachers.

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

Many presentations by HPE faculty this past year in state, regional, and national conferences.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Health Administration MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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 program is accredited by the AACSB and CAHME and is ranked 34th nationally (USNEWR, 2009). The mission is to prepare graduates to assume managerial and leadership positions in health sector organizations through 1) A leading-edge curriculum that integrates business and health care knowledge, 2) The engagement in scholarly inquiry related to the improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of health care services and the health care system, and 3) Providing and promoting professional service to the academic and health care communities.

---

**Goals**

G 1: Provide CAHME specified competency areas
Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical and medical issues affecting health care
organizations.

G 3: Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment
This relates to the 1st domain of the HLA competency model

G 2: Business skills and knowledge
This relates to the 2nd domain of the HLA competency model

G 5: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
This is the 3rd domain of our hybrid HLA competency model

G 4: Develop leadership knowledge and skills
This is the 4th domain of our hybrid HLA competency model

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas (M: 1, 2, 9)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical and medical issues affecting health care organizations.

SLO 2: Competency in Business skills and knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Apply basic and complex business analyses to the healthcare sector. Seven subcompetency areas are identified.

SLO 3: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment (M: 2)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The ability to describe components of the healthcare sector and their relationships, and the ability to explain the implications of those relationships for leadership and management. Nine specific subcompetency areas are identified.

SLO 4: Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills (M: 2)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Competency in areas of 1) Communication, both oral and written; 2) motivating and empowering others; 3) group participation and leadership; 4) change management; 5) physician and other clinical relationships

SLO 5: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills (M: 2)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Competency in the areas of 1) self-awareness and confidence; 2) self regulation and personal responsibility; 3) honesty and integrity; 4) public service; 5) life-long learning.

SLO 6: Develop real world experience in the HA field (M: 2, 6, 7)
Normal 0 false false 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 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 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 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 false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 student evaluation of H.A. program during residency, capstone course, and on-going feedback
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas
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 healthcare 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

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

Curriculum improvements and competencies

CAHME accreditation is requiring that all HA programs be competency based. The Institute is in the process of selecting a base competency model, modifying where appropriate, mapping the curriculum content areas to the competencies, and evaluating the measures to assess attainment of the competencies. HA has further refined our competency model for our CAHME accreditation. It consists of 4 domains, 26 competencies, and about 80 benchmarks for these competencies. AY 11-12 is our self-study year. A capstone case course HA 8860 is being implemented MayMester 2012

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills | Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | Develop real world experience in the HA field | Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- Measure: Assessment of residents by HA faculty | Outcome/Objective: Develop real world experience in the HA field
- Measure: GPA of each HA student | Outcome/Objective: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills | Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | Develop real world experience in the HA field | Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- Measure: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills | Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | Develop real world experience in the HA field | Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- Measure: Student evaluation of H.A. program | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills | Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | Develop real world experience in the HA field | Provide CAHME specified competencies areas

Implementation Description: Fall 2010 target for CAHME competencies in HA
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

Additional Resources: Development and Implementation of CAHME competencies requires much additional faculty effort.
Many potential students are not aware of HA area of study, including many that are in the MBA, PMBA and MS programs at GSU.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment
- Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment
- Measure: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment
- Measure: Student evaluation of H.A. program | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment

Projected Completion Date: 07/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Health Science-Nutrition MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
To prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of Research Techniques
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are entry-level researchers who have knowledge of research techniques needed to interpret and conduct nutrition research.

G 2: Effective Communication Skills
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are highly effective educators whose communication skills are appropriate for advanced practitioners in the field of nutrition/dietetics.

G 3: Advanced Knowledge of Nutrition
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are informed practitioners who have advanced knowledge of nutrition needed to meet the needs of clients and patients.

G 4: Knowledge of Health Care Policies
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are informed health care professionals who have knowledge of health care policies needed to successfully provide services to clients and patients.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate entry-level competence in the design, interpretation, and ethical conduct of nutrition research.

SLO 2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care (M: 2)
Candidates demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills through the use of current and emerging technologies to enhance the practice and delivery of nutrition care in a professional and ethical manner.

SLO 3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes (M: 3, 4)
Candidates will comprehend the interrelationships between macro- and micronutrient intakes as they impact human health in normal and disease states.

SLO 4: Understand the Essential Components of Delivering Health Services (M: 5)
Candidates will successfully evaluate contemporary principles of health policy in the U.S. and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Research Proposal Assignment (O: 1)
SNHP 6000 (Research Methods for Health Professionals) – Research Proposal Assignment
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
### Target for O1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research

Target – Of the total points available, 25% of students will receive a score of >90% and 75% of students will receive a score of >80%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

13 of 17 (76.5%) received a score of at least 90%; 15 of 17 (88.2%) received a score of at least 80%.

### M 2: Research Presentation (O: 2)

NUTR 6012 (Orientation to Practice) – Research Presentation

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

#### Target for O2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

Eighty percent of student groups will receive an evaluation of “exceeds expectations” or “meets/exceeds expectations” on all presentation evaluation criteria by the majority of the evaluators.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% (4 of 4 groups) received an evaluation of exceeds or meets/exceeds expectations on all presentation criteria by the majority of the evaluators.

### M 3: Macronutrients Final Exam (O: 3)

NUTR 6104 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Macronutrients) – Final Exam

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

#### Target for O3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Of the total points available on the exam, 25% of students will score >90% and 75% will score >80%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

18 of 22 (81.8%) scored at least 90% and 20 of 22 (90.0%) scored at least 80% on the final exam.

### M 4: Micronutrients Quizzes (O: 3)

NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Micronutrients) – Five quizzes are given during the semester

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

#### Target for O3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Of the total points available on the quizzes, 10% of students will score >90% and 50% will score >80%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

19 of 24 (79%) students had a score of at least 90%, 24 of 24 (100%) of students had a score of at least 80%.

### M 5: Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment (O: 4)

SNHP 8000 (Trends Affecting Health Policy) – Debate on Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment

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

#### Target for O4: Understand the Essential Components of Delivering Health Services

Of the total points available on the assignment, 25% of students will score >90% and 75% will score >80%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

22 of 22 (100%) of students scored at least 90% on the assignment.

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

#### Additional Reviewers and Criteria

Only 3 faculty reviewers were available to evaluate the students' presentations. A greater number of reviewers will be recruited in the future. An additional criteria (response to audience questions) will be added to the evaluation form to evaluate understanding of the project and ability to provide a response.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2012

#### Assignment Change

The Research Proposal Assignment will be changed from a group project to an individual project to ensure that all students gain experience with all components of the research proposal process.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011

**Continue to Monitor**
Continue to monitor this assessment
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Continue to Monitor
This is a new measure. NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition - Micronutrients) is a required and very challenging course.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Continue to Monitor
This assessment measure will continue to be monitored as the faculty instructor changed from academic year 2010-2011 to 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

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

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: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Research Proposal Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research

Continue to monitor  
Continue to monitor this measure in 2014-2015 because the instructor has changed.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Micronutrients Quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Continue to monitor  
We will continue to monitor this measure because the instructor for the course and the Coordinated Program Director have changed.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
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  
We wish to continue to monitor this measure as we have a new instructor teaching the course.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The results were desirable in that all of the measures were successfully met. The results exceed findings from previous years. Although our program content has not changed we will have new instructors for all of the courses represented in the measures. Therefore, we wish to continue to monitor the existing measures. The findings reveal that our students are achieving the outcomes required by our program. This is also evidenced by the near 100% pass rate for the national registration examination that students take after graduation.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

No program changes are planned as a result of the 2013-2014 assessment findings. The objectives were met and correspond with the objectives required in our graduate program. The only proposed change to our graduate program is the addition of a specialization in Sports Nutrition which will require students to take several Nutrition and Kinesiology and Health courses as required and elective courses.
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 World History surveys (1111 and 1112) and the U.S. History survey (2110) introduce students to the fundamentals of historical thinking and historical methods through analysis of political, economic, and social developments.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Source Differentiation (M: 1)
Students in 1111, 1112, and 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 1111, 1112, and 2110 will be able to discuss and analyze historical developments, encounters, or conflicts that both emphasize and transcend 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 1111, 1112, and 2110 will demonstrate understanding of the ways in which geography both determines and is constructed through human history.

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 can differentiate a primary source from a secondary source, but is not able to put those differences to use in his/her 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 in a reasonably proficient way. A student who receives a 4 can both differentiate primary sources from secondary sources and put those differences to use in sophisticated historical interpretation.

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

Target for O1: Source Differentiation
80% to receive 2 or above; 60% to receive 3 or above; 30% to receive 4.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Over the course of the 2013-14 school year, students in HIST 1111 and 1112 (our World History surveys) responded to questions/assignments that tested their ability to differentiate between primary and secondary sources. Each instructor of 1111 and 1112 submitted work from five students (the first three students and the last two students on the class roster) that tested this Student Learning Objective. Usable material was submitted by 11 instructors over the course of the year (of 22 instructors who taught the course in total). The instructors assessed the students' answers themselves, and then these assessments (and the assignments from which they were derived) were reviewed by the History Department's Assessment Committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Christine Carter). Of the 49 examples of student work submitted for this SLO: 2 received a 1 (4%) 8 received a 2 (16%) 22 received a 3 (45%) 17 received a 4 (35%) 96% of students received a 2 or above (which exceeds our target of 80%) 80% of students received a 3 or above (which exceeds our target of 60%) 35% of students received a 4 (which exceeds our target of 30%)

M 2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context (O: 2)
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 developments, encounters, or conflicts within or among past societies in their historical contexts. A student who receives a 2 can recognize and analyze developments, encounters, or conflicts within or among past societies, and is able to use historical context to show understanding of multiple historical perspectives in a rudimentary way. A student who receives a 3 can recognize and analyze developments, encounters, or conflicts within or among past societies, and is able to use historical context to show understanding of multiple historical perspectives in a reasonably proficient way. A student who receives a 4 demonstrates creativity in recognizing and analyzing developments, encounters, or conflicts within or among past societies, and is able to use historical context to show...
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Collect and assess data from 2110 (Survey of U.S. History)

Collect and assess data for fall 2012 and spring 2013. Submit findings into WEAVE.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Marni Davis, Christine Carter

New Assessment Process

For the cycle 2012-13, we have revised the Outcomes, Measures, and assessment rubric for the Core. We will begin collecting data for HIST 2110 in the fall of 2012, and will continue to do so through the spring of 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Marni Davis, Christine Carter

Assessment of World History surveys

We will shift our assessment away from HIST 2110 for the year 2013-14, in order to focus on assessment of our World History surveys, HIST 1111 and 1112. These courses will undergo the assessment process in both the fall and the spring of this school year. All data will be collected by the end of the spring semester of 2014.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Christine Carter

Assessment of 2110

We will shift our assessment away from our World History surveys, HIST 1111 and 1112, in order to focus on assessment of HIST 2110, our U.S. History survey, for the year 2014-15. This courses will undergo the assessment process in both the fall and the spring of this school year.
Mission / Purpose

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 history.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

The Core SLOs are taught in each of the three survey classes: 1111, 1112, and 2110. All instructors are required to include opportunities to learn, practice, and master the SLOs in their sections of these surveys, though the nature of these exercises are determined by the individual instructors. Activities, exercises, and exam questions specifically targeting each SLO are included in each class; in addition to providing assessment data, these also constitute opportunities for students to reinforce their engagement with the SLOs.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We are extremely pleased with the findings of our assessments, for both 2013-14 (our most recent year of data collection) and 2012-13 (the year we started collecting data). Though we intend to proceed with assessing the U.S. Survey (2110) and the World Surveys (1111/1112) in alternating years, we find that because of their methodological and structural similarities in the history department curriculum, the results for each are essentially comparable. Since we have only been collecting data for two years now, we are not yet ready to say how our assessment program might be affecting student learning. We can say with confidence, however, that our assessment program has affected the ways in which our instructors are teaching these courses. Instructors report designing and executing activities and lessons around explicit engagement with our SLOs, though the nature of these exercises are used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

As noted in response to the previous question, despite the relatively short amount of time that we have been assessing our surveys, the very act of assessment has resulted in improvements in the departmental surveys. In particular, the articulation and incorporation of SLOs into survey curriculum design and execution stand out as tangible improvements to our Core program. In addition, our shared instructional mission, as articulated by the SLOs, has become a more regular part of the department’s conversation about undergraduate education. Assessment findings are shared regularly at faculty meetings, but informal discussions and meetings of survey course instructors have also proven to be important and fruitful.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

In the interest of measuring by a consistent metric, we are going to maintain the same SLOs and assessment instrument for at least one more two-year cycle, so that 2110 will be assessed this year (2014-15) and 1111/12 will be assessed next year (2015-16). At that point, we will reassess our assessment program and consider possible revisions.
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 skills 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 twenty-two 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 during the 2013-2014 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 3LO 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 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 and Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective from consideration when reading capstone papers. The results are listed under 2013-2014 Assessment Summary/Findings. 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 3LO 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 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 and Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective from consideration when reading capstone papers. The results are listed under 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. For 2012, five members of the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee read a randomly selected sample of fifteen student research papers (three papers each from five different classes) written for HIST 4990 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 Semesters. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning some evidence of outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Five Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being professional skills, 2LO being historiography, 3LO being interdisciplinary awareness, 4LO being comparative/global/transnational perspective, and 5LO being professional values. The results are listed under 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. During 2011, the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee evaluated 18 final research papers written for the Department of History Capstone Course Hist 4990 taken from classes offered in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning some evidence of outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Five Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being professional skills, 2LO being historiography, 3LO being interdisciplinary awareness, 4LO being comparative/global/transnational perspective, and 5LO being professional values. The results are listed under 2010-2011. For 2010, the history department undergraduate studies committee read a sample of sixteen student research papers written for HIST 4990 in Spring, Summer, and Fall 2009. We assessed the extent to which these students seemed to have mastered our stated outcomes. Each paper was evaluated on a one to four scale for the five outcomes/objectives, with one meaning no evidence of this outcome, two meaning some evidence of the outcome but below expectations, three meaning met expectations, and four meaning exceeded expectations.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

### Target for O1: Professional Skills
The department's target is for 70% of our graduating students to score three (met expectations) or four (exceeded expectations) in this area.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
Approximately 64% of students met or exceeded expectations in Learning Objective 1, Professional Skills. The specific breakdown is as follows: 23% exceeded expectations 41% met expectations 32% did not meet expectations 4% showed no evidence of the outcome.

### Target for O2: Historiography
The department's target is for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The department met its benchmark of 60% of our graduating students meeting or exceeding the learning outcome #2, historiography. In all, 60% of students met or exceeded expectations in this objective. The specific breakdown is as follows: 19% exceeded expectations 41% met expectations 36% did not meet expectations 4% showed no evidence of the outcome.

### Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness
The department's target is for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The previous Director of Undergraduate Studies has indicated in previous assessment cycles that the current assessment tool does not fairly report this learning outcome. While this is true, there has not yet been a tool designed to seriously assess either Learning Outcome 3, Interdisciplinary Awareness, and Learning Outcome 4, Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. This is because the faculty who teach the capstone course assign research topics which do not necessarily engage interdisciplinary or transnational tools. Nevertheless, these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet programmatic requirements to graduate with courses in U.S., European, and World history, as well as to gain proficiency in another discipline by minoring in it. While the sample size is smaller, the 4990 papers that do engage the subject of Interdisciplinary Awareness indicate movement towards that target. Of the 22 papers collected for review, 15 were on subjects that indicated evidence of interdisciplinary awareness. Of those papers, 67% met or exceeded expectations. The specific breakdown is as follows: 13.3% exceeded expectations 53.3% met expectations 33% did not meet expectations.

### Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective
The department's target is for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The previous Director of Undergraduate Studies has indicated in previous assessment cycles that the current assessment tool does not fairly report this learning outcome. While this is true, there has not yet been a tool designed to seriously assess either Learning Outcome 3, Interdisciplinary Awareness, and Learning Outcome 4, Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. This is because the faculty who teach the capstone course assign research topics which do not necessarily engage interdisciplinary or transnational tools. Nevertheless, these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet programmatic requirements to graduate with courses in U.S., European, and World history, as well as to gain proficiency in another discipline by minoring in it. The sample size for assessing this outcome using 4990 papers is too small to be of any use. Only 8 of the 22 papers indicated any evidence of the outcome. So while 75% of those papers met or exceeded standards, this is not a proper measure of the learning outcome.

### Target for O5: Professional Values
The department's target for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
The department met its benchmark of 70% of our graduating students meeting or exceeding the learning outcome #5, professional values. In all, 77% of students met or exceeded expectations in this objective. The specific breakdown is as follows: 36% exceeded expectations 41% met expectations and 23% did not meet expectations.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**comparative/global/transnational**
The majority of our student papers performed well in this area. Those that did not treated topics that made comparison difficult. We plan to circulate our department's standards to remind students and faculty that this is one of our defined goals.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective

- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Historiography**
We plan to do more to emphasize historiographical debates in our upper-division courses. Students learn about historiography in HIST 3000, Introduction to Historical Studies. Many of the intervening courses drop the issue of historiography to a large extent. We hope that by assigning more short research-type assignments in our upper-division courses, our students will become more comfortable with talking about historiographical debates in their seminar papers. We have also changed to prerequisites for HIST 4990, our capstone course, to require at least two 4000-level classes prior to enrolling in the class. By ensuring that all our majors get some experience doing research and writing about historiography in our 4000-level classes, we hope that their performance will improve in 4990.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Historiography

- **Implementation Description:** We have already submitted the proposal to change the prerequisites for 4990 in the course catalog, and the department agreed with the idea of working on emphasizing research skills and historiography in our upper-division courses.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Interdisciplinary Awareness**
We seem to be doing quite well in terms of interdisciplinary awareness as all but two of our sample group satisfied the criteria. We continue to emphasize different disciplines and their impact on history in HIST 3000.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Interdisciplinary Awareness

**Professional Skills**
To improve our students’ level of preparedness for the capstone seminar paper, we have agreed as a department to do more to emphasize research skills in our upper-division courses. We will be organizing a pedagogy workshop on research and writing assignments for these classes later this semester.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills

- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Professional Values**
We hope that the changes described under in action plan for the “historiography” outcome will have a similar effect in this area. We are going to emphasize more research-type assignments in our 4000-level classes so as to give students more research and writing experience in the classes that lead up to 4990. This experience should help them to develop the skills and values described here. The faculty have agreed to attend a workshop on research assignments during the upcoming semester.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Revision of outcomes**
The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students’ level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes.

Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee 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.

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.
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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The findings indicate that a good portion of History students are able to meet professional standards for the production of a historical research project. The long term trajectory of these outcomes appears to be good. However, there was a decline in the number of students who are showing a basic grasp of professional skills. While this may be explainable by short term factors, it appears that more attention needs to be given to creating common resources for undergraduates which will assist their creation of research projects in upper division courses and the capstone course. There have not been significant program changes or changes in the assessment process in the past two years to assess at the time of this report. However, the CTW program's influence on the development of both the gateway and capstone course shored up the connections between these two courses, and this has had a positive impact on the pedagogy involved in communicating both research skills and professional values.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee will begin an assessment of the development of its gateway CTW course as a means of identifying the teaching of various skills which will be used in upper division courses and ultimately in the capstone CTW course. This will involve discussing some common assignments and assessments, as well as the possibility of linking this to academic advisement. Regarding assessment, last year's action plan of reevaluating the assessment tool took place but without resolution. This year the Undergraduate Studies Committee will revisit not just the tool but the means by which the assessment is given. It is possible that scores could be assigned both by individual instructors and a sampling by the committee so that a more detailed assessment of programmatic needs could be made.
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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

**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): 72 1024x768 Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE

**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.

**Target for O2: Historiography**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to score a 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.

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.

Target for **O5: Professional Values**
The department expects 70% of the MA students to earn a score of 6 in the Professional Values 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.

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.

**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

---
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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 PhD level for professional activities in History and related fields. This involves not only the mechanics of research, teaching, and writing but developing such personal qualities as accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, and evenhandedness. The Department demands active learning, involving the student in reading and participation in seminars, in research and analysis of primary sources, and in the presentation of the resulting findings in written and verbal formats that adhere to recognized professional standards. Graduates of GSU graduate History program are prepared not only to be competent historians and teachers but also to function successfully in the larger community, both within and outside the academy.

**Goals**

**G 1: Prepare students to research, write and teach history**

**G 2: Learning**
Assist students in becoming active, interdisciplinary learners

**G 3: Academic Honesty and Integrity**
Nuture in students the qualities of honesty and accuracy

**G 4: Global Perspective**
Help students understand the links between history and the larger world
**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

**Target for O2: Historiography**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive a score of 6 in the Historiography category.

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive 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.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**
At least 70% of the PhD Students will receive 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

---
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---

**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
Measures, Targets, and Findings

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

### 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

### 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

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Mission of this concentration is to prepare students for work in social and community service and in business learning environments and/or for graduate study in counseling, education, educational psychology, human development, kinesiology and health, and related fields.

**Goals**

**G 1: Acquire an understanding of theories, systems, and processes associated with human learning and development disciplines**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will understand the theories, systems, and processes associated with disciplinary areas related to Behavior and Learning Disabilities, Child Growth and Development, Counseling, Educational Psychology, Learning Technology, and/or Physical Activity And Health.

**G 2: Analyze and draw relevant conclusions associated with human learning and development disciplines**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will be able to analyze and draw relevant conclusions associated with human learning and development in Behavior and Learning Disabilities, Child Growth and Development, Counseling, Educational Psychology, Learning Technology, and/or Physical Activity And Health.

**G 3: Understand the role of and be able to effectively work in careers/pursue graduate degree in human learning and development**

- A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will understand the role of and be able to effectively work in careers associated with or pursue graduate studies in human learning and development fields and related disciplines.

**G 4: Develop critical thinking skills**

- A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will be an effective critical thinker.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analyze and evaluate the systems and processes associated with human learning and development disciplines (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 3)**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will be able to analyze and evaluate the systems and processes associated with human learning and development in the areas of Behavior and Learning Disabilities, Child Growth and Development, Counseling, Educational Psychology, Learning Technology, and/or Physical Activity And Health.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

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

**SLO 2: Function in practical and inquiry based settings related to the human learning and development the field. (G: 3)**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will demonstrate the ability to effectively function in practical and inquiry based settings related to the human learning and development field.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

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**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 3: Present analyses and evaluations of processes and systems related to the human learning and development field (G: 3) (M: 1)**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will present their analysis and evaluations of processes and systems related to the human learning and development field.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 4: Use critical thinking in their decision processes (G: 1, 3) (M: 3)**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will use critical thinking in their decision processes.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 5: Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

A student graduating with a BIS degree in Human Learning and Development will demonstrate effective oral and written communication 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: An investigation of internship and workplace opportunities (O: 3, 5)**

Working as members of a group assigned to a discipline associated with the BIS program in Human Learning and Development, students present an introduction to the discipline by providing illustrative glimpses into educational and professional prospects in the discipline. Students' presentations are graded on elocution, organization, nonverbal communication skills, mechanics, and content.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Present analyses and evaluations of processes and systems related to the human learning and development field**

The Target is defined as 80% of our students to have "met or exceeded our standard" for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

93.75 (15/16) of our students achieved the satisfactory standard of 3 or above in their presentations. This figure is greater than the target achievement rate of 80%.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills**
The Target is defined as 80% of our students to have ‘met or exceeded our standard” for each learning outcome.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
93.75 percent of students taking the EDUC 3100 Intro the Careers class exceeded the standard by achieving 4.5 and above on their “elocution” scores during the oral presentation component of course assessment. And 94.1 percent of the students met or exceeded the standard on the "written skills" component of the final paper by achieving 3 or above.

M 2: Final Paper - CTW EPRS 4990 (O: 5)
Students submitted a final paper in which they identified an issue to research; included 5 scholarly sources and summarized each while doing a critical analysis of the literature; provided a thorough comparative analysis between the literature; discussed data collection methods and discussed how data were triangulated; clearly and fully identified and discussed the significance of the issue and the implications/consequences by taking into consideration context, assumptions, and data to be collected.

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

Target for O5: Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills
The Target is defined as 80% of our students to have ‘met or exceeded our standard” for each learning outcome.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
The target was also met on the “quality of writing” component of the final research paper for the CTW EPRS 4900 class by 100% of students.

M 3: Final Paper - EDUC 3100 (O: 1, 4, 5)
In this assignment that students completed as a final paper in the EDUC 3100 class, students engaged in an (a) analysis and evaluation of the systems and processes associated with a discipline(s) field of Human Learning and Development and (b) did so using critical thinking to address goodness of fit between personal goals and aptitudes and the job responsibilities, skills, and knowledge needed in the discipline. Their grades were assigned using a rubric (attached). Students' scores on section 2 of the rubric will be used for an assessment of the achievement of learning outcome #4: Use critical thinking in their decision processes. Scores on section 3 of the rubric will be used to measure students’ written communication skills (Learning objective # 5).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Analyze and evaluate the systems and processes associated with human learning and development disciplines
A target rate of 80% was set for students achieving level of "met" or "exceeds" for this learning outcome on this measure.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Of the 16 students who were assigned a grade on this assignment, 14 students either met or exceeded the expectations. Two students who failed to meet the expectations were graded 2 out of 5 which meant that (a) there were clear inaccuracies in their response, (b) Major aspects to be covered are insufficiently addressed, and (c) documentation for 2 or more site visits was superficial, lacked detail, and/or was incomplete. With 14 students achieving at least at a "Met" level, the achievement rate is 87.5%, which is greater than the 80% target set for this learning objective.

Target for O4: Use critical thinking in their decision processes
A target rate of 80% adopted for the attainment of this learning outcome by our students.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Of the 16 students who completed this assignment, 14 achieved at "meets" or "exceeds" standard by scoring 3 or above on section 2 rubric items. This represents a 87.5% rate of achievement learning outcome that is greater than the preset 80% target rate.

Target for O5: Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills
A target rate of 80% adopted for the attainment of this learning outcome by our students.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Sixteen students completed this assignment. 100 percent of the students were assigned a score of "meets" or "exceeds" on this assignment. This achievement rate exceeds the target set at 80% on this learning outcome.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

A number of important observations were made in light of the findings from this WEAVE reporting process: 1. It became clear that the measures we have used in program evaluation did not link with learning objective 2 as well as they did with the other objectives. A new set of measures are needed for learning objective #2. These may include the measures used in the internship courses (EDUC 4670 or EDUC 4982). 2. On the other hand, our measures provided at least three opportunities for the assessment of students’ achievement of the learning objective # 5 (i.e., Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills). 3. On all measures, target achievement rate of 80% was met with students showing the minimum expectation. With 87.5% the achievement rate each, learning objective #1 (Analyze and evaluate the systems and processes associated with human learning and development disciplines) and #4 (Use critical thinking in their decision making processes) were the lowest. Action planning efforts may be focused on the improvement of the achievement rate on assessments linked with these learning objectives. 4. Although small, an advantage
is seen for students’ achievement of the minimum standard for learning objective #5 on written final paper projects than through in-class group presentations. This may also be included in future considerations for building/incorporating support systems for rehearsing/practicing public speaking strategies and/or incorporating instructional/communication technologies that may be available through the University’s Center for Instructional Innovation.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Based on the analysis of student achievement of learning objectives, two areas have been identified for implementation of programmatic/instructional change: 1. with a 87.5%, the achievement rate for learning objective #4 (Use critical thinking in their decision making processes) is one of the lowest. An instructional change is envisioned that will include scaffolded activities (e.g., templates, modeling, reciprocal teaching, self-evaluation, etc.) to promote students’ understanding of and ability to use higher levels of critical thinking on the assignments of “Understanding Internship and Workplace in Human Learning and Development” and final paper in the EDUC 3100 class. 2. Although small, students appeared to achieve the minimum standard for learning objective #5 at higher levels on written final paper projects than when doing classroom presentations. In order to address this, instructional efforts will be included to provide support systems for rehearsing/practicing public speaking strategies that might aid students’ development of confidence/comfort speaking in front of others.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

Despite its infancy (2 years old), our program started to graduate students starting in December 2014.

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.

Assessments used for the current reporting cycle did not seem to be appropriately suited for determining the achievement rate of learning objective #2 in the program. Function in practical and inquiry based settings related to the human learning and development field. There are required internship experiences in the program through courses that may provide more appropriate assessments of students’ achievement of this learning outcome, such as weekly reflections of internship experience, midterm and final reflection papers, presentations. A challenge will be identifying assessments with strong bearing on the learning objective noted above.

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

The final paper in the EDUC 3100 course which is currently focused on students’ ability to examine graduate program study prospects for a future in the disciplines they are considering to choose in this program appears to lock students into thinking about graduate school. This may be an inappropriate requirement for students who are not interested in going to graduate school after graduation from the BIS program given the goals of this program for students to either explore career-oriented practical experiences as well as graduate school options following their graduation from the program. A modified focus in the final paper for EDUC 3100 will have students draw upon the site visits they conducted, the information (through videos/guest speakers) gathered about the disciplines and graduate programs studied as they consider the interdisciplinary potential between the two disciplines they would like to choose for concentrated study in the BIS HLD program.

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

None.

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

None.

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


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

None.

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the
retention, progression, or graduation of students. We have considered, and when appropriate, approved petitions of variance for courses in the disciplines of our program submitted by students. This facilitated students' progress toward graduation by transferring credits from courses with the same/similar overlap in rigor and content. We have made the final decisions on the basis of recommendations from our point faculty from disciplines associated with the courses petitioned.

**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).

In our program, our students are required to complete an internship experience. They can choose to do a community-based practical experience or a research internship with faculty in the College of Education. If students choose the community based internship option, they are to spend 200 hours at the site of their internship. With most students doing the community based internship as volunteers, they provide 200 hours of service and free help to the site of their internship in turn for supervised practical learning opportunity.

---
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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 progressio
**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 in detail of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.3/3.0. 75% of MS/HRM students met or exceed 2.0

**M 2: Intergration of All Compensation Components (O: 1)**

Inclusion, integration, and proper usage in MGS 8390 project of all components of compensation systems, including job evaluation, market wage analysis, pay structures, and compensation budgets.

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

**Target for O1: Compensation System Design**

At least 80% of the students scoring higher than 2.0 on the criteria in the Measure 2 Rubric. To be scored from randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately in detail describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.3/3.0. 80% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all.

**M 3: Job Analysis and Description (O: 2)**

In the final project in MGS 8360 students will Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE include a clear explanation of job analysis procedure and resulting job description and job specification.

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

**Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment**

Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Below Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 3: Inclusion 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.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.2/3.0. 85% of students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.2/3.0. 85% of students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.2/3.0. 85% of students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 4: Behavioral Interview Questions (O: 2)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Inclusion of detailed behavioral interview questions, and related scoring system and administrative guidelines, and work sample and other tests for an employee recruitment and selection system.

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

**Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 4 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Does not meet Standard (1) Meets the Standard (2) Exceeds the Standard (3) Measures 4: Inclusion and proper usage of behavioral interviews, work sample, and other selection tests Student designs behavioral interviews or work samples, but not more than 2 selection tests with no validation. Student designs behavioral interviews and work samples, and validation for both. Student designs behavioral interviews, work samples, and additional selection tests with validation for all methods.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Average faculty rating of 2.3/3.0. 90% 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 4: Understand and effectively apply 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Average faculty rating of 1.5/3.0. 55% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Average faculty rating of 1.5/3.0. 55% of MS/HRM students met or exceeded 2.0 on all.

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 Standard Not Met (1) Meets 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

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

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

M 9: Identify ROI of HR functions (O: 5)
Identify relevant costs of benefits of various HR activities
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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.

M 10: Link HR ROI to organizational profitability (O: 5)
Link ROI of HR functions to organizational profitability, including labor and productivity costs
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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 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>

<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>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Use of contingent workers (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of all relevant costs and benefits (monetary and other) to support the business case for use of contingent workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Use all inputs to build a case for contingent workers (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to use all relevant costs and benefits to develop and present a business case to support contingent worker use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Compensation System Design
With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's ability to design comprehensive compensation system, two actions will be taken:
- In MGS 8390 add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.
- In MGS 8390 provide a written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.

- **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
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 8300 and provide additional supplemental handouts on performance management. Evaluate after next offering.
  · Add a homework assignment in MGS 8300 on linking performance management to specific employer productivity measures. Require students to find research results for performance management techniques. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Added Case Example
Provide sample of case analysis with issues, laws, and conclusions. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: 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
Continue to review one week prior to due date 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: Kelly Grace
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Check coverage of topics in all HR core classes
Ensure job analysis and job description are taught in all HR core classes and covered at a minimum of one hour in each class. Give students more practice in all classes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Check coverage of topics in all HR core classes.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All core course instructors.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue emphasis on topic in MGS 8360
Continue emphasis on topic in MGS 8360. Since several different instructors have taught the course recently, not all are including
the topic. Check syllabi to ensure coverage.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Check coverage of topic across instructors to be sure it is being emphasized in all classes.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue in-class exercises
Continue to use in-class exercises and critiques of policy statements written in class. Give immediate feedback and opportunity for correction and additions.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Continue to use in-class rewrite exercise on policy statement formulation.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors in all core HR classes.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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)

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
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

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
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
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Mission / Purpose
The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and
industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals

G 1: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in P-16
The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the P-16 education sector.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Corp
The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the corporate 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. 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.
6. Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
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)
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. 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.
6. Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
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)
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.
Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**  
95% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through the internship experience.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
95% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through the internship experience.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**  
95% of completers demonstrated target knowledge.

Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**  
95% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through the internship experience.

Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**  
95% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through the internship experience.

Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
95% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through the internship experience.

### M 3: End of Course Assessments (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

**Source of Evidence:** Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
<th>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Continue to Monitor Curriculum**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **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
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
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report. Students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master learning outcomes in a variety of outlets. These include the various forms of in-class projects and assessments which come in the form of applicable assignments that they can make connections with to their professional lives. For example, students might develop samples of learning objects that they can use at their workplace. Students are also provided opportunities at internships where they can apply overall program goals.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings? Students who completed our program did so in all areas assessed. Our assessment findings suggest that the guidance we are providing our masters students who are all online has been effective. We continue to enhance communications via group (our program listserv) and private communication as needed beyond the set advisement times. Otherwise we see no need to make additional modifications at this time but to continue to explore online mentoring models.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process. All assessments in the masters program are developed, presented, discussed, and finalized by the faculty in the Learning Technologies Division. These are then collectively presented, discussed, and ratified. The process is overseen by the Coordinator and the department chair. Faculty also discuss at least each semester during department meetings, advisement week and students are evaluated on a rubric for each of the outcomes. Improvements are made based upon the outcomes of the discussions as needed.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans. Because of the positive outcome of existing strategies, we do not anticipate a need for any changes currently. We do anticipate the need to explore additional mentoring strategies online students. We did, in the last year submit a proposal for a graduate certificate program which, among other anticipated benefits, is aimed at increasing community presence.
Mission / Purpose
The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals
G 1: Produce Researchers in Learning Technologies
The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of conducting world-class research in Learning Technologies.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies
The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of world-class teaching in Learning Technologies.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Understands and uses technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

SLO 3: Demonstrates research expertise (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student demonstrates a general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

SLO 4: Engages in scholarship (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

SLO 5: Understands foundations of education (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

SLO 6: Develops a professional identity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The Ph.D. student develops an identity as a professional and contributes to a professional community of scholars and educators.

SLO 7: Develops an extended knowledge base (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student develops an extended knowledge base that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Develops leadership for the profession (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The Ph.D. student provides leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings
M 1: Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Target for O1: Understands and uses technology
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.
**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
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.

**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.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Evidence:</strong> Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Understands and uses technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O6: Develops a professional identity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Evidence:</strong> Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Evidence:</strong> Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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

**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

**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

**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
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...
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Complete analyses Goal 1 (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Related Measures: I M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives Measure 1 Understanding of International Business Environment – Critical Success Factor Analysis Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot sufficiently distinguish critical success factors, align major resources with these factors, and construct logical cause-effect relationships. Meets standards=2. The student can identify most critical success factors, and generally align most factors with firm's major resources. Exceeds standards=3. The student captures almost all critical success factors, tightly aligns resources with these factors, and effectively compares the firm's position in a thorough manner. Measure 2 Understanding of International Business Environment – Identification of Viable Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot set out clear, viable alternatives for action based on critical success factors in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generate some viable alternatives that are aligned with the critical success factors in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student generates clear and well-supported viable alternatives of action that a grounded in the critical success factors of the environment. Measure 3 Understanding of International Business Environment – Impact on Competitor Actions and Reactions Under the Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot clearly illustrate of explain how a competitive action will be responded to by rival firms in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generally set out the likely competitive responses to strategic moves in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student clearly sets out the impact of the alternatives on the competitors in the environment and incorporates it into the overall analysis and decision.

SLO 2: Complete Analyses Goal 2
Case analysis or a final paper that shows how business decisions are subject to international dynamics by demonstrating functional area knowledge in the context of international environment Measure 7 Extend Functional Skills in International Operations Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot sufficiently distinguish between domestic and international contexts. Meets standards=2. The student is able to recognize at least two functional areas and integrate them. Exceeds standards=3. The student can fully capture the implications of four or more functional area decisions.

SLO 3: Complete Analyses Goal 3
Measure 8* Understanding of International Business Environment – Critical Success Factor Analysis Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department. Meets standards=2. The student does a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department. Exceeds standards=3. The student does a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department an their skill level is distinctly higher than that needed for a pass.

SLO 4: Complete Analyses Goal 5
Measure 9* Team Skills Team Assessment Fails to meet standards=1. In peer evaluation forms it shows that:Student cannot work effectively with others, cannot incorporate functional knowledge, and problem solving. Meets standards=2. In peer evaluation forms it shows that:Student can 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 bring multiple views and perspectives to problem solving and create synergies from diverse perspectives. Measure 10* Team Skills Faculty Assessment Fails to meet standards=1. In team evaluation forms by the faculty of the team members:The student has not been an effective member of the team in incorporating knowledge and problem solving. Meets standards=2. In team evaluation forms by the faculty of the team members: The student has effectively worked with his/her teammates, incorporated functional knowledge and problem solving. Exceeds standards=3. In team evaluation forms by the faculty of the team members: The student has integrated multiple views and perspectives to problem solving, can create synergies from diverse perspectives and demonstrate critical thinking. * Kaufman, Felder, and Fuller (2000); May and Gueldenzoph (2003)

SLO 5: Complete Levels Goal 5 (M: 10, 11)
90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria. 30% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria.
SLO 11: Complete Analyses Goal 6

M.11: Faculty assessment of 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.

M.12: Faculty assessment of cumulative supervisor/company report
Non Pass: The company/supervisor fails to file a cumulative internship report, or files an incomplete report with missing sections. Pass: The company/supervisor files a cumulative internship report and provides brief description of the student's responsibilities and adequate execution of these tasks. Exceed: The company files a cumulative internship report and provides a commendation for outstanding work ethic and accomplishment of tasks and responsibilities assigned.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Target Levels Goal 1
90% of students will get 2.0 on Measures 1, 2 and 3
30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 1, 2 and 3

O/O 3: Complete Analyses Goal 2

Related Measures: I M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use. I M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations I M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and from firm level variable to conduct the analysis Measure 4 Country Market Analysis - Explicit Identification of criteria, Fails to meet standards=1. The student fails to consult reliable data sources and considers trends in less than three macro variables. Meets standards=2. The student identifies and consults two sources for data and analyzes the trends in three macro variables. Exceeds standards=3. The student consults three or more reliable sources for data and analyzes trends in four or more macro variables. Measure 5 Country Market Analysis – Data Interpretation, Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not apply the techniques developed in IB for country market analysis in data interpretation. Meets standards=2. The student generally accesses tools developed in IB in interpreting the data collected for a country market analysis. Exceeds standards=3. The student uses tools developed in IB to develop rich and insightful interpretations of the data collected in a country market analysis. Measure 6 Country Market Analysis – Delineation of different Levels in Analysis Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not effectively distinguish between the different levels of analysis in the country market analysis. Meets standards=2. The student shows an understanding of the different levels of analysis and conducts the country market analysis in that way. Exceeds standards=3. The student can effectively distinguish the different levels of analysis and integrate the different perspectives from each in the country market analysis.

O/O 4: Target Levels Goal 2 (M: 5, 6, 7)
. 90% of students will get 2.0 on Measures 4, 5 and 6 . 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 4, 5 and 6

O/O 6: Target Levels Goal 3 (M: 8)
. 90% of students will get 2.0 on Measure 7 . 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measure 7

O/O 8: Target Levels Goal 4 (M: 9)
80% of MIB students pass one of the three measures on their first attempt. . 90% of MIB students pass one of the three measures on their second attempt.

O/O 12: Target Levels Goal 6 (M: 12, 13)
90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Pass” criteria. . 10% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceed” criteria.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Measures (O: 1)

M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 2: Measure 1 (O: 1)

M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 3: Measure 2 (O: 1)

M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 4: Measure 3 (O: 1)

M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 5: Measure 4 (O: 4)</td>
<td>Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use.</td>
<td>Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6: Measure 5 (O: 4)</td>
<td>Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations</td>
<td>Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7: Measure 6 (O: 4)</td>
<td>Delineation of country level, industry level, and firm level variable to conduct the analysis</td>
<td>Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8: Measure 7 (O: 6)</td>
<td>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>
<td>Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: Measure 8 (O: 8)</td>
<td>There are three assessment methods, either one should be met. Completion of foreign language requirement at a foreign institution, passing an examination approved by the GSU IIB Department, or sit for an examiner as determined by IIB.</td>
<td>Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: Measure 9 (O: 10)</td>
<td>Team Assessment: Ability to bring multiple views/perspective to problem solving, and demonstrate individual performance when functioning in the team.</td>
<td>Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: Measure 10 (O: 10)</td>
<td>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>
<td>Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: Measure 11 (O: 12)</td>
<td>Faculty assessment of monthly internship report</td>
<td>Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: Measure 12 (O: 12)</td>
<td>Faculty assessment of cumulative supervisor/company report</td>
<td>Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Update Assessment Plan**
In order to attract more students the program has been modified in terms of format and focus. We are working to develop a new assessment plan in light of these program revisions.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status**: In-Progress
- **Priority**: High
- **Implementation Description**: In coordination with the Assistant Dean for Assessment, a committee consisting of faculty teaching in the program is engaged in the development and implementation of the assessment plan with the intention of collecting the first assessment data for this cohort in Spring 2013.
- **Projected Completion Date**: 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Leigh Ann Liu, Program Faculty, Tracy Widman

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2013-2014 Journalism BA**
As of 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University's Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a
deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students' oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors, about 840 are Journalism majors.

**Goals**

**G 1: evaluate information**
Students will be able to find and evaluate credible sources of information.

**G 2: objective analysis**
Students will be able to analyze and interpret information for bias and objectivity.

**G 3: apply standards when originating content**
Students will be able to apply ethical standards and conventions of journalism and related mass communication industries when creating original content, e.g. news stories, press releases, newsletters, etc.,

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 8: Write correctly and clearly**
Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve.

**SLO 9: Critically evaluate own/others’ work**
Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness.

**SLO 10: Apply numerical/statistical concepts**
Apply basic numerical and statistical concepts.

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

**CTW**

Adding the CTW course as a capstone to the Journalism curriculum will allow for additional assessment measures of students' research abilities.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning fall semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

With the addition of the CTW courses to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the critical thinking learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized in the junior-level and capstone courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning fall semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

With the addition of the CTW courses—specifically the capstone course options—to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the research learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning of Fall semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

With the addition of the CTW courses—specifically the capstone Media, Ethics & Society course—to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the ethics learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning fall semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty
With the addition of two CTW courses in the Journalism curriculum next year, additional measures will be easily included, e.g. embedded assignments in the junior-level CTW course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Beginning fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

Multiple measures

At least one more measure is needed to assess the theories learning outcome. A rubric to score a sample of student papers written about theory in Jour 3070 was abandoned this year but perhaps should be reconsidered. An assessment exam about theories was abandoned several years ago, but perhaps embedded questions in existing Jour 3070 exams should be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

Multiple measures

At least one more measure should be added to assess the diversity learning outcome. Perhaps a specific assignment requiring multiple viewpoints to be included should be required in at least one of the core Journalism courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

Multiple measures

At least one more measure should be added to assess the evaluation learning outcome. Perhaps a writing style/editing assignment or an embedded exercise about editing on an exam could be used.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

Multiple measures

At least one more measure should be considered to assess students' ability to critically evaluate others' work. Perhaps an embedded assignment in at least one of the Journalism core courses or an exercise on an exam should be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

Revised curriculum

The revised Journalism curriculum has more technology in more courses earlier in the major map than the existing curriculum. The assessment of the use of tools/technology will be much easier as embedded assignments in at least two of the new Journalism core courses will be measured. The curriculum revision will not be fully implemented until AY 2011 so next year will be a transition year, allowing for a pilot study of measures to be tried.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
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 EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Revise/increase number of goals to align all eleven learning outcomes with a goal.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty will assess each outcome to ensure that it flows from specific goal. This assessment will also identify goals not yet captured
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
### Data Collection Protocol

Improve collection of data and develop multiple measures for each goal/learning outcome.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty will determine most efficient and effective process by which data can be collected for assessment. In addition, faculty will determine assessment tools that best measure learning outcomes.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Rotate Assessment

Determine rotation of learning outcomes to be assessed in each cycle. Not all goals/learning outcomes have to be assessed every year, but each one has to be assessed regularly.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty will determine system by which all learning outcomes will be assessed at least once over a three-year rotation.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Student Work Selection

Random selection of student work rather than selection based on cross-section of student work by performance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Instructors will randomly select student work from several assignments for assessment
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Assessment Reconfiguration

Current assessment protocols need to be revised to ensure that assessments truly reflect student achievement. The program will need to standardize assessment tools and rubrics for each outcome, as well as create systems whereby students understand the assessment process and rubrics that will be used to assess achievement.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Increased analysis of secondary sources

Students should be given the opportunity to assess the validity of 'facts' drawn from sources by seeking to check those facts against third party data—governmental, academic or proprietary. Students should be required to rate the validity on a standard scale to be established by the class where assessment in taking place.

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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Kinesiology PhD**

(As of: 12/13/2016 06:08 PM EST)

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge**
Students will gain knowledge in Kinesiology and advanced knowledge in their area of research focus

**G 2: Problem solving**
Students will become better problem-solvers

**G 3: Skills**
Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in research, scholarship, and teaching

**G 4: Cultural Sensitivity**
Graduates are prepared to work and interact with individuals who are culturally and individually different themselves

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)**
Prepare graduates for careers as professors and researchers in higher education and research institutions

**SLO 2: Understanding of research (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 3)**
Graduates understand the concepts and applications of exercise physiology, biomechanics, exercise psychology, and physical education research methodology

**SLO 3: Specialization (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)**
Graduates of the program will have a subspecialty that strengthens their skills in their major concentration

**SLO 4: Grant writing and management (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 5)**
Graduates are prepared for careers that involve grant writing and management skills

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive exams and dissertation (O: 1)**
Students pass comprehensive exams and write dissertations that contribute to the body of research literature in the exercise physiology, biomechanics, psychology of physical activity, and physical education fields

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**
95% of students will successfully complete this requirement


**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
All eligible students passed their comprehensive exams. Two students graduated during the review period, and took jobs either in academia (professorship) or private industry related to their field. The target goal was exceeded.

**M 2: Research presentations (O: 1, 2)**
Students must present papers at professional conferences before they are allowed to sit for comprehensive exams

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**
100% of students complete this requirement


**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
25% of students met this requirement in the previous year. One reason this number is lower than normal is that the size of our PhD program doubled from last years reporting and we have a large number of first year students who presumably focused on coursework. This data will be discussed at our annual review of doctoral students that occurs in the spring semester.

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**
100% of the students will complete this requirement


**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Only 25% of the students presented research at research conferences before their comprehensive exams last year. One reason this outcome measure is low is the large number of first year students in our program who presumably focused on coursework and learning new research environments. This topic will be discussed at our Annual Review of Doctoral Students in the spring semester.

**M 3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)**
Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**

100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

60% of all of our students successfully completed course work in the area of statistics and research design. The reason this measure is lower than normal is likely due to two upper level students having already completed their coursework, and the large number of new doctoral students who may not have started coursework in this area. This topic will be discussed at our Annual Review of Doctoral Students in the Spring semester.

**M 4: Cognate (O: 3)**

Successful completion of the cognate portion of their doctoral program

**Target for O3: Specialization**

100% of students that successfully complete the program will develop skills in areas of specialization within their respective fields

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

25% of the students have completed their cognate studies, and the remaining 75% are on track to complete this coursework.

**M 5: Seminar and professional development (O: 4)**

Successful completion of seminars and dissertation grant proposals

**Target for O4: Grant writing and management**

95% of students will meet this requirement

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially 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 not completed this requirement. This topic will be discussed at our Annual Review of Doctoral Students in the Spring semester.

**M 6: 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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Cognate | Outcome/Objective: Specialization
- Measure: Comprehensive exams and dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
- Measure: Research and statistical design | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of research
- Measure: Research presentations | Outcome/Objective: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
- Measure: Understanding of research
- Measure: Seminar and professional development | Outcome/Objective: Grant writing and management

- **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.
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

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):

   1) Prepare for careers as professors and researchers. Students will develop advanced content knowledge in their respective field through several critical avenues: 1) coursework in their major and cognate areas, 2) writing research abstracts, manuscripts, and/or grant proposals with their faculty adviser guidance (typically associated with KH 9820 Research in Kinesiology), 3) presenting research papers at local, regional, and national conferences, and 4) general interactions with faculty during the mentoring process. Practical research skills are developed through a faculty mentoring process in research laboratories or field-based setting while students are enrolled in required Research in Kinesiology (KH 9820) courses that are repeatable. Teaching experience is mandated in the Residency requirements and are evaluated by faculty via KH 9795 Seminar for Graduate Assistants. Grant writing experience is also mandated by the Residency requirement and is usually addressed in the Advanced Research Seminar in Kinesiology (KH 9960) and/or with faculty mentoring in KH 9820 Research in Kinesiology. Service (departmental, college, and professional) experience is also mandated by the residency requirements and these may be addressed in the Advanced Research Seminar in Kinesiology (KH 9960) and/or with the student's faculty adviser. 2) Understand research in their field. Students will develop advanced content knowledge in their respective field through several critical avenues: 1) coursework in their major and cognate areas, 2) writing research abstracts, manuscripts, and/or grant proposals with their faculty adviser guidance (typically associated with KH 9820 Research in Kinesiology), 3) presenting research papers at local, regional, and national conferences, and 4) general interactions with faculty during the mentoring process. In addition, students develop advanced statistics and research design knowledge and skills via core program coursework and during direct application of statistical designs during research projects before (KH 9820) and during dissertation (KH 9990) work. Practical research skills are developed through a faculty mentoring process in research laboratories or field-based setting while students are enrolled in required Research in Kinesiology (KH 9820) courses that are repeatable. Grant writing experience is also mandated by the Residency requirement and are usually addressed in the Advanced Research Seminar in Kinesiology (KH 9960) and/or with faculty mentoring in KH 9820 Research in Kinesiology. Service (departmental, college, and professional) experience is also mandated by the residency requirements and these may be addressed in the Advanced Research Seminar in Kinesiology (KH 9960) and/or with the student's faculty adviser. 3) Specialization of students in their field. Students develop advanced content knowledge and practical research skills during research projects conducted before (KH 9820) and during dissertation (KH 9990) work. 4) Grant writing and management. Grant writing experience is also mandated by the Residency requirement and is usually addressed in the Advanced Research Seminar in Kinesiology (KH 9960) and/or with faculty mentoring in KH 9820 Research in Kinesiology.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We continue to place graduates in appropriate jobs related to their field and therefore is a strength of the program. However, several measurement findings were either lower this year than in previous years or have been consistently low. The sudden increase in the size of program and number of first year students can explain part of the results. However, some of these measurement findings reflect deficiencies in the assessment. Some of the measures do not make a distinction between students that have and have not reached doctoral candidacy in the review year. Therefore, it appears that some faculty may be unsure whether to provide data for a given question. I have met with faculty representing the different concentrations, and we continue to discuss revision of the assessment tool with the intent of simplifying it.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):

   Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is
used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

The assessment findings are typically discussed at annual faculty retreat, as well as specific program faculty meetings. Specific meetings with faculty representing the different concentrations are ongoing to discuss findings and to develop a new assessment tool. In addition, we will discuss findings and plans for new assessment at our Annual Review of Doctoral Students meeting that is planned for February 2015.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

There are no plans to change the academic program of study at this point considering major changes were made within the last couple of years. However, subtle changes in Residency requirements may occur to address professional development needs of the individual concentrations. If these take place, then a corresponding change in the assessment will take place.

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 biggest challenge over the next year is to revise the assessment in order to properly align it with the needs of the four distinct concentrations that make up the program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Law
As of: 12/31/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Georgia State University College of Law is committed to providing a high quality legal education in its full time and part time, day and evening programs. In order to fully prepare students for professional lives as practicing attorneys or professionals making other uses of their professional knowledge and skills, the College of Law uses a variety of teaching methodologies, including the case study method, the Socratic method, lectures, seminars, writing workshops, and clinical education. The College of Law seeks to produce students whose knowledge, performance and behavior exemplify the best of the legal profession. In addition to taking classroom courses, students are encouraged to participate in our two live-client clinics, the Tax Clinic and the HeLP Clinic. The Tax Clinic helps clients resolve issues with the IRS. The HeLP Clinic helps clients who come to the clinic with a variety of legal problems related to health problems. The Tax Clinic works closely with the IRS, while the HeLP Clinic works closely with Egleston Hospital and Atlanta Legal Aid. We also encourage students to engage in significant pro bono activities related to skills they develop in the College of Law. As of Spring 2007, 701 students are enrolled in our JD program. In the academic year 2006-07, beginning with Summer 2006 and ending in Spring 2007, 212 students earned J.D. degrees from the College of Law. Ten of those students earned joint degrees; a breakdown follows: JD/MPA - 2; JD/MBA - 7; JD/MFA - 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 RWAI and RWAI 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 analyze the existing law dealing with such issues; (iii) predict resolution of the issues by applying the existing facts to the existing law, or propose legal solutions to deal with them in the future.

G 2: Basic proficiency in legal research

All students must learn how to find the existing law, whether it be in the form of statutes, regulations or caselaw. Students must also learn the proper format for using and citing the law in memos, briefs, and other relevant forums.

G 3: Basic proficiency in fundamental legal principles

All students must learn the fundamentals of the American legal system. Once they learn these fundamentals, they may choose to "specialize" and take courses in specific areas of the law.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing (M: 2, 2)
The primary vehicle via which all students must demonstrate writing proficiency occurs in the required RWA I and II courses. All law students must take and pass these courses in order to graduate; indeed, they must do so in order to take any elective courses. In the Fall (RWA I), the objective is to have the students master the art of "objective writing." Students are first provided with a hypothetical legal scenario and "canned" research, already developed by the entire RWA faculty. Students must first produce a "closed memo," in which they objectively describe the issue, the relevant existing law, and their assessment of how a court would resolve the issue. The hypothetical is a "balanced" one, meaning that there are generally equally good arguments to be made that the relevant law supports one result or the other. The student must learn to identify and effectively present the different possible interpretations of the law, and the varying results at which courts might arrive. The memo is written as if a new law associate is presenting the memo to a senior law firm partner who needs to know whether or not to take on a client’s case. In the course of writing their memos, students receive constant feedback, both written and oral, from their RWA instructors. The final product is graded using a highly specific grading rubric.

#### SLO 2: Basic proficiency in advocacy legal writing (M: 2)
In the Spring (RWA II), the objective is to have the students master the art of "advocacy writing." This differs from RWA II in two primary respects. First, the students are no longer able to rely upon any "canned research." For this semester, they rely almost entirely upon research they develop on their own. The research skills are those learned in both RWA I and II, as well as in Legal Bibliography, a course taught by law librarians. Second, the product the students must produce for RWA II is a legal brief. A brief is a document presented to a court for the benefit of one party to a lawsuit. Thus, unlike the memos which are intended to present objective descriptions of the law, the brief uses the current law to argue for the position of the client the lawyer represents in a lawsuit. Students are assigned to represent one side or the other.

#### SLO 3: Basic proficiency in oral advocacy
In the final weeks of RWA II, the objective is to have the students orally present their "advocacy writing" product in a Moot Court competition. This competition, in which all first year students in all sections of RWA II participate against one another, utilizes upper class students, professors and practicing lawyers to sit as appellate judges and hear the students’ presentations. The key to an effective presentation is being able to answer the judges’ questions about the problem. Some questions are based solely on the students’ understanding of the law and gauge the students’ appreciation of the consequences of a court ruling for or against their clients.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 4: xxx (M: 2)

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 2: Production of satisfactory written product (O: 1)
Using the grading rubric in attached scoring sheets, students’ memos are objectively evaluated. They are given multiple opportunities to meet with instructors and write and re-write their papers.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing**

Our target is to ensure that every single student at the College of Law acquire the proficiency described herein. While that is not possible, our more modest goal is simply to say that students who do not achieve this proficiency will not pass RWA. In fact, there is a significant correlation between those students who do not pass RWA the first time (or at least make a C) and those who do not end up graduating from the College of Law. A significant number of students who are excluded for academic reasons at the end of their first year have either failed or done very poorly in RWA.

#### M 2: Writing Intervention exercises (O: 1, 2, 4)
In addition to RWA, all students must also take Civil Procedure I in the Fall and Civil Procedure II in the Spring. Traditionally, these courses have both been tested and graded using one exam at the end of each semester. Especially in Civil Procedure I, the exams have been almost exclusively essay exams. Since Civil Procedure is both required and rather esoteric (especially Civil Procedure I), it seems like a good course to attempt to assess and measure the degree to which students’ writing skills are up to par. Picking up on that idea, two Civil Procedure professors first started using a "writing intervention" program throughout the course of the semester to see if such interventions would improve upon the skills already first learned in RWA I. In its first iteration, one professor used the intervention program, while the other did not. So as to make fair comparisons of the results in the two classes, each professor otherwise used the same syllabus and the same final exam. The intervention used in the first (experimental) year and beyond consisted of giving students five three-page, take-home papers, in addition to the final exam. The papers were designed to help students learn how to break a legal rule into its component parts, analyze and apply facts to each of the rule’s elements, and make arguments on both sides. Two weeks into the semester, the intervention professor gave her students an initial single issue "practice" paper. After the students turned the paper in, the intervention professor read approximately ten papers to get a sense of the common errors and issues. Before assigning the next paper, she reviewed the IRAC formula (issue, rule, analysis, and conclusion) with the class. She also gave students general feedback on common problems she saw in the papers she read and discussed how to avoid these problems in the future. Since that first experimental year, these methods have been incorporated into that professor’s class, and they are being copied by other professors, as well.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing**

The goals of these writing intervention exercises are threefold. First, we want all students to become comfortable with practicing writing exercises. While the point of this practice is to succeed on examinations, such practice is good preparation for work as a practicing lawyer. Second, we want students to become comfortable with self-editing, so that they are capable of both writing good
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 principals in general management, human resource management, operations management, entrepreneurship, and the concepts that underlie the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations, as well as the skills to use this understanding effectively 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 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

---

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

**Revision of MGS**

Managerial Sciences needs to expand and improve its measurements. New measures have to be able to better detect the sources of the disappointing performance that MGS is experiencing relative to other students who are not Management majors. The first step in this will be having the department assessment team attend the daylong assessment workshop that the College is sponsoring on Sept 19th. Subsequently, members of the department assessment team need to apply lessons from that session and quickly develop new measures and ways of measuring. Those measures will then be implemented in the department in the 2008-09 cycle.

*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
*Priority: High*
*Implementation Description: Oct 15, 2008*
*Projected Completion Date: 09/2013*
*Responsible Person/Group: William C. Bogner*

**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.

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
*Priority: High*
*Implementation Description: 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 PTI and PhD instructors into any*
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 2013-2014 assessment cycle, we again used scores on students' analysis of a business case entitled “Nundies.” This case is comprehensive in that it 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 based on the point value of that item. For calculating the data for assessment, we look at the percentage that obtains when the points earned on an item are divided by the possible points for that item. In some cases, as in SLO 4 (Clear, Concise Writing) we tally the total across 4 items.

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 1 items on case analysis rubric Exhibits a solid understanding of the marketplace situation and issues facing Advanced Materials. Exhibits good insight into the into the introductory program that Advanced Materials has used to market Nundies. For the 2013-2014 Reporting Period (10 Points) Total possible points for this item = 10 Target score average = 8.5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

The average score for this item was 8.43 out of 10. (84.3% of all possible points. Out of 67 usable cases (students enrolled in MK 4900, Spring/Summer 2014) 17 students (25.4%) were above the target (9.0+); 35 students (52.2%) were at target (8.0-8.75) 15 (22.4%) students were below target (< 8.0) Although student performance, based on the average score, was about the same as last year (84%), we have seen an apparent improvement in the number who scored at or above target (77.6%) Vs. last year (67%). Thus, the average score was slightly below target, but we would consider this target to have been met.

**Target for O2: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools**

An average score of 85% or higher on items relevant to marketing metrics in case analysis. Specific tasks can include: Accurate break-even analysis and assessment of required break-even share of market. Appropriate product pricing given competitive set. Assessment of market size potential. Production of appropriate P&L or Pro Forma statement. Competent computation of contribution, margin and profit. Total possible score for this assessment item = 15 Target average score = 12.75

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score, across all sections for this Objective was 8.93 (59% of total possible points). This appears to be a decline from last year's results when 71% (on average) were at or above target. On the 2013-2014 results: 8 students (12%) were above target (13 or higher) 25 students (37%) were at target (10.5 - 12.75) 34 students (51%) were below target (less than 10.5). So, there has been some improvement in this measure when we look at the percentage of students who were at or above target (49% Vs 41% in 2012 - 2013). It is also noteworthy that 4 students received a 0 score for this item, which means either they did not address the item or they were unable to discuss the metrics that they had supposedly calculated. We have chosen not to treat these 0 scores as outliers because they are evidence that (for our department) too many students are leaving this university without the skills we wish them to have. Because there has been some positive news, however, we consider this target to have been partially 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

The average score on this item was 8.44 out of 15 (56%). As in past assessment reporting periods, there is evidence of an association between scores on the Metrics assessment (SLO3) and scores on this measure. The quality of one's recommendations about strategy is going to be linked with the quality of one's analysis of the data. In this cycle, of 67 students who were assessed: 1 Students (1.5%) scored above target 5 Students (7.5%) scored at target. 61 Students (91%) scored below target. This is a marked deterioration of scores on this measure compared to the previous reporting cycle when 45 students (64%) scored at or above target. We are puzzled at these results and will be delving further into this issue to see if we can determine the cause. Meanwhile, we are forced to report that our target was Not Met.

**Target for O4: Clear concise writing**

An average score of 85/100 on 4 items that assess clear, concise writing/presentation. Total points = 30. Target score is 25.5 Organization/Coherence: Logical, coherent structure guides the reader smoothly through the document. Good use of headings, sub-headings and paragraphing (5) Writing Style: Uses precise and accurate language. Sentences are well structured, varied and writing is concise and focused. (10) Mechanics: Diligently proof-read for spelling, punctuation and usage errors (5) Data Presentation: Graphs/Tables are well composed, properly labeled, appropriate and relevant. (5)

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

An average score of 85/100 across 4 items that measure clear, concise business writing and presentation of graphs/tables. In this cycle, these items totaled 35 possible points on the rubric. In the current cycle, the average of all scores for 67 students was 28.25 (81%). This breaks out to: 19 Students (28%) scored above target 29 Students (43%) scored at target. 19 Students (28%) scored below target There has been a marked increase in the percentage of students who have scored above target since the previous cycle when 14% scored above target. However, the percent who have scored below target is higher than the previous cycle has also markedly increases (11%). Because of this and the fact that the average score was below our target average, we consider this objective to have been partially met.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

The average score across three sections was 76% which is below the results we achieved in the previous cycle (80%). The explanation could be that students were not, generally, as well prepared for case discussion in this cycle. However, we will need to examine the data more closely to make a final determination as to whether this is the case or some other variable has caused the decline. At this point, we would rate this objective as Not Met.

---

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

##### Increase Usage of Written Assignments

We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they develop more assignments that require writing in their classes. This can be as simple as short, one-page reaction papers. We will also encourage them to require students to employ specific writing frameworks (e.g., memorandum) that force them to develop their thoughts logically and clearly. We must also note, here, that we are not writing instructors, and our students are required to take only one business communication course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Clear concise writing
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

##### Increased Class Discussion

We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they increase their use of class discussion through posing problem solving questions and the use of mini-cases.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall Semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

##### Increased problem solving assignments

The undergraduate curriculum committee will issue a formal recommendation to all undergraduate instructors asking them to include at least 3 problem solving assignments in their syllabus, with provision made for in-class discussion and feedback. We will also recommend that these assignments can be in the form of mini-case analyses. These are often present as end-of-chapter activities in most textbooks and should be fairly easy to implement. These could be either individual or group assignments. They could be take-home or entirely in class. What matters is that they provide students with opportunities to develop their logical and critical thinking abilities. We hope that the cumulative effect will be an improvement in our students' ability to articulate clear, feasible recommendations on major assignments. We will issue a recommendation along with a copy of this report to all undergraduate instructors.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions
- **Implementation Description:** Fall Semester, 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

##### Introduce Required Course in Marketing Metrics

In the 2008-2009 academic year, we introduced a new course entitled "Marketing Metrics". Our purpose was to better prepare our students for performing the kinds of quantitative analyses employed in marketing management. This is not a marketing research or statistics course but rather it covers such tools as break-even, margin analysis, pro forma development, etc. The course becomes a requirement of all majors in the 2009-2010 academic year. In addition, it will be a pre-requisite for MK 4900, in which these techniques must be applied. Our goal is to improve the ability of our students to perform these types of analyses and to apply the learning from them. We expect that this will be reflected in improved scores on assignments pertinent to this objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
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
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Require Marketing Metrics Course
As of Fall Semester 2009, all students entering the Marketing Major have been required to take Marketing Metrics as part of their plan of study, and prior to enrolling in the capstone course (MK 4900). The 2010-2011 Academic Term will be the first in which the majority of majors should have taken this course at the time of assessment via the instruments employed in MK 4900. We also will be recommending that marketing metrics be included in all required courses for the department.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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.

**SLO 1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 1, 2, 3)**

MS-MKT graduate will be able to identify marketing opportunities and problems.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Because we have only partially met some of our objectives and have not met one that is very significant (Marketing Metrics) we are disappointed, but not necessarily surprised. Although we have had a full year of the Marketing Metrics course which we have instituted as a requirement and a prerequisite to our capstone class (on which our assessment is based), we have seen no improvement in the scores on that Objective. Moreover, we have seen an apparent decline in scores that measure strategic thinking. Those of us who teach the capstone class have discussed this issue with instructors in the marketing metrics class. We are all rather puzzled as to why we are not seeing significant improvement. We will be disseminating these results, first to our department head and next to the undergraduate faculty. This reporter is also a member of our department undergraduate curriculum committee and I intend to have this issue placed on the agenda both for the next committee meeting and for the next department meeting. Other possible explanations are that: Our assessment criteria are too stringent. Our instructors have increased their expectations of student performance. We need to reassess the measures we employ with respect to our objectives.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

In the past, a copy of this assessment report has been forwarded to the entire department. However, because this has elicited no comments/feedback from the faculty, last year we sent the full report to the department head and a summary to the faculty. Except for discussion with our department head, we received no feedback from the faculty. Our intention is to discuss this report with the department head and those instructors involved in our Marketing Metrics and Capstone (Marketing Strategy) courses. We will also plan to include discussion with those faculty members who teach our required classes to solicit their advice on what can be done to improve student performance and/or our measurements of that performance.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

At this time we have no plan for systematic changes to our program. We feel that a full and frank discussion among the faculty is warranted first. However, as an individual instructor, this reporter has determined that even more emphasis on marketing metrics and methods for helping students connect those metrics with the business problems with which they are confronted in the cases they are required to analyze is called for. This has already begun to be implemented informally but a more planned approach with specific lesson plans will be developed and, it is hoped, implemented before the end of the current semester (Fall 2014).
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Application of Segmentation Analysis (O: 1)</td>
<td>Application of segmentation analysis</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 1)</td>
<td>Development of viable target market(s) and positioning</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Impact of Competition (O: 1)</td>
<td>Assessment of impact of competition on the firm's actions</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Solution Consistent with analysis. (O: 2)</td>
<td>Solution Consistent with analysis.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5: Realistic implementation plan. (O: 2)</td>
<td>Realistic implementation plan.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 5 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6: Attention to customer satisfaction. (O: 3)</td>
<td>Attention to customer satisfaction.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7: Attention to customer loyalty (O: 3)</td>
<td>Attention to customer loyalty.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 7 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8: Student defines the necessary information (O: 4)</td>
<td>Student defines the information necessary to address question.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**M 9: Student correctly interprets information collected (O: 4)**

Student correctly interprets information collected.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 9 Rubric to the common case assignment.

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

#### Communication of Assessment Results

Provide each faculty member who teaches classes to our MS students with the results of the assessment. These results, including the outcomes/objectives, measures and grading rubrics for each criterion, will communicate to the faculty what the program is striving to achieve. This information in combination with the assessment results will guide faculty in knowing what areas need or would benefit from additional emphasis.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Application of Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Attention to customer loyalty | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Impact of Competition | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan. | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Solution Consistent with analysis. | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Student correctly interprets information collected | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Student defines the necessary information | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Viable Target Markets/Positioning | Outcome/Objective: Identifying Marketing Problems and Opportunities

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

#### Evaluate current assessment case.

Evaluation of the current case being used to generate the assessment material. Specifically, we need to gauge whether or not this case provides sufficient emphasis on customer loyalty and customer satisfaction.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan. | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

#### Update Assessment Plan

In order to attract more students the program has been modified in terms of format and focus. We are working to develop a new assessment plan in light of these program revisions.

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

**Implementation Description:** In coordination with the Assistant Dean for Assessment, a committee consisting of faculty teaching in the program is engaged in the development and implementation of the assessment plan with the intention of collecting the first assessment data for this cohort in Spring 2013.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** Bruce Pilling, Program Faculty, Tracy Widman

### Georgia State University Assessment Data by Section

**2013-2014 Mathematics & Statistics Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/13/2016 06:08 PM EST*

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

#### Mission / Purpose

"Basic quantitative literacy depends on students being introduced to the foundations of quantitative reasoning and then given reinforcement experiences which develop and deepen in the student the habits of thinking which the student has been encouraged to develop. Taking one course is not enough to endow a student with a habit of mind, but completing a carefully devised program can provide sufficient practice to make a pattern of thought part of the student's intellectual tools. The construction of such a program requires leadership from the mathematics faculty and other faculty as well as commitment to the three other major points of this report." 1 The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is fully committed to providing all of the students of Georgia State University..."
with these foundations in the core courses and providing the university with baseline data for its students' abilities to perform quantitative reasoning. In particular, the department will use placement testing to help determine appropriate entry into the quantitative literacy program; and, provide foundational experience(s) within (usually) the first year of the student's college work. From the Preface of Quantitative Reasoning for College Graduates: A Complement to the Standards, Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics (CUPM), MAA. http://www.maa.org/past/ql/ql_toc.html

**Goals**

**G 1: Quantitative Literacy**
Quantitative literacy is knowledge of and confidence with basic mathematical/analytical concepts and operations required for problem-solving, decision-making, and real-world applications.

**G 2: Translation**
Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Computation (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students effectively perform arithmetic operations, as well as reason and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information.

**SLO 2: Translation (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: PreQL Success Rates (O: 1, 2)**
Pre/Post testing of student abilities basic quantitative literacy. Our idea was to test during the first week, middle of the semester as well as at the end. This would tell us the length of time associated with their learning. We have currently implemented the first two weeks and end of the semester quizzing. Regular course embedded assessments are used for the “middle of the semester” time. We intend on studying how to improve this by tracking those students that progress through lower level sequences.

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

**Target for O1: Computation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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, Math1113, and Math2211 in the fall and spring.

**Target for O2: Translation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 1111 and 1113 in the fall and spring. Many Math 2211 instructors 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 “Wilma and Betty” 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. MML and MSL give partial credit on this problem for the correct number of hours. The Desire2Learn would mark this completely wrong if either part is incorrect. The results of the “Coin Toss” problem are positive, since probability is a prominent subject in elementary statistics Math1070. As can be seen for both Fall semester and Spring semester the success rate increases from less than 70% on the pre QL's to above 70% on the Post QL. This gives clear evidence that Math 1070 helps the students improve their quantitative reasoning for these types of concepts. Though probability is not a topic covered in four of the five classes, an improvement on this question is clear at the end of the semester. It is interesting to note that the two classes that had formal Problem Solving Activities (Math111 and Math1113) often outperformed students in Math2211. Though probability is not a topic covered in Math 1113, it is clear to see an improvement on this question. As students complete the Problem Solving Activities (in Math 1113) during the semester, it is possible students might have developed analytical abilities to solve those QL problems and their performance shows an improvement at the end of the semester. For Math 1070, in addition to these positive results we also see that the success rate for the “Pie Chart” question has increased for both Fall and for Spring. As statistics is the science of data, this includes interpreting pie charts. This is another instance of evidence that Math 1070 helps the students improve their general quantitative reasoning. From the tables we find that in more than half cases students are reaching the success rate of 70% on these activities. In addition, we have seen improvement in the performance of students from the Pre- to the Post QL tests. Math1101 has not reached the success rate of 70% in most cases. There is a big room for the improvement. Our department had a target of 50% response (these are voluntary quizzes) and this target was met in Math 1070, 1111,1113 both semesters. If we try the same teaching model of Math111, Math1113 for Math1101, the success rate will reach 70%. It was hoped that using the “course coordinator” course would help these response rates, but too often the quizzes did not “drop” down to the individual instructor classes and so had to be manually uploaded.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

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. The assessment of pre/post QL is much easy to access. 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.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

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. Over the past years, MATH 1111 student learning outcomes have been improved to 76% from 60%. 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. A new teaching and learning software, eMATH, has been implemented and used in pilot courses of Math1111. The system is used in Summer 2014 to complete the preparations for Fall 2014. The course coordinator will complete the analysis of the results in the summer semester. Ongoing revision of the class material presented on eMATH is necessary and all instructors who use the new system will provide feedback during the summer semester. Some pilot studies have been done to evaluate the hours allocated in class and in the lab. An increase of success rate has been observed with longer lecture time and eMATH. As one of the coordinators for Math 1070 and Commons MILE, I, Leslie Meadows will be writing a statistics text to coordinate with the eMath software (which we will attempt to pilot in the Spring of 2015). The results for Math 1111 – College Algebra, which is currently utilizing the eMath instructional software, have been promising and we look forward to similar results with eMath and Math 1070.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Mathematics and Statistics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Ph.D. program in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics 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: Mathematics (including statistics) 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 and statistics can be used to solve problems. The Ph.D. program includes concentrations in mathematics, bioinformatics, biostatistics, and collegiate mathematics education. These concentrations address the critical need for mathematics faculty as well as the need for highly trained researchers in mathematics and statistics.

Goals
G 1: Mathematics/Statistics Professionals
Successful students will be effective and creative mathematics and statistics professionals. There are four concentrations: mathematics, bioinformatics, biostatistics, and collegiate mathematics education. Students graduating in these concentrations will have broad knowledge of core areas of pure or applied mathematics or statistics, and will be able to conduct independent research in mathematics or statistics.

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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

100% of PhD students who have passed the PhD Qualifying Exams successfully completed and defended their dissertations.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The findings indicate that the targets we set are appropriate and are met consistently. There are no recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process. We learned from the assessment that our PhD program is successful in teaching/learning and research.
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 fields.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O5: Ability to consult and understand the specialized literature in their major
ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were asked to consult a reputable undergraduate mathematical journal and select an article based on their overall mathematical interests. Then they were required to write a detailed mathematical review of that article.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
2013 Fall: Students in Math 4991 were required to attend five of the semester’s departmental colloquia. The purpose of this requirement was to instill an appreciation of the breadth and variety of mathematical topics, techniques, people and (academic) programs. There was one writing project (first of three) involving presenting a review of a research article from the American Mathematical Monthly. Another project (third of three) involved preparing a paper on a mathematical subject and presenting their work in class. 2014 Spring: There were three projects and two presentations. The first project was two write a report on proofs for two theorems (using LaTeX). The third project was to write a review report on one paper from American Mathematical Monthly (from within the last 5 years); and the last presentation was to present the review in class using slides (Beamer or Powerpoint). This enhanced the students’ ability to utilize specialized literature in mathematics.

M 2: In-class presentations (O: 7)
In-class presentations designed to measure critical thinking, oral, and writing skills necessary for reading, analyzing and presenting mathematical proofs.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O7: Mathematical proofs
ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were asked to give two in-class presentations on a topic from the textbook involving mathematical proofs, and the other on a research topic.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

2013 Fall: There were two in-class presentations. The first one involving presenting a review of a research article from the American Mathematical Monthly (which is part of a project). The final project involved preparing a paper on a mathematical subject and presenting their work in class. All projects were written up using LaTeX2e. Each student was asked to present one section of the textbook. A number of homework assignments were given during the semester, which helped students understand important aspects of the course. Grades on projects were based on clear presentation as well as correct mathematics. Some of the problems chosen for written assessments required students to use two or more concepts together to solve a problem they had not yet seen before. This means that students had to make an effort to gain a strong understanding of the concepts in addition to working example problems. The process, and not merely the final answer, is critical to their understanding of the material and their success in the course. LaTeX had to be used. 2014 Spring: There were two in-class presentations. The first presentation was to do a board presentation to teach one of the theorems; and the last presentation was to present the review in class using slides (Beamer or Powerpoint) on one paper from American Mathematical Monthly (from within the last 5 years). The instructor also added more peer grading for the in-class presentations, which boosted attendance rate as well as their enthusiasm level. Rigorous proofs and clear presentations were both emphasized.

**M 4: Technology Projects (O: 3)**

Technology Projects designed to measure the student ability to use Mathematica, Matlab, or Maple for solving mathematical problems of general interests, as well as their ability to use LATEX in preparing mathematical presentations.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Technology**

In Spring 2011, all students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were required to learn how to use Mathematica to solve practically oriented problems. All students were required to learn how to use LATEX and use it, together with BEAMER, in a research presentations.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

2013 Fall: Students used a variety of technologies in this class including LaTeX, Beamer, Powerpoint, Mathematica and Maple. For example, LaTeX had to be used in writing up the projects; A project (the second of three), called the Technology project, involved working with Mathematica and/or Maple V. 2014 Spring: The second project (out of three) was to write a report on investigating the dynamical behaviors of logistic map using Matlab. There were hands-on Latex and Matlab sessions in class, to make sure that everyone mastered the skill of using technologies. The majority of students learned both tools and were able to use them for their projects and reports. The projects and presentations were written up using LaTeX. The presentations were done via Beamer, Powerpoint, etc.

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

**Engagement of the Undergraduate Mathematics Commit**

Undergraduate Mathematics Committee will play an active role in the development of the assessment program for Math BS in AY 2011-2012. Members of the committee will discuss effective ways to perform assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>AY11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Dr. Enescu (the chair of the Undergraduate Mathematics Committee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>AY11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Dr. Guantao Chen (chair of the Department)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction to the software**

Students should be introduced to various types of mathematics software, which is needed 1. to solve mathematical problems numerically and display the results (Maple, Matlab, Geometry Pad); 2. to typeset a project report, a paper, or any other math text (LaTeX); 3. to make a quality presentation on a topic in undergraduate math (LaTeX-Beamer, LaTeX-Proseminar). The Department now has all the necessary resources. Students learn various types of software in Math 4991 as well as in some elective courses. Also the department will continue to actively support Mathematics and Statistics club and an undergraduate research program (RIMMES). Both of these have become a focus of interest among math majors. During the RIMMES final conference students make presentations using LaTeX-Beamer, LaTeX-Proseminar. They perform numerical simulations for their research projects with Matlab and other software.

| Established in Cycle: | 2009-2010 |
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Although this year's assessment turned out to be somewhat 'normal' or 'as usual', we can still learn a lot from it. Overall, we accomplished what we planned to achieve. Due to the nature of mathematics, we always face the challenge of how to let the students learn the skills on proof writing. And we believe the department is handling the challenge successfully. The assessment findings confirm that, via the CTW courses (as well as other courses), the students can indeed master the skills on writing proofs. The department will keep improving our educational program according to the existing action plans.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

No change in the educational program concerning the assessment process has been planned. We keep improving our program by carrying out the action plans. To be concrete, the undergraduate committee is still serving its functions; We try our best to improve the students' skills on writing proofs (via the CTW courses in particular); Finally, we make sure that the students are exposed to the software commonly used in mathematics and applications.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
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: 2009-2010
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: 2009-2010
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: 2009-2010
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 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: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the 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: 09/2009
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 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

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

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

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

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 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)
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** To continue monitoring student/program outcomes  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the 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 second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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
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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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 requirements. We will continue working closely with students to make sure they understand the standard well and work accordingly.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- 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 exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. Although the portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. In order to make sure that students have a clear understanding of the standards, more emphasis will be given to the portfolio standards during the advisement sessions that we hold once every semester.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the spring semester in 2014.
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 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 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 3: Facilitate Learning in Urban Environments
The teacher candidate will be knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners.
**G 4: Commit to the learning Community**
The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 4)**
The teacher candidate demonstrates content and pedagogical knowledge in Mathematics with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs (G: 2) (M: 3, 4, 5)**
The teacher candidate possesses a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students.

**SLO 3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners (G: 3) (M: 3, 4, 5)**
The teacher candidate creates a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

**SLO 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn (G: 2, 3) (M: 4, 5)**
The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator (G: 2, 4) (M: 6)**
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: 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: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

75% of the candidates will pass the GACE Content Tests (#022 & #023) by Spring 2014 but must pass these tests before the end of program.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

93% and 79% of the students have met the target. The most current data at hand for the year 2012-2013, for the GACE Content test #022 is 93%, which has met our target of 75%. The number of students passing the GACE Content Test for #023 is 79%. This achievement has also met our target.

**M 2: 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: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

85% of the candidates will meet the target of successfully completing 5 content courses.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students are moving along to complete their content courses. Students are rated from 1(did not demonstrate adequate content knowledge), 2(Partially demonstrated content knowledge), 3(adequately demonstrated content knowledge), to 4 (Effectively demonstrated content knowledge) with 2 being the indicator that students are moving along to complete their content courses for the program. Students can take these content courses anytime during the program. Thus 100% of the students are moving along to complete their content courses.

**M 3: KA#3 Planning (O: 2, 3)**

Evidence of planning will be demonstrated in the livetext portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**

85% of the candidates will demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students have met these categories [edTPA rubric 7-8], which is above our target of 85%.

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners**

85% of the candidates will effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of the students have met this category [edTPA rubric 2], which is below our target of 85%.

**M 4: KA#4 Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**
85% of the candidates will demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of our students have met the target. The data from edTPA rubric 7 and 8 [engaging and deepening student learning in content knowledge] demonstrates that 100% of our students are able to challenge and support students' learning by providing appropriate content. We will continue to monitor these standards closely as we implement the Common Core GPS standards for mathematics (CCGSP-M) and seek innovative ways of preparing our interns to address all standards.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**
85% of the candidates will demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners' needs.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of the students have met these categories [edTPA rubric 7-8], which is above our target of 85%.

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners**
85% of the candidates will effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
88% of the students have met these categories [edTPA rubric 6 & 9], which is slightly above our target of 85%.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn**
85% of the candidates will demonstrate that all learners can learn.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
88% [Average] of the students (TAPS 7-8; edTPA 7-9) have met proficient and exemplary levels.

**M 5: KA#5 Effects of Student Learning (O: 2, 3, 4)**
Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**
85% of the candidates will demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners' needs.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
88% of the students have met these categories [edTPA rubric 11-15], which is slightly above our target of 85%.

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners**
85% of the candidates will effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
88% of the students have met this category edTPA rubric 13, which is slightly above our target of 85%.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn**
85% of the candidates will demonstrate that all learners can learn.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
88% [Average] of the students (TAPS 7-8; edTPA 7-9) have met proficient and exemplary levels.

**M 6: KA#6 Disposition (O: 5)**
Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator**
85% of the candidates will demonstrate the attitude of a reflective educator.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of the students have met proficient or advanced levels in demonstrating their professionalism in the classrooms with diverse learners and their teachers.
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
Maintain admission criteria and advisement to candidates on taking appropriate courses and working collaboratively as a cohort. In the methods courses, we have collaborated with the mathematicians form the College of Arts and Sciences to teach a module of content.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Maintain and modify syllabi
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
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
Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

Co-Teaching with Mathematics Educator and Mathematician
The faculty, a mathematics educator has co-taught in the summer 2012 and will continue to implement this teaching strategy to improve the content knowledge and the content pedagogical knowledge in the methods courses. Research on the implementation was done in 2012-2013 and ongoing.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In the summer 2012, a mathematics educator and a mathematician co-taught a module of CCGPS - Statistics within the methods course. The feedback received at the end of the course will provide action for the future years in the program.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Junor Clarke, Coordinator of the MAT MTE Program.
Additional Resources: We had a STEM COE Mini-grant to assist us in the planning, teaching and research
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain and Monitor Development for Diverse Learners
We will maintain and monitor our students’ development for providing, monitoring, and sustaining positive learning environments for diverse learners.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4 Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn

Maintain and Monitor Development for Diverse Learners
We will maintain and monitor our students’ development for providing, monitoring, and sustaining positive learning environments for diverse learners.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): KA#5 Effects of Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn

Maintain and Monitor Development of Disposition
The data demonstrates that most students have a positive disposition of self. In the year 2013-2014: from fall to spring semester, there is a decline in the number of students in the advanced mode of disposition but the shift went to the proficient mode, which remains in the positive. There is also a decline in the number of students completing the program. Four students were advised to take their student teaching in the next phase due to their personal situations at the time. An action plan with the Associate Chair, the Program Coordinator, the University supervisor, and each student was developed to support each candidate. The Program Coordinator will monitor the return of these students for student teaching in the next phase. In the methods courses, we will continue to encourage students to develop a better disposition.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): KA#6 Disposition | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

Modify and Collaborate
Working collaboratively in cohorts, as students progress through the program has been beneficial to them. We will maintain, advise, and monitor our students more closely.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#1 Georgia Content Test | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Modify and Collaborate for Development
We will monitor the taking of their content courses in the program more closely.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#2 Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Modify and Monitor Instruction, Engagement, & Implementation
A new pedagogical tool “edTPA” is given during student teaching, in spring 2014 semester. In the academic year 2013-2014, students seemed to be in a developing mode as they plan to support diverse student needs. We will modify and monitor instruction, engagement, and implementation of the process. Faculty will continue to monitor students' development of planning skills.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#3 Planning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs

Modify and Monitor Instruction, Engagement, & Implementation
A new pedagogical tool “edTPA” is given during student teaching, in spring 2014 semester. In the academic year 2013-2014, students seemed to be in a developing mode as they plan to support diverse student needs. We will modify and monitor instruction, engagement, and implementation of the process. Faculty will continue to monitor students' development of planning skills.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4 Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners

Modify and Monitor Instruction, Engagement, & Implementation
A new pedagogical tool “edTPA” is given during student teaching, in spring 2014 semester. In the academic year 2013-2014, students seemed to be in a developing mode as they plan to support diverse student needs. We will modify and monitor instruction, engagement, and implementation of the process. Faculty will continue to monitor students' development of planning skills.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#5 Effects of Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs
Modify and Monitor Instruction, Engagement, & Implementation

A new pedagogical tool “edTPA” is given during student teaching, in spring 2014 semester. In the academic year 2013-2014, students seemed to be in a developing mode as they plan to support diverse student needs. We will modify and monitor instruction, engagement, and implementation of the process. Faculty will continue to monitor students’ development of planning skills.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4 Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs

Monitor and Collaborate

Working collaboratively in cohorts, as students progress through the program has been beneficial to them. We will maintain, advise, and monitor our students more closely.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4 Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Georgia State University
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(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 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

2.1 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, 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

90% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

Approximately 70% of the thesis proposals were approved for continuation on the thesis track. The rest pursued non-thesis options. 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
95% of the non-thesis students completed 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.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
92% of the non-thesis students have completed their research papers or project reports successfully in one semester.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The findings indicate that the targets we set are appropriate and are met consistently. There are no recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process. We learned from the assessment that our MS program is successful in teaching/learning and research.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 MBA/MHA and Concentration in Health Administration MBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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**  
**2013-2014 Mental Health Counseling MS**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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: Program Goal: Knowledge**  
Students are knowledgeable about current and projected needs concerning client and counseling practice in a multicultural and pluralistic society.

**G 2: Program Goal: Skills**  
Students who are preparing to work as clinical mental health counselors will be effective in addressing 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 experience as members and leaders group development, dynamics, theories, methods, skills, and other group approaches in a multicultural society, including group leadership or facilitation styles and approaches, and 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 a 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
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.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
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.

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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
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.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

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.

### 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 examinations.

### Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

90% of all Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 8100 will earn a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

### M 12: Suicide Assessment (O: 10)

All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

### Target for O10: Crisis Intervention and Assessment

All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.

### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

All Mental Health Counseling students will 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: Medium

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: Medium

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
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: All MHC program faculty.

Revises Practicum/Internship Paperwork and Placement

The paperwork and handbooks for practicum/internship experience are becoming obsolete for the outcomes we hope to measure in our MHC program. The paperwork can be more effectively utilized if it is transferred to a digital format. This action item will address the updating and digital transition for practicum and internship paperwork. Likewise, practicum and internship sites need to be reassessed overall for their suitability in providing necessary experiences for our students.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: MHC Practicum and Internship Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Our students in the Mental Health Program (MHC) are consistent in their performance within our program. Program faculty work hard to build a cohort that has the aptitude to meet the expectations of our program and can be successful in learning. From an applicant pool of >150 candidates, program faculty screen applicants, conduct in-person interviews with approximately 60 selected candidates and then finally admit 25-30 individuals for the program. The care in selecting appropriate students for the program contributes to the positive assessment outcomes for the MHC program. Additionally, our faculty is committed to consistent formative feedback for our students throughout their program so that students can make early adjustments to their learning and practice of Mental Health Counseling. Finally, program faculty engages in regular in-person meetings to review students’ progress/performance in the program and plan support interventions. All of these student-focused support systems empower students in the MHC program to meet expectations. There have not been any major changes in the program and this can be represent an area for growth moving forward.

It may be that we have reached an area of comfort in our systems for supporting and assessing our students. That area of comfort may reflect a need for creating greater challenge and raising our threshold for expectations with our students. As required by our major accrediting body (Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs - CACREP) we regularly hold community advisory meetings. These meeting provide feedback on the performance of our graduates in the profession and consistently our alumni are considered strong in the field of mental health counseling. Changes to our program may create even more opportunities for our graduates to become leaders and innovators in the field of counseling. It is expected that as we change and grow the program, some of our typically high assessment results may temporarily decrease as students and faculty adjust to changes. Finally, our assessment processes may need to be updated and that might account fro the lack of variance in the current report. To test this hypothesis, the program coordinator and other program faculty in MHC will be charged with revising/updating assessment practices for the 2014-2015 reporting cycle. It is expected that the report for next cycle will provide greater levels of detail so that student development and program development can be further refined to be responsive to both academic needs and the needs of the counseling profession.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Communication to program faculty of assessment findings happens at the conclusion of each semester (approximately 3 times per year). These meetings are attended by all MHC faculty and led by the program coordinator. Most assessments of students are embedded in courses, so course instructors send findings to the program coordinator to compile. The program coordinator then reports this information to the program faculty in a spreadsheet during the end of semester meeting; each student is reviewed individually in terms of performance in courses for the semester and performance throughout the program. Approximately 60 students (combined first year and second year cohort members in the 2-year MHC program) are reviewed in this way and strategies for supporting students are discussed at this time. During a yearly (typically held in December) community advisory meeting, the MHC program coordinator reports overall assessment findings for the students in the program. Feedback for improving the program is solicited from the community advisory board at that time. Lastly, feedback about the MHC program and the level of preparation of our students is solicited from sites where our students are placed for practicum and internship. This information is used to guide decisions about program development.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

As mentioned in response to question #2, there is no need for changes in response to current assessments findings. Growing forward, greater refinement of program and student assessments may be needed to provide richer detail related to student performance in MHC program. Specifically, this will involve revising goals, outcomes/objectives, and measures and findings. The timing for this revision will take place over the next year and will involve all MHC program faculty and some affiliated faculty who contribute to teaching and student development in the program. The purpose of the revision is to provide greater detail in the reports so that student needs can be better identified and addressed; likewise, the revisions are expected to provide greater connection between the learning and practice. This latter connection to practice will require input from the advisory community of professional mental health counselors. Overall, the expected outcome for revisions to the assessment process is to provide program faculty with a more detailed portrait of the performance of their students and to highlight areas for the program to grow.
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 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 7: Pursue professional development
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
## 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.

### 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 III (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and conferes 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.

### M 3: Teacher Work Sample: Planning (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students’ course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the final 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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Effects on Student Learning (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument. Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Professional Dispositions (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment for Dispositions is entitled &quot;Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies programs will demonstrate high levels of professionalism by obtaining a rating of "Exceptional" or "Acceptable" on the assessment of students' professional dispositions.

## 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</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): 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
- Measure (Key Assessment): Teacher Work Sample: Planning | 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2012-2013</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): 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
**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 to 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)

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Exemplary Proficient Needs Development Ineffective Mean Mode Stddev Professional Knowledge: The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences. 0 14 1 0 2.933 3.000 0.249

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**
90% of the candidates will scored at the level of proficient or higher.

**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2)**
Exemplary Proficient Needs Improvement Ineffective Mean Mode Stddev 2. Instructional Planning: The teacher plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students. 1 14 0 0 3.067 3.000 0.249 3. Instructional Strategies: The teacher promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key knowledge and skills. 2 12 1 0 3.067 3.000 0.442 4. Differentiated Instruction: The teacher challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences. 0 13 2 0 2.867 3.000 0.340 5. Assessment Strategies: The teacher systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population. 0 15 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 6. Assessment Uses: The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents. 0 15 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 7. Positive Learning Environment: The teacher provides a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all. 0 15 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 8. Academically Challenging Environment: The teacher creates a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners. 0 14 1 0 2.933 3.000 0.249 9. Professionalism: The teacher exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school’s mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession. 3 11 1 0 3.133 3.000 0.499 10. Communication: The teacher communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning. 2 12 1 0 3.067 3.000 0.442 Overall Rating 0 14 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000
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.

**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.
M4: 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.

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

Additional support in professionalism
Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty; field experiences director
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Strengthening knowledge of professionalism
While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between university supervisors and teacher candidates, thus will foster our teacher candidates' understanding and reflective practices of professionalism.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

**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

---
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**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the BSE program in Middle Level Education is to prepare teachers to teach in two of the following areas in grades 4-8: Reading, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Our program purpose is for our educators to be: 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of their chosen content fields. (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. (M: 2)**
Candidates plan, implement, and reflect upon a wide range of instructional methods through teacher inquiry.

**SLO 3: Candidates create meaningful learning experiences. (M: 3)**
Candidates create meaningful learning experiences that develop all young adolescents’ competence in subject matter and skills.

**SLO 4: Candidates demonstrate effective dispositions. (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. (M: 5)**
Candidates use a variety of teaching methods and assessment tools to measure and reflect upon their impact on their students’ learning.
### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Student Teaching Evaluation (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **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. |
| **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. |
| **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." |
| **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. |

### 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.

**Additional Resources:** None

**Revise target**

We will revise target.
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.

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.
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—semester calendar entries—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 be 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.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the five concentrations in Multiple and Severe Disabilities (Autism, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, Moderate, Severe, and Profound Intellectual Disabilities, and Physical and Health Disabilities), is to prepare graduate level teachers who are grounded in research-based curriculum development, instructional technology, data collection and interpretation, and the ethical foundations of the profession. The program prepares teachers to be responsive to the learning needs of students, the concerns and questions of parents, and the collaborative needs of related professionals. The program provides students with recommendation for certification in its respective areas (e.g., Special Education: General Curriculum, Special Education: Adapted Curriculum, Physical and Health Disabilities, Deaf/Hard of Hearing).

Goals

G 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

G 2: Understands student development regarding learning.
Understands student development regarding learning.

G 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

G 4: Can effectively plan for and assess instruction.
Can effectively plan for and assess instruction.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy. (G: 1) (M: 1)
The teacher demonstrates understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches by creating learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.


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. National Association for the Education of Young Children standards (ECSE).

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. National Association for the Education of Young Children standards (ECSE).

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. National Association for the Education of Young Children standards (ECSE).

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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
With an n of 12 students, 83% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric. The range was 2 - 4 with a mean of 3.48.
M 2: Pupil Change Project (O: 2)
P-12 change project using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include a description of the behavior to be changed, a treatment for change, baseline and treatment data or pre and post instructional data, and analysis and discussion of the results.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn**
90% or more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the pupil change project rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
With an n of 22 students, 100% of students scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the pupil change project rubric. The range was 3.4 - 4 with a mean of 3.94.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
With an n of 21 students, 100% of the students scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3.5 - 4 with a mean of 3.91.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
With an n of 39 lesson plans (and several students having been scored on 2 lesson plans), all but one student, 97%, scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The range for scores on the lesson plan rubric was 2 - 4 with a mean score of 3.83.

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

**Current data collection**
Indicators for weave data of MSD students were strong for 2013-14. In three of four areas (pupil change, performance, and lesson planning), the target of 90% was met. Two of the areas, pupil change and performance, were particularly strong with mean scores of 3.9 and above. In the one area where the target was not met, teaching content sequence, two of the 10 students (83%) rated scored below a 3 out of 4. In 12-13, this area was strong at 96%, though it was at 84% in 11-12. The MSD faculty will again discuss the teaching sequence rubric and related content to see if changes are indicated. Faculty will continue discussions regarding how WEAVE data utilizes the Livetext data that is part of the NCATE and PAAR reports.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.

**Implementation Description:** MSD faculty to meet to discuss results and current data system particularly targeted teaching content sequence.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: MSD faculty

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Music Assessment of Core**

*(As of 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST)*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence for all students.
## Goals

**G 1: Humanities/Fine Arts Goal**  
Students will effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Evaluation of Performance (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students will be able to provide critical evaluation of a specific musical performance including expression of musical insight into the pieces played.

## Strategic Plan Associations

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

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Music Society and Culture (O: 1)**  
All students enrolled in Music, Society and Culture were required to write a report on a large ensemble concert they had attended. Eligible ensembles were limited to School of Music groups only giving the students seven ensembles from which to choose. The report is assessed on, among other items, grammar and sentence structure, accuracy of musical terminology, and musical insight. Please refer to the uploaded rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Evaluation of Performance**  
We expect 80% of the students enrolled in Music, Society and Culture to receive an acceptable rubric score on this single evaluation.

**Findings 2013-2014**  
- **Target:** Not Reported This Cycle  
  - No data collected in 2013-14

## 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

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2013-2014 Music Bachelors**
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 excellence 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)
Students must acquire the skills to improvise at a rudimentary level.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data collected in 2013-14.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No data collected in 2013-14.

**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):**
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Music Masters
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
10 of 10 (100%) 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.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
32 of 39 (82%) received a 3 or 4 on the project. Scale: 1. Not adequate. 2. Adequate, but below expectations. 3. Meets expectations. 4. Exceeds expectations. Action Plan to Improve Future Results: Provide time and opportunity for students to resubmit their assignment in order to earn the minimum criteria of 3. Meets 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

Time and opportunity for assignment resubmission
Provide time and opportunity for students to resubmit their assignment in order to earn the minimum criteria of Meets Expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Bibliography Project | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: Work with course instructor to further develop timeline in MUS 8000 for the assessment project.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2015
Responsible Person/Group: School of Music Graduate Director Course instructor of MUS 8000
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   The target "Bibliography Project" occurs in the Master of Music program's first Fall semester of study in the course MUS 8000 Introduction to Graduate Study. The target "Recital Jury" occurs in the Master of Music program's final semester of study (Spring) in the course MUS 8590 Solo Recital.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

   For the Recital Jury target (MUS 8590), the findings exceed the desired results. The findings reveal that Master of Music graduate students have had semesters to prepare their recital repertoire. The jury is the test that they are finally ready for their recital. The results are indicative of the preparation prior to the Recital Jury. For the Bibliography Project (MUS 8000), the findings are below the desired results by 3%. The assessment project may need tweaking in order to develop time and opportunity for a larger percentage of students to earn the scale ranking of 3. Meets expectations

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

   Assessment findings are shared with the instructors of MUS 8590 and MUS 8000, as well as the Interim Chair of the School of Music. Analysis of success and improvement are discussed in order to best develop WEAKE assessments at the graduate level.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

   Assessment Findings for Program Improvement are in the process of being formalized.
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Six students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all six passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Six students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all six passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration**
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Six students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all six passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

**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
Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
One student proposed a dissertation for the first time and was approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
One student proposed a dissertation for the first time and was approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
One student proposed a dissertation for the first time and was approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.

M 3: Dissertation Defense (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students write a dissertation and defend it orally. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Three students defended a dissertation for the first time and all were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Three students defended a dissertation for the first time and all were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Three students defended a dissertation for the first time and all were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.

M 4: Annual Review (O: 1, 2, 3)
Each student's performance and progress is evaluated annually. At the end of each spring semester, students submit an annual report describing their research, academic activities, and accomplishments using a specific form designed for that purpose (Annual Report Form- see Document Repository). At the same time, the Director of Graduate Studies solicits feedback from graduate faculty regarding student performance in class, research activities, and/or as a teaching assistant. Based on the annual report and feedback from faculty, the advisor writes a letter to the student summarizing the student's accomplishments, feedback from other faculty, and provides feedback and advice for the future year. The annual report and the advisor's letter are reviewed in June by the graduate faculty at a meeting called for that purpose.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
There were serious concerns with one out of 43 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 2.3% 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.
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):
Measure: Annual Review | Outcome/Objective: Neuroscience Theory and Content

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: Communication and Collaboration

Additional Resources: None

Qualifying 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.
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: Neuroscience Theory and Content

Implementation Description: First year students have already been instructed to take Neur 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

Time management 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: Qualifying Exam; Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Implementation Description: NI has biweekly faculty meetings.

Project Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

We have three SLOs: 1 Neuroscience Theory and Content; 2 Critical Thinking Skills; and 3 Communication and Collaboration. Students learn, practice, and master these SLOs in different and varied activities. SLO 1 Neuroscience Theory and Content and SLO 2 Critical Thinking Skills are learned in parallel and in several venues. One is formal course work, including core courses for first-year students, and advanced and specialty courses for other students. A second venue is in less formal activities such as attending research seminars, academic conferences, symposia, and student preparation for their qualifying exam (takes place during fall semester of third year). A third venue is in their laboratory research projects, where they are actively engaged in reading, researching, and writing their finding, including writing their dissertation proposal and dissertation. SLO 3 Communication and Collaboration is mastered in many of the same activities as with SLOs 1 and 2, as well as more. All graduate courses have discussion components, and many require students to present. Seminars, conferences, and lab meetings provide other opportunities to support student efforts in communication and collaboration. Students have training opportunities through teaching laboratory sections, guest lecturing, and in some cases being teacher of record for a course. The qualifying exam, dissertation proposal, dissertation defense, and annual review all require use and therefore development of communication skills. Finally, most laboratory research projects involve collaborations amongst lab members.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We have not had any recent program changes, so there is no impact of that on student learning. Students are succeeding in meeting SLO 1 Neuroscience Theory and Content and SLO 2 Critical Thinking Skills. Students are succeeding in meeting SLO 3 Communication and Collaboration.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment finding are shared and discussed with faculty in several venues. NI has biweekly faculty meetings. Each year, at one of these meetings, the NI faculty meet to discuss the outcome of the annual reviews of all students, and based on those discussions,
recommendations are made regarding the training program for each student. At intermittent faculty meetings, the faculty are presented with data on the graduate training program, such as how students are meeting milestones, and the ensuing discussions help with our assessment.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

This summer and early fall, we completed an analysis of our graduate program since its inception in January 2010. We focused on assessment of meeting of milestones and other outcomes, and what we can do to improve in this area. Our findings have led to formation of an ad hoc committee, the curriculum & milestone committee, which has evaluated several stages in students’ progression through our program, especially the nature and timing of the core course requirement and the qualifying exam. This committee is in the process of making recommendations to the director of graduate students and the graduate program committee, which is reviewing these and will make recommendations to the NI faculty for discussion and consideration of implementation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Nursing BS
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing is to create a premier multicultural learning environment that produces leaders, clinicians, scholars and researchers who exemplify nursing excellence and enhance healthcare delivery to Georgia and beyond.

Goals
G 1: Critical Thinking
Apply the unique knowledge and skills of nursing such as leadership, patient safety, collaboration and critical thinking in providing and promoting healthcare to clients from a diverse background in a variety of settings.

G 2: Research
Integrate knowledge of evidence based practice, informatics and quality improvement to provide safe effective care for individuals, families and communities.

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
O/O 1: CTW (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Graduates who enter the program in Fall 2009 or thereafter will take two critical thinking through writing courses.


O/O 2: Critical Thinking Exam (G: 1) (M: 3)
Students in the nursing program will complete a standardized critical thinking exam in their first semester and the last semester of the nursing program. 85% of UG students scoring less than national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment will show an improvement on the exit Critical Thinking Assessment


O/O 4: Research Article Critique (G: 2) (M: 5)
All students will complete a research article critique as part of the course work in NURS 3500 and will obtain a minimum of 74% of the possible points on the rubric.


O/O 5: Literature Search Activity (G: 2) (M: 6)
All students enrolled in NURS 3500 Nursing Reserach will complete a literature search activity paper on a topic related to nursing. Students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points on the rubric.

grounded in the translation of current evidence into one’s practice.

**O/O 6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (G: 3) (M: 7)**
Graduates of the pre-licensure program will successfully complete the NCLEX with a first time pass rate of 85% or better.


**O/O 7: Exit Survey (G: 3) (M: 8)**
Graduating seniors completing the exit survey will indicate that they felt prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).


### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: CTW NURS 2080 (O: 1)**
Students enrolled in NURS 2080 will complete four clinical narratives and by the fourth clinical narrative 85% will be demonstrating an increased performance in their critical thinking as evidence by an increased score in item six (Critical thinking is evident in the clinical narrative and during the decision making process) of the rubric.

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

**Target for O1: CTW**
All students enrolled and completing NURS2080 will complete the 4 required narratives. 85% of students completing the activity will show an increase in critical thinking as evidenced by an increased score on the 4th narrative.

**M 2: CTW NURS 4600 (O: 1)**
95% of students enrolled and completing NURS 4600 will complete the CTW assignment and obtain a minimum of 74% on the evaluation rubric.

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

**Target for O1: CTW**
All students enrolled and completing NURS4600 will complete the CTW assignment. By the 3rd submission, 95% will achieve the required score of >74%.

**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

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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).

**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).

**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
- **Implementation Description:** This is the end of the next academic year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
- **Additional Resources:** None at this time

**CTW NURS 2080**

NURS 2080 will develop clearer objectives related to this writing project. Consistent graders for each student's paper will be initiated Fall 2009. All graders will meet in the beginning of the semester to discuss issues noted the previous semester. One instructor will review all papers for a consistent numeric grade.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** By the end of Fall 2009 semester, these changes will be in place.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty assigned to NURS 2080
- **Additional Resources:** None at this time

**CTW NURS 4600**

We will continue to monitor the CTW assignment in NURS 4600 for continued achievement of target goal.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Continue to monitor for this academic year.
**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: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The course administrator for NURS 3500
Additional Resources: None at this time

**NCLEX First Time Pass Rate**
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON along with the Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program will continue to monitor the first time pass rate of graduating seniors. Graduates are encouraged to notify the school of NCLEX success.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate
Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program
Additional Resources: None at this time

**Research Article Critique**
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the article critique.

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

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

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

Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Administrator NURS3610 and NURS3710 The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee
Undergraduate Program Committee

Add weight to the Exit test

The course administrator has added consequences to this test. The students did improve on this measure, yet the goal of 85% has not been reached. The students will continue to have consequences related to this standardized test. The course administrator will continue to make sure the students are aware of the consequences and make sure the consequences are significant enough to warrant attention to this exit activity.

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

Projected Completion Date: 10/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator along with consultation from the UG program coordinator.
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Continued observation of 2080 writing assignment
It is commendable that the target was exceeded for Spring 2011. However the target was not met for the Fall 2010 class. This years overall score was significantly improved from the last cycle. For this reason the UG program coordinator has met with the faculty involved in this course and reviewed practices. Continued surveillance will result and we anticipate continued improvement in this area.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: The course administrator, a relatively new faculty member, has met with the UG program coordinator and discussed ways to improve the student's attention to this activity. Continued monitoring will take place with results submitted and evaluated every semester.

Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator and UG program coordinator.
Additional Resources: none

Evidence Based project
The focus of this project has changed slightly to reflect a more direct approach to this end. The expectation now include a review and not a formal paper. The end result of using evidence continues, but the assignment will change beginning summer 2010. This more closely reflects how a nurse would use the evidence in a real world situation.

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

Implementation Description: Changing the assignment to reflect a more real world approach
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Course administrators for NURS3610 and NURS3710 along with the UG program coordinator
Additional Resources: none

Summer graduates and plan to increase pass rate
While the overall pass rate far exceeded the goal and exceeded the state and national pass rate, we noticed some interesting information. 3 of the 6 failures for the period of inquiry were graduates from the summer class. This class constituted 19 of the total 123 students. For this reason, we looked at the difference in this group of students or perhaps the way they are taught and evaluated in the summer. The course administrator along with the UG program coordinator and the assistant dean for nursing decided that the summer 7 week session was too short to deliver all the required material. Additionally, the course had no attendance policy, and the students did not attend class with regularity. For Summer 2012, the course will be delivered during a 10 week session as many of the clinical nursing courses are, and the attendance policy will be written in the syllabus and enforced.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

Implementation Description: Summer 2012
Responsible Person/Group: NURS4610 course administrator
Additional Resources: none

Action plan to include revised measurement
Will change measurement to more accurately reflect progress of students. New measure will be: 85% of UG students scoring less than national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment will show an improvement on the exit Critical Thinking Assessment

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam

Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: UG Faculty
Additional Resources: none

Revised target
The target will be revised to more accurately reflect the students accomplishments in the area of Evidence Based Practice. the new target will read: 85% of students enrolled in NURS3610 will achieve a score of 74% or better according to the rubrick on an evidence based practice paper. 85% of students enrolled in NURS3710 will achieve a satisfactory score according to the guidelines on an evidence based practice exercise on the first attempt.

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

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

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students met/exceeded this measure.

Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing
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.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
92.5% of students indicated they meet this objective very well or well.

Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice
In the end of program evaluation, 80% of the students will indicate that they met or exceeded the objective of analyzing a variety of approaches used in the practice of nursing.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In the end-of-program evaluation 97.6% (n=50) of students indicated a met or exceeded.

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)

Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing
100% of the students enrolled in the clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
90% 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 92.5% of students indicated that they are able to make ethical decisions related to patient care.

Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice
See measure 1, target/finding 5.
### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the end-of-program evaluation 97.6\% (n=50) of students indicated a met or exceeded

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the end of program survey, 100\% (n = 52) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice of students reported that they met/exceeded this measure.

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

89\% (n = 52 )of the students completing the end of program survey indicated that they met/exceeded the expectations of evaluating concepts and theories related to advanced nursing practice

#### M 4: Demonstration of Caring in Nursing Practice (O: 5, 9)

At end-of-program, 90\% of the students will indicate they 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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the end-of-program evaluation 97.6\% (n=50) of students indicated a met or exceeded

#### Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice

At the end-of-program, 90\% of graduating students will indicates that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the end of program survey, 100\% (n - 52) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice of students reported that they met/exceeded this measure

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the end of program survey, 100\% (n - 52) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others.

#### Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice

See Measure 6, target/objective 9

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the end of program survey, 100\% (n - 52) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice of students reported that they met/exceeded this measure

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

92.56% (47/52) graduating students indicated that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice. But, only 70.47% (40/52) report understanding basis principles of statistical testing. On the other hand 92.62% (49/52) indicate they were prepared to evaluate the need for change to improve practice and 99% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Alumni data not available.

**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.

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

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% 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 meet; action plan under development.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

97.6% (51/52) 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.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of students met/exceeded this measure

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In the end of program survey, 100% (n - 52) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Will work with Lewis School Alumni Relations Officer on the best way to obtain this data.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students met/exceeded this measure

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Work with Lewis School Alumni Relations Officer about the best method to go about obtaining this data. Action plan continues.

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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of students met/exceeded this measure

Target for O11: Professional Membership
Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will report membership in professional nursing organizations (80%).

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Continue action plan to obtain alumni data specific to MS program.

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 meet; 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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of the students enrolled in the clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses

Target for 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% 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 sociopolitical forces on health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
98.2 % (51/52) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded this program objective

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

**Action Plan Development Following Master's Program Evaluation**
An action plan will be developed at the completion of the full evaluation of the master's program in December 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Practice in Specialty Area | Outcome/Objective: Practice in Specialty Area
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director for Academic Affairs; Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Action Plan Development Following Master's Program Evaluation

We will be developing an action plan following the completion of the full evaluation of the master's program that should be completed in December 2010.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director for Academic Affairs Faculty
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Scholarly Productivity | Outcome/Objective: Scholarly Productivity

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

  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Participation in Research | Outcome/Objective: Scholarly Productivity

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

  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

  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Professional Membership | Outcome/Objective: Professional Membership

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.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   See attached matrix

2. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

   Previous academic year's evaluation results are distributed to stakeholder at the beginning of each academic year. An example of how data results were used from 2012-2013: There were ongoing concerns regarding the dual specialty track in Adult Health CNS/NP. Students found the program to be too long with too many clinical hours. This delayed time to graduation. Over the past year the MS faculty and students put together a proposal to separate the dual specialty effective fall 2014. This will enable students to have a choice of specialty, decrease the time to graduation and ensure transparency of the clinical hours.

3. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program
and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

See above.

Annual Report Section Responses

**Most important accomplishments for year**—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

The MS program achieved another 10 year CCNE certification. The evaluators were at the SON Sept 2013 and found no major concerns. The Masters Program Committee developed a Preceptor/Student Manual to orient students and clinical preceptors to the clinical requirements of clinical courses. Separated Adult Health dual specialty track effective Fall 2014.

**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 School of Nursing has had a significant decrease in faculty over the past 2 years (a decrease in 8 with 3 temporary hires). This has impacted the number of students admitted to the master's program. We have become more reliant on part time faculty.

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

Reported in Digital Measures for each faculty member.

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

Reported in Digital Measures for each faculty member.

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

Reported in Digital Measures for each faculty member.

**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 Master's program coordinator has added noting midterm failure rated to help predict student success or failure of a course. Intensive advisement by course administrators, faculty, and advisors take place with referrals to counseling center. We will continue to trend and report during the next cycle.

**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 Nursing Collaborative, administered by Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, have relationships with Head Start facilities and homeless shelters in the community in order to provide physical exams and basis health care to children and adolescents.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Nursing PhD**

As of 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Doctor of Philosophy in Nursing Program is to prepare nurse scholars to be educators, leaders, and researchers who will engage in nursing and inter-disciplinary work that is grounded in nursing practice, provides leadership for the profession, and advances positive health outcomes for national and global populations.

Save

Goal 2 of the GSU Strategic Plan: Significantly strengthen and grow the base of distinctive graduate and professional programs that assure development of the next generation of researchers and societal leaders

**Goals**

**G 1: Research Implementation**

Plan and implement research to solve challenging health problems in our national or global population.

**G 2: Theory Utilization**

Link theory and research to the promotion of health in vulnerable population.

**G 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

Explore, develop, and disseminate research findings.

**G 5: Leaders of Changes**

Assume academic and clinical roles in education, administration, research, and health related practice.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
**SLO 1: Research Implementation (G: 1, 2) (M: 6, 7, 8, 9)**
Graduating students will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

Relevant Associations:
GSU Strategic Plan Goal 2: Significantly strengthen and grow the base of distinctive graduate and professional programs that assure development of the next generation of researchers and societal leaders

**SLO 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 6, 7, 8, 9)**
Students will demonstrate skills in the collection and analysis of qualitative data.

**SLO 5: Leaders of Change (G: 1, 2, 4, 5) (M: 9, 10)**
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 6: Dissertation (O: 1, 4)**
100% of the graduates will conduct socially relevant research.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Research Implementation**
100% of graduates will complete and defend the dissertation. 100% of dissertation topics will focus on health or health care.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
26 students in the program continue to work on course work, comprehensive exams, and dissertations. No one completed the dissertation and defense during 2013-2014. Action Plan: Recruit and retain senior faculty to assist, guide and help fund PhD students so that approximately the same number of students are entering and completing each year.

**Target for O4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**
95% of graduates will demonstrate competence in qualitative data collection and analysis, a requirement in NURS 8012 (core course).

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of the 26 students in the program have demonstrated competence in qualitative data collection and analysis. This competency was evaluated in NURS 8012 Qualitative Research course.

**M 7: Grant Application and Funding (O: 1, 4)**
Four students submitted and received funding for their research.
Source of Evidence: Honors and awards outside the institution

**Target for O1: Research Implementation**
20% of students will apply and receive funding for their research.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
15.4% of students applied for and received funding for their research. Action: Consider more formal approach in teaching grant writing, workshop or formal course.

**M 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (O: 1, 4)**
Five students (19.2%) reported presenting oral or poster abstracts at the national or international professional conferences during 2013-2014.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Research Implementation**
25% of students will disseminate research findings at state, regional, national or international conferences.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
19.4% of students presented their research findings at national or international meetings during 2013-2014.

**M 9: Completion of PhD Program (O: 1, 4, 5)**
In Fall 2013, we had a total of 26 students. At the end of Summer 2014, all the students are continuing with their course work, preparing comprehensive exams, and collecting data for their dissertation. None of the student graduated during this academic year period.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

**Target for O5: Leaders of Change**
100% of graduates will accept positions as leaders of change.

**M 10: Leaders of change (O: 5)**

Graduates from previous years (total of 130) are all holding positions either in health care or health education at the state and regional level.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O5: Leaders of Change**

100% of graduates will accept leadership positions as leaders in health care organizations, universities and health policy positions regionally and nationally.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

No graduates during the 2013-2014 year, but all previous graduates hold leadership positions regionally and nationally (total 130).

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

**Grant Application and Submission**

Action: Consider more formal approach in teaching grant writing, workshop or formal course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Grant Application and Funding
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Implementation

**Implementation Description:** 1. Discuss increasing the number of students funded for their research with the doctoral program committee. 2. Review current course offerings, electives and required courses.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ptlene Minick

**Presentations and publications**

Action: Develop an organized plan for this goal/objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Presentations at Professional Meetings
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Implementation

**Implementation Description:** Brainstorm with doctoral faculty at PhD program committee meetings to develop strategies in meeting this goal/objective.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Research Implementation Graduating students will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century. Every course in the program focuses on socially relevant research. Students work with their advisors to ensure that they choose a socially relevant topic, and begin writing about their research project during the first semester. They continue writing and rewriting about it in each course. The comprehensive exam contains three questions relevant to the student's topic specifically related to theory, methods and state of the science. After successful completion of the comprehensive exam, then the student completes a proposal, conducts the research and defends.

---

**Georgia State University**
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**2013-2014 Nutrition BS**

(As of 12/13/2016 06:09 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 nutrition 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.
**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

**Target for O1: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice**

Ninety percent of the junior students in NUTR 3600 (Life Cycle Nutrition) receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments. Ninety percent of the senior students in NUTR 4200 (Medical Nutrition Therapy) receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments.

**Target for O3: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and populations**

Ninety percent of the junior students in NUTR 4600 (FoodService Systems) receive at least 80% or better on the Human Resources case study.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate science understanding**

**M 3: Public Policy (O: 6, 7)**

Students in the DPD learn about the impact of a public policy position on dietetics practice and its consumers. In NUTR 4955 (Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Wellness), the students are assigned a group project, which address health care policy, bills, and amendments. The write-up for the final project includes information on: The topic and the Bill name; the original class vote on the bill; the concerns of individuals who did not vote to pass the bill; how these concerns were addressed by the group; how the bill was amended by group; justification for amendments, including relevant research, the final class vote on the bill; final the concerns of individuals who did not vote to pass the amended bill; and how would these concerns should be addressed in the future. The project was evaluated using the following scale: 20 points: All documentation is complete. Documentation is thorough, and responses show understanding of the bill-making process. Referencing, where needed, is complete and accurate. The project process is followed by the group. There are no more than 2 writing errors, and no writing errors affect the clarity of the document. All assignment requirements are followed. 18 points: All documentation is complete. Documentation and responses show understanding of the bill-making process. Referencing, where needed, is complete and accurate. There are no more than 2 writing errors, and no writing errors affect the clarity of the document. Assignment requirements are not followed. 16 points: All documentation is complete. Documentation and responses show understanding of the bill-making process. There are no more than 2 writing errors, and no writing errors affect the clarity of the document. Referencing is complete or inaccurate. There is not good documentation of strong participation by each group member and/or some assignment requirements are not followed. 14 points: Documentation is incomplete or shows little understanding of the bill-making process and/or there are more than 2 writing errors and/or

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

**Target for O6: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle**

Ninety percent of the students receive at least 80% on their group project.

---
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**2013-2014 Operations Management MS**
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(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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Develop a Strategic View of OM (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to analyze and evaluate alternative operations tactics and strategies for a given business environment and to identify the appropriate capacity, facility capabilities &amp; locations, product, service and process design, organizational design and process technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Develop Decision Making Abilities (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 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 and strategies in terms of the operations management function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 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 solve OM problems in the environmental/sustainability framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Become a Strong Team Member (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Student Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Reasoned Analysis (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, MGS 8730, MGS 8760 courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM**

- **Learning Objective 1:** Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3
- **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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

We assess this measure through case, project and homework problems that require rational and reasoned analysis for a clear understanding of the essential elements of OM. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students should be able to determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic and integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM**

Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Learning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 2 Integration of Recommendations The student is not able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student determines the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student excels at integrating recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student easily determines the effects that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Student finding reflect close to 80% understanding the importance of integrative thinking in their group project assignments and homework problems. We should be able to focus more on this aspect of the project and homework problems so as to improve this learning objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Performance (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE This measures the students' ability to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment through their ability to identify the critical success factors of an OM application and the assessment of available resources and capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Learning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3 Performance The student is not able 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 develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations. The student develops team skills by indicated by poor returns on peer evaluations. The student did not develop 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student findings reflect a 85% level of understanding and monitoring performance levels within their group projects, homework problems and case analysis. We will continue to improve through the following course: MGS 8710 Logistics and Operations Planning, MGS 8730 Project Management, MGS 8760 Quality Management, and MGS 8770 Service Operations Management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Critical Thinking (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Evaluation of individual MS student's work as completed in the required OM course. The accumulation of this type of knowledge will be received through the application of exam questions that will be measured overtime.</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: Develop Decision Making Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student should pass each outcome/objective as indicated by satisfactory work on course exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homework assignments, case analysis, group project and exams results in MGS 8710, MGS 8730, MGS 8760 and MGS 8770 reflect good to excellent decision making capabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation Skills (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Will develop a focus and will highlight the effects that OM decisions have on the environmental and substantiality aspects of industry.</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: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Learning Objective 3: Develop an Environmental/Substantiality Viewpoint Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 5 Environmental Impact Evaluation The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is 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 or are easily able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have MGS 8710 Logistics and Operations Planning, MGS 8760 Quality Management and MGS 8770 Service Operations Management all cover some environmental and sustainability issues. Our findings of class homework and case analysis indicate a greater appreciation for environmental and sustainability issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Team Skills (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Become a Strong Team Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This objective is mainly measured through group project where each team will submit a written report and make a presentation. Results indicate a partial meeting of this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

In this period, we have provided some opportunities for students to interface with corporate members of the Global Logistics RoundTable sponsored by the Managerial Science Department. There were eight meetings during the year with meeting sponsored by Shaw Industries, McKinsey, Genuine Parts Co., and Manhattan Associates, among others. Our students had the opportunity to visit and discuss the issues that are relevant to logistics, operations/ strategy and supply chain management.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

One significant change made to the program was with a change in focus for the elective Operations Planning to Logistics and Operations Planning. This was based on student feedback. The desired result will be assessed during the Fall 2014 semester. More of a focus has been placed on a comprehensive look at logistics to include procurement/ sourcing/ vendor selection and the optimization of the supply chain. We have found that the students lack an understanding of how the activities and critical path of a supply network interface and react to disruption, changes in policies and procedures and natural disasters. We desire to have our...
students view the extended supply network from a holistic integrated viewpoint and not seen as individual activities that are managed independently. The program is currently developing an optimization model that can be used in class to demonstrate the mechanics of relevant data input (inventory carrying cost, handling cost, sourcing lead times and ordering costs) and the impact of the various options available to an organization (mill source to hub, mill source to satellite, stock transfer from hub to satellite, and inter-satellite transfer).

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Once each semester, the participating faculty meet to discuss the class assessment finding from testing, in-class exercises and group projects. The group project criteria are always discussed and debated to ensure the objectives are class relevant and appropriate. We find that the students continuously ask for a template for group projects, but we resist the temptation to provide one, leaving the students to engineer their own template for their project. Each of the various MS electives have distinctively different in-class exercises and group projects. We are able to view the objectives and outcomes collectively and make specific recommendations to faculty members based on the assessment findings.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We plan on continuing the involvement of Operations Management MS students in our Global Logistics RoundTable meetings. There will be many opportunities for many of the MS students to hear and interact with corporate individuals involved in logistics, operations and supply chain management. (Spring and Fall semesters) We will develop our optimization model for use in logistics and supply chain studies. (Spring, 2015) We will continue our assessment of the in-class exercises and group projects to ensure appropriateness and learning objectives are being met.

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

### 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 Capstone one-on-one negotiation in MGS 8430 The capstone is a simulated business negotiation. It involves two parties, a buyer and a seller. A database exists of over 200 agreements recorded from previous MGS 8430 sections from which to calculate agreement percentiles. Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Divide Value in Negotiation
Meeting or exceeding a value at the 60th percentile of agreements normed on previous sections of MGS 8430. The 60th percentile for buyers is $290,000. The 60th percentile for sellers is $397,500.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In the past year, there has been 1 M.S. student who took MGS 8430. The student achieved the 83rd percentile, surpassing the target of 60%.

M 2: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation (O: 2)
Measures The combined total value obtained by the buyer and the seller in the capstone one-on-one negotiation Capstone one-on-one negotiation in MGS 8430 The capstone is a simulated business negotiation. It involves two parties, a buyer and a seller. A database exists of over 200 agreements recorded from previous MGS 8430 sections from which to calculate agreement percentiles. This particular negotiation is designed so that the combined total can only be optimized when bilateral concessions are used effectively and when contingent elements are effectively included in the agreement. Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O2: Create Value in Negotiation
Meeting or exceeding a value at the 60th percentile of agreements normed on previous sections of MGS 8430. The 60th percentile for the combined total is $639,000.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
In the past year, there has been one M.S. student who took MGS 8430. This student achieved at the 21st percentile, not meeting the target of the 60th percentile criterion.

M 3: Leadership Self-Assessment (O: 3)
Project in MGS 8420 Measures Describes their own leadership strengths and weaknesses. Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Prepare Leadership Development Plan
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the following rubric:

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met
Four students were in the assessment group in this cycle. Three met the target of 2.0 while the fourth did not. This yields an average of 1.75 which does not meet the target.

M 4: Leadership Development Plan (O: 3)
Prepare leadership development plans that will enhance their leadership capabilities. These plans will incorporate appropriate and
sound leadership development resources, tools and processes.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Prepare Leadership Development Plan**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 2 to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Four students were in the assessment group in this cycle. Three met the target of 2.0 while the fourth did not. This yields an average of 1.75 which does not meet the target.

**M 5: Coaching Scenario Assignment (O: 4)**
Ability to write up a coaching scenario that clearly demonstrates a managerial coaching moment. This comes from the coaching scenario assignment and coaching log book in MGS 8425

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

**Target for O4: Recognize Coaching Moment**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 3 to randomly selected coaching scenarios.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No students in this M.S. program took MGS 8425 in the past year. Therefore, there are no results to report.

**M 6: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness (O: 4)**
Ability to respond to think reflectively about their own effectiveness as a coach in the role of coaching others.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Recognize Coaching Moment**
A 2.0 average on the coaching log books. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 4 to randomly selected coaching log books.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No students in this M.S. program took MGS 8425 in the past year. Therefore, there are no results to report.

**M 7: OD Recommendations (O: 6)**
Inclusion of and appropriateness of recommendations and the rationale behind them.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O6: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurements will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric (Table 3) to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Four students were in this assessment group. Average of 2.5 with all students meeting the 2.0 criterion.

**M 8: Reflect on Own OD Effectiveness (O: 7)**
Ability to respond and to think reflectively about their own effectiveness and the effectiveness of others employed in the role of (internal or external) OD Consultant.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Recognize OD Consulting Opportunities**
A 2.0 average on the OD Consultant notebooks. Measurement will be done by applying the Measurement 7 Rubric (Table 3) to randomly selected OD Consultant Notebooks.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Four students were in this assessment group. Average of 2.25. All students met the 2.0 criterion on all dimensions.

**M 9: Organizational Change Project (O: 8)**
Demonstration of OD Consulting skills in the OD/Change Management Project (Group Assignment)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O8: Apply OD Consulting Skills**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric (Table 3) to randomly selected team evaluations.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Average of 2.0 with all students meeting the 2.0 threshold.

**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
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Continue to Gather Data
Because data in this cycle was from only 3 students, we will continue to collect data.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: 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 8420 instructors
Additional Resources: none

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

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8430 course 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
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
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?
This particular concentration in the M.S. in Managerial Sciences is being phased out. We are no longer accepting applicants, and we anticipate that remaining students will complete their degrees within the next two semesters. There are two reasons for phasing out this concentration. First, the enrollments have dwindled to a point where there is no longer a critical mass of students. Second, because of losing critical mass, we are no longer able to offer a reasonable complement of relevant electives (12 credit hours) in this program. We anticipate that, in the near future, we will be offering other concentrations in the M.S. in Managerial Sciences in a cohorted format.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
This particular concentration in the M.S. in Managerial Sciences is being phased out. We are no longer accepting applicants, and we anticipate that remaining students will complete their degrees within the next two semesters. There are two reasons for phasing out this concentration. First, the enrollments have dwindled to a point where there is no longer a critical mass of students. Second, because of losing critical mass, we are no longer able to offer a reasonable complement of relevant electives (12 credit hours) in this program. We anticipate that, in the near future, we will be offering other concentrations in the M.S. in Managerial Sciences in a cohorted format. This format will permit us to assure students a more coherent set of electives will be provided.
Mission / Purpose

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):**
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

Mission / Purpose
Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

Goals
G 1: Phil 1010
Phil 1010, Critical Thinking (in Area B), contributes significantly to GSU's General Education program by helping students hone critical thinking skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Students learn to effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. Outcomes 1 and 2 and Measures 1 and 2 are relevant to Phil 1010.

**G 2: Phil 2010**

Phil 2010, Introduction to Philosophy (Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history's most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being. This contributes significantly to GSU's General Education program by helping students hone critical thinking skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Students learn to effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. Students also learn to effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them. Outcomes 3 and 4 and Measures 3 and 4 are relevant to Phil 1010.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

| SLO 1: 1010 Objective 1: Identifying 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 have mastery of some standard content knowledge, including the following: (i) a basic |

**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 scores (from §V of our Assessment Policy) 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**

New in 2014: We expect the 1010 assignments to be scored somewhere between 1 and 4 with a target of 3.25. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 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 Grad Student 10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student 12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student 13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 14: High performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 17: Low performing new PhD 18: High performing new PhD

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

For this 2013-2014 cycle, average 1010 student's ability to identify premises and conclusions was assessed a 3.125 on our new scale.

**M 2: 1010 Measure 2: Argument Evaluation (O: 2)**

Every fall, five sections of Phil 1010 taught by different instructors will be selected at random. Four final argument analyses will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the analyses of the first four students on the roll (assuming that each of these four turns in an analysis; if they do not, continue down the roll), but only one per student.) A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each analysis scores (from §V of our Assessment Policy) on the student's ability to analyze information and arguments by (iv) critically evaluating the arguments of others.

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

**Target for O2: 1010 Objective 2: Argument Evaluation**

New in 2014: We expect the 1010 assignments to be scored somewhere between 1 and 4 with a target of 3.25. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 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 Grad Student 10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student 12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student 13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 14: High performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 17: Low performing new PhD 18: High performing new PhD

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

For this 2013-2014 cycle, the average 1010 student's ability to critically evaluating the arguments of others was assessed a 3.05 on our new scale.

**M 3: 2010 Measure 1: Critical Thinking (O: 3)**

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 2010 will be selected at random. Four final exams will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the exams of the first four students on the roll (assuming that each of these students turns in an exam; if they do not, continue down the roll), but only one per student.) The instructor of the course will assign each exam scores (from §V of our Assessment Policy) on the following criterion: 2. Think critically and effectively as evidenced by (i) a basic ability to present clear and sound arguments.
Target for O3: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking

New in 2014: We expect the 2010 assignments to be scored between 3 and 6 with a target of 5.25. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 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 Grad Student 10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student 12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student 13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 14: High performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 17: Low performing new PhD 18: High performing new PhD

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

In this 2013-2014 cycle, the average 2010 student's ability to think critically and effectively is assessed a 2.25 on our new scale.

M 4: 2010 Measure 2: Content (O: 4)

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 2010 will be selected at random. Four final exams will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the exams of the first four students on the roll (assuming that each of these students turns in an exam; if they do not, continue down the roll), but only one per student.) The instructor of the course will assign each exam scores (from §V of our Assessment Policy) on the following criterion: 1. Mastery of content knowledge, more particularly, any of the following: (i) have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?) (ii) have a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology (What do we know?) (iii) have a basic understanding of central problems in ethics (What should we do?) (iv) have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. (v) have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: 2010 Objective 2: Content

New in 2014: We expect the 2010 assignments to be scored between 3 and 6 with a target of 5.25. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 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 Grad Student 10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student 12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student 13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 14: High performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS 15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student 17: Low performing new PhD 18: High performing new PhD

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

In this 2013-2014 cycle, the average 2010 student's knowledge of content was assessed a 2.9 on our new scale.

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

Watch 2010

The disappointments this cycle are both regarding Phil 2010. Neither the content knowledge nor critical thinking targets were met. This 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. ADDED 2014: With our new scale in place, we see the same problem we saw with the older scale. We now suspect that the problem is our method of data collection. The way we assess the work in 1010 and 2010 is quite different. Moving into the next cycle we will plan to make the procedures for the two classes more similar to see if that changes the success in approaching, meeting, or surpassing the targets. We may also re-evaluate the targets.

Established in Cycle:2012-2013
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.

Replacement New Rating System

After one year of using the 18 point scale, we found it had too many problems to be of value. For example, Assessment Committee Members thought some 5's (low performing rising sophomores) performed better than "low performing rising juniors" (etc for other grade levels). Moreover, we clearly had difficulty determining adequate targets given the scale, which many felt was overly complicated. After lengthy discussion, a new rating system was accepted. It is as follows: Scoring Scale (1/2 point designations permitted) 0: Does not meet expectations of a college student 1: Meets expectations for a College Freshman 2: Meets expectations for a College Sophomore 3: Meets expectations for a College Junior 4: Meets expectations for a College Senior 5: Meets expectations for a First Year Grad Student 6: Meets expectations for a Second Year Grad Student 7: Exceeds expectations for a Second Year Grad Student Our targets will be straightforward: 1010 students should score 1 on average 2010 students should score 2 on average 3000 students should score 3 on average 4990 students should score 4 on average MA Theses should score 5 on average 5000 students should score 6 on average MA Theses should score 7 on average

In addition, the Department now has more 2010 classes taught by GTAs than we had in the past. This has an impact on our assessment numbers because GTAs are likely to score assignments differently than regular faculty and 2010 work is currently assessed by regular faculty on the Assessment Committee while 1010 work is currently assessed by the instructors of the randomly selected classes that participate in Assessment. Given this, we will now have the instructors of the randomly selected 1010 classes that participate in Assessment assess the work that they submit for Assessment. That is, beginning in the 2014-2015 year, all of the work submitted for use in our Assessment procedures for 1010 and 2010 courses will be assigned assessment scores by the instructors of record.

Established in Cycle:2013-2014
Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

**Goals**

**G 1: Philosophy BA**

Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in the English-speaking world has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering critical thinking skills and clear argumentative writing as with imparting information. We believe our major should and does do both. As such, students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate a knowledge of representative philosophers and movements in historical and contemporary philosophy as well as knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in the various fields of philosophy. They will also demonstrate the ability to read critically with comprehension, think critically, and write clearly and critically.

**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.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### 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. Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
3. Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
4. 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. Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
3. Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
4. 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. Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
3. Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
4. 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 score on critical thinking (from §V of our Assessment Policy). 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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

In this 2013-2014 cycle--AND USING OUR NEW SCALE--the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 5.35 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 7.65. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.25. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.25, progressing students at 5.35, and finishing students at 7.65. This progression suggests the program is successfully helping students to improve their critical thinking skills. Still, we are not meeting our current targets. We will have to monitor this to see if our targets with our new scale are realistic or if other changes are needed.

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 score on content knowledge (from §V of our Assessment Policy). 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

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met

In this 2013-2014 cycle--AND USING OUR NEW SCALE--the average 3000 student's content knowledge was assessed a 3.4 and the average 4990 student's content knowledge was assessed a 8.1. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.9. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.9, progressing students at 3.4, and finishing students at 8.1. This progression suggests the program is successfully helping students to improve their content knowledge, especially at the higher levels. Still, we are not meeting our current targets. We will have to monitor this to see if our targets with our new scale are realistic or if other changes are needed.

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 score on written communication
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   All philosophy classes contribute to our students’ abilities to communicate well in writing, to engage in critical reasoning and careful analysis of texts.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

   We view this as a long term process. We make changes to the assessment process and to our curriculum for many reasons including student demand for courses, policies requiring class size minimums, and a need to maintain low DFW reports. Assessment is a valuable part of that process and will remain so.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

   After data is compiled, a draft report is prepared in WEAVE. This is then shared with all members of the Department. It is then discussed at a faculty meeting and any suggested changes are incorporated into the final product.
4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

While we discuss the draft assessment report, we consider if any changes to our program or the assessment process would help the department. This year we decided to refine our assessment scoring system as several people found the system used last year less then ideal.
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(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; a familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements; knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the main areas of philosophy (ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic, all defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy); knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry; and knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life.

O/O 2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills (M: 2, 3)
Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to gain a higher level of the philosophical skills than graduates of the B.A. program attain. These include: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: MA Content Knowledge (O: 1)
All students receiving the MA defend a thesis to a committee of at least 3 faculty members. Upon successful defense, the committee members all indicate a content knowledge score (from §V of our Assessment Policy).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content
New in 2014: We expect the MA students to be scored between 11 and 14 with a target of 13.25. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 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 Senior: 8: High performing rising College Senior: 9: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student: 10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student: 11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student: 12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student: 13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student: 14: High performing Third Year Grad Student: 15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student: 16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student: 17: Low performing new PhD: 18: High performing new PhD

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the 2013 calendar year, using our new scale, our M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 13.327 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 (from §V of our Assessment Policy).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills**

New in 2014: We expect the MAs to be scored between 11 and 14 with a target of 13.25. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 0: High School Dropout or below; 1: Low performing High School Graduate; 2: High performing High School Graduate; 3: Low performing rising College Freshman; 4: High performing rising College Sophomore; 5: Low performing rising College Junior; 6: High performing rising College Senior; 8: High performing rising College Senior; 9: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student; 10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student; 11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student; 12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student; 13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student; 14: High performing rising Third Year Grad Student; 15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student; 16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student; 17: Low performing new PhD; 18: High performing new PhD

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

For the 2013 calendar year, using our new scale, our M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 12.7091 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the 2013 calendar year, we had 12 MA graduates apply to PhD programs in philosophy. All but one were accepted to at least one school. One was accepted to 6 programs, 3 were accepted to five programs; on average our graduates were accepted to 3 programs. The acceptance rate is an astonishing 91.67% for those who applied. We take this as clear indication that our grad students are learning philosophical skills and content. (Seven graduates did not apply to PhD programs; of these, one entered Teach for America, one works as a clinical psychology intern in Washington D.C., one works in an Atlanta-area business; the others are pursing different paths.)

**Replacement New Rating System**

After one year of using the 18 point scale, we found it had too many problems to be of value. For example, Assessment Committee Members thought sometimes “high performing rising sophomores” perform better than “low performing rising juniors” (etc for other grade levels). Moreover, we clearly had difficulty determining adequate targets given the scale, which many felt was overly complicated. After lengthy discussion, a new rating system was accepted. It is as follows: Scoring Scale (1/2 point designations permitted): 0: Does not meet expectations of a college student; 1: Meets expectations for a College Freshman; 2: Meets expectations for a College Sophomore; 3: Meets expectations for a College Junior; 4: Meets expectations for a College Senior; 5: Meets expectations for a First Year Grad Student; 6: Meets expectations for a Second Year Grad Student; 7: Exceeds expectations for a Second Year Grad Student. Our targets will be straightforward: 1010 students should score 1 on average; 1020 students should score 2 on average; 3000 students should score 3 on average; 4990 students should score 4 on average; MA Theses should score 6 on average. In addition, the Department now has more 1010 classes taught by GTAs than we had in the past. This has an impact on our assessment numbers because GTAs are likely to score assignments differently than regular faculty and 1010 work is currently assessed by regular faculty. While 1010 work is currently assessed by the instructors of the randomly selected classes that participate in Assessment, the work they submit for Assessment is, beginning in the 2014-2015 year, all of the work submitted for use in our Assessment procedures for 1010 and 2010 courses will be assigned assessment scores by the instructors of record.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Acceptance into PhD Program
- Outcome/Objective: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

All of our MA courses contribute to our students' abilities to communicate well in writing, to engage in critical reasoning and careful analysis of texts.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We view this as a long term process. We make changes to the assessment process and to our curriculum for many reasons including student demand for courses, policies requiring class size minimums, and a need to maintain low DFW reports. Assessment is a valuable part of that process and will remain so.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

After data is compiled, a draft report is prepared in WEAVE. This is then shared with all members of the Department. It is then discussed at a faculty meeting and any suggested changes are incorporated into the final product.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

While we discuss the draft assessment report, we consider if any changes to our program or the assessment process would help the department. This year we decided to refine our assessment scoring system as several people found the system used last year less ideal.
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 Expressively and receptively communicate in a culturally competent manner with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, practitioners, interdisciplinary team members, consumers, payers, and policy makers. o Influence legislative and political processes

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability (G: 1, 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 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)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring (G: 4, 6) (M: 1, 2, 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)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
SLO 3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity (G: 1, 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 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)

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

SLO 4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 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)

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

SLO 5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication (G: 1, 5, 6) (M: 1, 2, 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)

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

SLO 6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 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.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
5 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

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

SLO 7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence (G: 1, 2, 4, 7) (M: 1, 2, 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)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

---

**SLO 10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education (G: 4, 5) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 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 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**


**Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**


**Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**


**Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**


**Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**


**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**


**M 2: Licensure Exam Pass Rate (Q: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**

The National Physical Therapy Examination pass rate for the program (first time and ultimate)

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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.
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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

**Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

**Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

**Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

**Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of '2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.
Content material on national license testing are broken down into categories to demonstrate the students learning in multiple areas to include: I. Physical Therapy Examination II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis and Prognosis III. Interventions/Equipment and Devices/Therapeutic Modalities IV. Non-System Domains System Specifications Cardiovascular/Pulmonary and Lymphatic Musculoskeletal Neuromuscular Other Systems Source of Evidence: External report

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of ‘2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of ‘2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of ‘2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of ‘2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 29 graduates of the 2013 class scored 90.63% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 95.8% as compared to 86.58% nationally. For the class of ‘2014, our first time pass rate was 96.77% (31/32) as compared to national average of 92.34%; mean score was 684.9 as compared to national average of 675.25.

M 3: National Testing Content Scores (O: 6, 8, 9, 10, 11)
Content material on national license testing are broken down into categories to demonstrate the students learning in multiple areas to include: I. Physical Therapy Examination II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis and Prognosis III. Interventions/Equipment and Devices/Therapeutic Modalities IV. Non-System Domains System Specifications Cardiovascular/Pulmonary and Lymphatic Musculoskeletal Neuromuscular Other Systems Source of Evidence: External report

Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism
Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

1st Time and Number of Items Test Takers/ Test Takers From in Each Area of the from U.S. Accredited Test Content Outline Your Program Programs Content Area/System Specifications: % of # Items in Mean Standard Mean Standard Exam Each Scale Deviation Scale Deviation Content Scale Score Scale Score Area Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 673.9 59.2 676.8 67.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 705.8 54.2 687.1 64.2 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 690.8 69 677.7 64.3 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 659 64.9 659.5 79.2 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 682.6 67.1 680.6 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 674.5 54.4 681.8 68.3 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 699.7 64.4 674.5 65.5 Other Systems 15.50% 31 707.2 76.7 689.4 71.8. All criteria scored at or above mean except I. Physical Therapy Examination and system specification Musculoskeletal System.

**Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

1st Time and Number of Items Test Takers/ Test Takers From in Each Area of the from U.S. Accredited Test Content Outline Your Program Programs Content Area/System Specifications: % of # Items in Mean Standard Mean Standard Exam Each Scale Deviation Scale Deviation Content Scale Score Scale Score Area Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 673.9 59.2 676.8 67.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 705.8 54.2 687.1 64.2 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 690.8 69 677.7 64.3 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 659 64.9 659.5 79.2 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 682.6 67.1 680.6 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 674.5 54.4 681.8 68.3 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 699.7 64.4 674.5 65.5 Other Systems 15.50% 31 707.2 76.7 689.4 71.8. All criteria scored at or above mean except I. Physical Therapy Examination and system specification Musculoskeletal System.

**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

1st Time and Number of Items Test Takers/ Test Takers From in Each Area of the from U.S. Accredited Test Content Outline Your Program Programs Content Area/System Specifications: % of # Items in Mean Standard Mean Standard Exam Each Scale Deviation Scale Deviation Content Scale Score Scale Score Area Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 673.9 59.2 676.8 67.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 705.8 54.2 687.1 64.2 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 690.8 69 677.7 64.3 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 659 64.9 659.5 79.2 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 682.6 67.1 680.6 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 674.5 54.4 681.8 68.3 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 699.7 64.4 674.5 65.5 Other Systems 15.50% 31 707.2 76.7 689.4 71.8. All criteria scored at or above mean except I. Physical Therapy Examination and system specification Musculoskeletal System.

**Target for O10: Professional Pracction Expectation: Education**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

1st Time and Number of Items Test Takers/ Test Takers From in Each Area of the from U.S. Accredited Test Content Outline Your Program Programs Content Area/System Specifications: % of # Items in Mean Standard Mean Standard Exam Each Scale Deviation Scale Deviation Content Scale Score Scale Score Area Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 673.9 59.2 676.8 67.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 705.8 54.2 687.1 64.2 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 690.8 69 677.7 64.3 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 659 64.9 659.5 79.2 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 682.6 67.1 680.6 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 674.5 54.4 681.8 68.3 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 699.7 64.4 674.5 65.5 Other Systems 15.50% 31 707.2 76.7 689.4 71.8. All criteria scored at or above mean except I. Physical Therapy Examination and system specification Musculoskeletal System.

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

1st Time and Number of Items Test Takers/ Test Takers From in Each Area of the from U.S. Accredited Test Content Outline Your Program Programs Content Area/System Specifications: % of # Items in Mean Standard Mean Standard Exam Each Scale Deviation Scale Deviation Content Scale Score Scale Score Area Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 673.9 59.2 676.8 67.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 705.8 54.2 687.1 64.2 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 690.8 69 677.7 64.3 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 659 64.9 659.5 79.2 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 682.6 67.1 680.6 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 674.5 54.4 681.8 68.3 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 699.7 64.4 674.5 65.5 Other Systems 15.50% 31 707.2 76.7 689.4 71.8. All criteria scored at or above mean except I. Physical Therapy Examination and system specification Musculoskeletal System.

**M 4: Clinical Skills (O: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**


Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met


Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met


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. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met


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. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met


Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2014 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2015 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

M 5: Research Project (O: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Progressing over a two year period, student’s engagement in a research project will result in 1) a manuscript for submission to a peer-reviewed journal, and/or 2) a poster/platform presentation at a regional or national meeting.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met


Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

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 2013-2014 - 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 platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

A comprehensive examination will be administered at the completion of each year for each class. Target for

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 Praction 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2013-2014 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2014: 88% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2015: 84% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2016: 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 2014 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%. 2014 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.
Employers of GSU DPT graduates 2011-2013 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</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for | Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectations: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and &gt;80% response for employee rank of 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for | Patient/Client Management Expectation |
|------------|------------------------------------------------|

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.
Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% scored graduates in the top 10%.

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations**
Our program expects an overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 4 responses with an average score of 4.6 on all criteria. 75% 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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
  - Measure: Professional Behaviors | Outcome/Objective: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability

- **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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: National Testing Content Scores | Outcome/Objective: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: $37,000 grant approved by the University to implement program for entire school. Currently in planning stage and expecting partial implementation by Fall 2013 and full by Spring 2014.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant Department Head
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 in progress.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Currently in progress  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2015  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Inter-professional Education Committee: Dr Kimberly Morelli  
**Additional Resources:** School/University support to start up once approved: Amount 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**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

See response to question #4 below.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The included data continues to indicate we have a strong program in relation to the above average outcomes of our students. Our goals to improve the program are in hiring faculty for our two open positions. The inter-professional collaboration within the BFLSNHP will be integrated in the curriculum by Spring 2015 with our partnership with Grady Memorial Medical Center. The integration of electronic health records into the program curriculum will benefit our current DPT students in terms of early exposure with electronic documentation. 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. Our first time National Physical Therapy Examination passing rate and student's overall average testing score both exceeded the state and national average. Our graduating DPT Class 2014 presented a total of 21 research poster and platform as part of their graduation requirements. The PT-CAS admission process were in place July 2014 to expedite the review process of the applicants and to be able to attract more out-of-state students in our DPT program. Planning for a PhD and dual program to compliment the DPT degree is still in place for this cycle. All of these goals should serve to further strengthen and improve the programs status including our most important goal of graduating competent physical therapists. 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**

**2013-2014 Physics & Astronomy Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

For Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, Phys1111K students scored an average of 26% on the pre-test and 50% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.34. Phys2211K students scored an average of 35% on the pre-test and 56% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.32.

**M 4: Electricity & Magnetism Diagnostic Test (O: 3)**

Within the lab portion of the courses, students in Phys1112K and Phys2212K 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: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

For the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, students in Phys1112 scored 34% while students in Phys2212 scored 40%.

### 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
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.

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.

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 laboratory 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.

Lab/lecture changes in Phys2211/2212
In 2012-2013 we plan changes to Phys2211/2212 classes to improve student learning. The flipped classroom project will be producing and implementing

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Three Area D lab science sequences in Physics & Astronomy have been assessed over the last 4 years using the newer Area D learning outcome. Astr1010/1020: New assessments have not been adopted for these courses and no assessment has been made for the newer learning outcome. Phys1111/1112: The newer learning outcome has been assessed for 4 years using standard diagnostic instruments. In Phys1111, a pre to post instruction gain of 0.34 was achieved in 2013/2014 after 3 years with a gain of 0.24. This is a marked improvement toward the goal of achieving a gain of 0.40 which is identified nationally for this diagnostic as a moderately successful course in teaching for conceptual understanding. Using a different standard diagnostic instrument, post-instruction scores increased modestly from 30% to 34% over the last 4 cycles. A goal of 44% was set based on work by the authors of diagnostic instrument. Given the course redesign and the use of interactive engagement techniques including a "studio" physics classroom and course design for some of the classes, these diagnostic scores are disappointing despite the improvements.

Phys2211/2212: The same assessments as are being used in Phys1111/1112 have also been used in the calculus-based physics sequence, Phys2211/2212. In Phys2211, the pre to post instruction gain increased from 0.23 to 0.32 over the last 4 cycles, but are still below the goal of 0.40. In Phys2212, a post-instruction scores on the diagnostic have been stable at around 40%, below the goal of 47%.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Three Area D lab science sequences in Physics & Astronomy have been assessed over the last 4 years using the newer Area D learning outcome. Astr1010/1020: The department assessment committee has been reorganized and is committed to implementing an assessment beginning in Fall 2014. Phys1111/1112: A federally funded (NSF) project by Drs. von Korff and Thoms in collaboration with researchers at UCF and George Washington University has begun with a goal to examine the factors that determine success in algebra-based introductory physics courses taught in a studio format. This project runs from January 2014 to December 2016. In addition, the department is engaged in an internally funded project to "flip" the class using videos to reduce the time used for lecture and allow more and higher quality group work. The flipped classroom project will be producing and implementing video use from Spring 2014 to Summer 2015. Phys2211/2212: A significant redesign of the lab portion of the courses has been
undertaken through the acquisition of external funding as part of PhysTEC project (Physics Teacher Education Coalition). The labs are being redesigned to improve conceptual learning and will include a one hour tutorial using nationally recognized curricular materials and led by undergraduate peer instructors. The remaining 2 hours of the laboratory portion is also being redesigned with inquiry-based labs and an emphasis on conceptual understanding. There has also been an attempt to improve the coordination and timing between the lecture and lab portions of the courses. The new lab design was piloted for 3 lab sections of Phys2211 in Spring 2014 and is being used in all lab sections beginning Fall 2014. The new lab design is being piloted in 3 lab sections of Phys2212 in Fall 2014 and will be used in all lab sections beginning Spring 2015.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Physics BS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

- Nineteen physics majors completed Phys4600, Classical Mechanics, in the Spring 2014 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 2.8 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 2.9 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

- Eight physics majors completed Phys4700, Electricity Magnetism, in the Fall 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.8 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 2.8 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

- Nineteen physics majors completed Phys3850, Statistical & Thermal Physics Magnetism, in the Spring 2014 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.7 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.5 out of 5.0.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

- Not reported in this cycle.

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

- Met
Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.4 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.8 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.8 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Twenty one physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2013 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.3 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In Spring/Summer 2014 a total of seventeen students completed Phys4900, Research Project - CTW. 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 seventeen students based on the completed long research report were completed by the course coordinator using the physics rubric. Thirteen out of seventeen students (80%) scored 3 (competency) or 4 (mastery) in all seven criteria in the final assessment with 66 out of 119 scores (55%) rated as 4, 46 scores (39%) of 3 and 7 (6%) scores of 2. In comparison with our targets, 80% of students achieved at least 3 (competency) on each criterion in the rubric and 55% of the scores were 4 (mastery). The average score on each of the criteria in the rubric were: A. Develop research questions - 3.6 B. Collect appropriate data - 3.6 C. Analyze and interpret data - 3.5 D. Formulate new questions - 3.5 E. Appropriate communication - 3.5 F. Scientific writing - 3.4 G. Appropriate audience - 3.4.

**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**
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

For the assessments performed in the content classes, the assessments fell below targets this cycle as they have been in the past. Although not very different on average from the past, they appear to be generally slightly lower. This may be due to the large increases in the sizes of the content classes in recent years because of growth in the number of majors and numbers of degrees given. Whether the slightly lower assessment results are from a change in the incoming skills or a struggle to effective teach larger classes can't be determined at this point. In either case, it does indicate that our classes are not as effective as desired for our current population and size. Despite larger enrollments in the Advanced Laboratory course (first CTW course), assessment results appear similar to previous years with some scores improving and other dropping. These variations appear to occur from year to year with no clear trend. The assessment results for the Research Project course (second CTW course) does show a decline. Although results still meet targets, the increasing enrollment (9 completers in Spring 2013 and 17 completers in Spring 2014) has resulted in more scores below 3 out of 4. While 20% of the students completing the project had scores below 3 out of 4 on one or two of the criteria, no student was below 3 out of 4 in more than two of the seven criteria. Over 50% of the scores were 4 out of 4. Overall, it is clear that the enrollment increases have caused difficulty in maintaining or improving the findings.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

The first CTW course (Advanced Physics Lab) is critical in preparing students for success in the second CTW course (Research Project). To improve the preparation of students we have redesigned the lab room by moving the course from a shared space to a dedicated space for this course. This will allow the development of better experiments and a more collaborative environment.
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I (O: 5)**
As part of the astronomy concentration, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Astronomy Qualifying Exam I Assessment Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

**M 2: Astronomy Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)**
Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor and committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student’s progress in collaboration, knowledge content, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the advisor at the completion of M.S. degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Astronomy MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

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

**M 3: Physics Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)**
Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor and committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student's progress in collaboration, knowledge content, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the advisor at the completion of M.S. degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Physics MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

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

**M 4: Physics Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Physical M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Physics MS Committee Evaluation Form.

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

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

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

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
### Target for O5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

### M 5: Astronomy Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)

Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Astronomy MS Committee Evaluation Form.

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

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

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

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

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

### M 6: Physics Presentation and General Examination (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)

Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students take a general examination (typically an oral examination) administered by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the general examination are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are part of the Physics MS Committee Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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

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

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

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

### M 7: Astronomy Thesis Defense (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.

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

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

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

**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 & Research Technology | Scientific Communication
- Measure: Astronomy Committee Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Astronomy & Research Technology | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
- Measure: Astronomy Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- Measure: Physics Advisor | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
- Measure: Physics & Research Technology | Scientific Communication
- Measure: Physics Committee Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
- Measure: Physics Presentation and General Examination | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking

Implementation Description: Assessment Committee will present results at a faculty meeting in the Fall of 2009, at the chairman's discretion.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Physics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Coming Soon

Goals
G 1: Coming Soon
Coming Soon

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 4)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

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

SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4)
Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

SLO 5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)
Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. Students in the applied physics or biophysics options shall be able to demonstrate and apply knowledge in certain alternative areas appropriate to their specialties. Students demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.

SLO 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2)
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Physics Qualifying Exam (O: 5)
Students take a number of required courses during their first three semesters that cover the physics and math content for their particular area of research. Following their third semester they take a Qualifying Examination (Q-exam) in the areas applicable to their area of research. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and can be found in the Physics Qualifying Exam Evaluation Forms for Classical Mechanics, Electricity & Magnetism, Statistical Mechanics, and Quantum Mechanics.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

M 2: Research Advisor Evaluation (O: 1, 4, 6)
The students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their Ph.D. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student’s progress in collaboration and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student’s successful dissertation defense. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are the first section of the advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

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

M 3: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)
In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, written communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

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

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

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

M 4: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)
In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The
committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
  - Measure: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
  - Measure: Physics Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills
  - Measure: Research Advisor Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
  - Measure: Scientific & Research Technology | Scientific Communication

**Implementation Description:** Assessment Committee will present results at a faculty meeting in the Fall of 2009, at the chairman’s discretion.

**Projected Completion Date:** 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

**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

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2013-2014 Political Science Assessment of Core**
(As of: 12/13/2016 06:09 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Department of Political Science's undergraduate program and its central role in the University core curriculum is to
increase substantive knowledge, analytical skills and communication skills by educating students about governmental institutions and processes in the state of Georgia, the United States and the World.

Goals

G 1: Substantive Knowledge 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

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.

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)

Strategic Plan Associations

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
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).

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 of view when appropriate.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.
8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

**SLO 4: Communication Skills in Political Science (G: 4) (M: 4)**

Students should demonstrate an ability to write a paper or make an oral presentation with a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner, and draw logical conclusions from findings.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Measures of Substantive Knowledge in American Government (O: 1)**

This year the department used 25 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 outlined above. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please see attached report of learning outcomes in substantive knowledge in POLS 1101 FY 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please see attached report of learning outcomes in substantive knowledge in POLS 2401 FY 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 18 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 18 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

1691 Students took POLS 2401 in the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters. Please see attached report of learning outcomes in POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 Analytic Skills FY 2013-2014

**M 4: Measures of Communication Skills (O: 4)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Instructors POLS 2401 were asked to assess each student's performance on a written assignment and rate it on a scale of 1 to 4 as follows - Sophisticated 4, Competent 3, weak 2, Poor 1 See written assignments attached.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Communication Skills in Political Science**

The department seeks an average score of 2.5 or higher on the four point assessment of the written assignment

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report on student performance on communications skills. These are from POLS 2401 only.

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

**New Pedagogy and Assessment**

Over the Summer of 2013 The department developed new pedagogy for teaching POLS 1101 and is in the process of developing new assessment tools to test for learning outcomes. Next years report should start including the results of some of the new assessment tools. This was made possible by a grant from the Center for Teaching and Learning.

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

**Pedagogical and Assessment Review**

The plan is to implement for POLS 2401 the same process that was carried out for POLS 1101 in the Summer of 2013 (See description above under Action Plan for POLS 1101 in the current cycle)

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

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Political Science BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The Department of Political Science is committed to preparing undergraduate majors to think critically, to communicate ideas and arguments effectively, to make informed choices, and to engage in creative problem-solving. The Department's mission also includes grounding its students in the methodology of social science as well as preparing students for the practical and professional application of their course of study. Moreover, the Department strives to create an important experiential component to the BA program in Political Science, encouraging study abroad, discipline-oriented internships, and participation in competitive academic teams (Mock Trial, Model United Nations, Model Arab League). The Department of Political Science seeks to fulfill the above mission by offering undergraduate students education in the five major sub-fields of the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Administration/Policy. We offer specific concentrations in prelaw education and in International Relations. The BA program in Political Science endeavors to ensure that students get broad exposure to these fields. The Department is exceptionally well placed to help realize the University's mission of producing responsible citizens who can contribute to the ideals of an open, democratic and global society. The Department seeks to enhance student participation outside the classroom, to stimulate and award academic excellence, and to stimulate general awareness throughout the University community of the nature and impact of the field of Political Science

**Goals**
G 1: Understanding of US and global political institutions and behavior
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate basic understanding of political institutions and behavior both in the United States and globally.

G 3: Developing critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline

G 4: Effective written and oral communications
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate effective writing and oral presentation skills

G 2: Methodological and analytical skills
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate a competence in methodological and analytical skills

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Appropriate methodological and analytical skills (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate methodological skills appropriate to the Major. Specifically students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the use of social statistics. Students will demonstrate an ability to understand data reported in various forms. Students will demonstrate an 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 used assessments from POLS 3800 - Introduction to political research (a required course for all majors) to assess learning outcomes for this objective. Instructors 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.

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.
M 2: Critical Thinking measures (O: 2)

This measure evaluates student achievement in terms of critical thinking skills identified by the department as critical thinking skills appropriate to the major. The department uses learning assessments from POLS 4900 (CTW course) to measure achievement in this objective. The course uses a rubric for this assessment (Please see attached rubric). The first six items of the POLS 4900 Assessment Rubric are used to assess learning outcomes for critical thinking.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Critical thinking

We expect 80% of our students to score a 3 or better on each of the six items on the rubric (the first six) being used to measure critical thinking learning outcomes.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

187 students completed POLS 4900 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2013-2014. 10 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. 1. Identification of question or issue - 45.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 46.9% scored 3-4 (Competent) 7.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 47.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 39.5% scored 3-4 (Competent), 13.2 % scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 40.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 39.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 19.6% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric (items 4-5) the scores were as follows. 4. Collection and presentation of facts/data - 46.1% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 45.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 8.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 48.1% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 41.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 10.0% scored 1-2 (Developing). 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% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 43.2% scored 3-4 (Competent) 11.8% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures have been rounded off.

M 3: Effective Communication (O: 3)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE The assessment of effective communications skills was carried out using two courses (Both of them CTW courses and required of all majors) POLS 3800 and POLS 4900. Both these courses use rubrics to assess learning (Please see attached rubrics). The last items on each of these rubrics deal with communication skills and are used to assess learning for this objective.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Effective Communication

On the POLS 3800 assessment Rubric we expect 80% of our students to score 1 or higher out of a possible score of 2 on Item four (4) of the rubric On the POLS 4900 assessment rubric we expect 80% of our students to score 3 or higher out of a possible score of 5 on item seven (7) of the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill on the POLS 3800 Assessment Rubric 60% of our students scored 2 (Competent), 39.0% scored 1 (Developing) and 1% scored 0 (Absent). On the Presentation of conclusions skill on the POLS 4900 Assessment Rubric 36.9% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 54.2% scored 3-4 (Competent) 8.8% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met

In the period Fall 2013 to Spring 2014 196 students took POLS 3140. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge for this course during the period was 3.6

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 structures and processes of international institutions and the behavior of governmental and non governmental actors in the international system for each student using results of exams and quizzes as well as written work turned in for the course. They used the following five (5) point scale, with five (5) representing the highest level of learning outcomes and one (1) the lowest. The instructors rated each student in the following subject area: overall knowledge/mastery of the subject matter. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates an absence of knowledge 2. Demonstrates basic knowledge 3. Demonstrates competency 4. Demonstrates mastery 5. Demonstrates sophistication See examples of attached projects and quizzes used in POLS 3200 and POLS 3400.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Substantive knowledge - Global structures and processes

The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in substantive knowledge of global political structures and processes.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

239 students completed POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2013-2014. 11 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 63.5% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 29.7% scored a 1 (Developing) 6.5% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 68% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 30.5% scored a 1 (Developing) 1.4% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 58.8% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 38.2% scored a 1 (Developing) 3.0% scored a 0 (Absent).
In the period Fall 2013 to Spring 2014, 180 students took POLS 3200. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 3.20. 197 students took POLS 3400. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 3.35.

### 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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Measure of substantive knowledge US structures and processes
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Substantive Knowledge - US structures and processes
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
- **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 knowlege 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
- **Additional Resources:** Summer money
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**2. Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Overall the assessment shows continued achievement of targets in all four objectives of the program. 1. Understanding of US and global political institutions and behavior. 2. 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. [Preview Formatting] Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 Active Through: Keep Active Show in this Cycle: Yes Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: S. R. Naim on 6/7/2011 Established By: S. R. Naim on 6/24/2010 Edit Methodological and analytical skills. 3. Developing critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline and 4. Effective written and oral communications. All targets were exceeded in each of these areas. In three of the above 2, 3 and 4 scores showed improvement over the pervious years. This is in spite of the greater rigor in the assessment process. Scores were lower than last year in 1. above though targets were still being met. One result of these and previous findings is an overhaul of the undergraduate programs requirements which has now been completed and goes into effect Fall of 2015.

**4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Please see 2 above. In addition as requested in previous years the department needs resources to develop a more comprehensive assessment system using more course offerings for assessment purposes.
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.

**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.

**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 "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.

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

2-draft requirement
Last year we implemented a two-draft requirement for all non-thesis papers, requiring the first draft to be turned in just after mid-semester, at the same time as the defense date for thesis papers. Based, admittedly, on a limited amount of data, we think this has helped improve the quality of the non-thesis papers and will continue this requirement.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: This is continued from last year.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director, non-thesis committee members
Additional Resources: none

Pre- and post-tests for methods sequence
For next year, we plan to strengthen our assessment capacity for the graduate programs by implementing a pre-test and post-test for students in our required methods sequence, POLS 8800 (fall) and POLS 8810 (spring). 8800 teaches research design, while 8810 is intermediate applied statistics. Because we must do this in order, the first pre-test will be given in Fall 2010, and the first results will not be reported until June 2011. The Graduate Director will work with the instructors of these two courses to come up with appropriate pre- and post-tests and ensure inter-coder reliability. Normally the same person teaches 8800 on a regular basis, and the same is true for 8810.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will give the first pre-test in August 2010, the last post-test in April 2011, and report results in June 2011.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Grad director, graduate committee, instructors of 8800 and 8810.

"C" grade minimum
The department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change.

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

Implementation Description: It has been added to the graduate catalog and will be enforced by the graduate director and the college graduate office.
Projected Completion Date: 02/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Admissions procedure reform
Last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship resources.

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

Implementation Description: The graduate director and graduate committee meet to decide admissions and assistantships.
Projected Completion Date: 02/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director; graduate committee.

Elimination of Public Policy and Administration
The department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department.

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

Implementation Description: Graduate director and college graduate office will enforce
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Elimination of Spring Intake
We have eliminated spring intake for our MA program. We were finding that students who entered our program in January were (1)
having trouble following their courses because they had not yet taken POLS 8800, and (2) having trouble socially fitting into their cohorts.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Graduate office will stop accepting applications.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate office; graduate director

### Faculty advisors

The department has decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Graduate director will assign advisors to incoming graduate students.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director; faculty.

### Joint MA / JD

We are in the process of negotiating the creation of a joint MA / JD degree program with the law school. This joint agree will attract students that are interested in both law and politics.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** A sub-committee of the graduate committee is currently leading the discussions.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director; sub-committee of graduate committee.

### 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 major research skills we wish to impart to all graduates of our program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**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. We believe implementing this new sequence of courses will ensure that all of our students are able to demonstrate a high degree of mastery of the major research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

**Goals**

**G 5: Teaching Effectiveness**

Doctoral candidates are effective teachers with the ability to teach courses in their primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

**G 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

Doctoral candidates are effective researchers with a full understanding of the research enterprise, including the ability to critique others' work and to be a contributing scholar by producing original research.

**G 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods**

Doctoral candidates are effective researchers with a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to their research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.

**G 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield**

Doctoral candidates are knowledge scholars with demonstrable competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

**G 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

Doctoral candidates are knowledge scholars with demonstrable familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student's major field of expertise.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The student demonstrates familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student's major field of expertise.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.
- 3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students must demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)**

Students have a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to their research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: Comprehensive exam assessments (O: 1, 2)
Based on the program's learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the outcomes.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting. Comprehensive exams test students' knowledge of, at minimum, two fields in the discipline.

**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.

### 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 dissertation.

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

**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.

**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.

**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.

### M 3: Conference presentations, publications and grants (O: 1, 3, 4)

This measure gauges research competency and professional socialization by assessing the success of graduate students in placing...
their work at conferences and in publishing outlets and in attracting funding to support their research.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**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.

**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.

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

**Continue to fund grad student conference travel**

Budget permitting, the department will continue to offer financial support to students for travel to conferences to present their work. Last year, we were able to offer students $250 per conference for a total of two conferences per student per year. This year we had to cut that back to one per student per year at $250.

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

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

- **Measure:** Conference presentations, publications and grants
- **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
- **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.

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

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

- **Measure:** Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations
- **Outcome/Objective:** High Level of Competency in Research Methods

**Implementation Description:** Because it makes sense to collect data following the course sequence, we will implement this measure in August 2010 and report first results in June 2011.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director, graduate committee, instructors of 8800 and 8810.

**"C" Grade Limit**

The department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate
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.

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.

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.

Methods Sequence Reform
The department plans to add a third course to the required methods sequence for PhD students. This is partially in response to data gathered through the assessment process that shows that some of our PhD students do not have adequate methodological skills. The specific details of the proposal are as follows: 1. The 8800 and 8810 requirements would be maintained as they exist now, such that students must take 8800 in their first semester and 8810 in their second. 2. PhD students (not MA students) would be required to take a third methods course, either "Advanced Quantitative Methods" or "Advanced Qualitative Methods", as they prefer. 3. "Advanced Qualitative Methods" would be offered every other spring semester and could be taken at the same time as 8810. This sequence would allow students to take the course within two years of beginning the program. 4. "Advanced Quantitative Methods" would be offered every other fall semester and would have to be taken after completion of 8810. 5. Students entering the program in the year it is not offered could take it the following fall. Those entering in the year it is offered would have to wait until the first semester of their third year to take the course. For this reason it would be better to offer the course every year, but if resources (or enrollment concerns) make that impossible, we can allow students in this position to go forward with comps at the end of their second year even without having taken the course. That way, their progress would not be slowed.
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.

<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):
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: 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.

<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>

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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level of Competency in Research Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: We have been submitting all necessary changes to the graduate catalog for the 2013-2014 academic year.

Responsibles Person/Group: Graduate director and chair.

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 faculty 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.

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.

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.
**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 (G: 1) (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) (G: 2) (M: 2)**
To interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems by applying economic, financial, and psychological theories.

**SLO 3: Assurance Skills (G: 2) (M: 4)**
To provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts.

**SLO 4: Analytical Skills (G: 2) (M: 3)**
To present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions.

**SLO 5: Collaboration Skills (G: 2) (M: 6)**
To collaborate and contribute to achieve team results.

**SLO 6: Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 5, 6)**
To demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant.

**SLO 7: Technology Skills (G: 2) (M: 7)**
Students will demonstrate proficiency in the utilization of technological tools for data analysis.

**SLO 8: Tax Analytical skills (G: 3)**
Tax analytical skills

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 8: Tax analytical skills. (G: 3) (M: 8)**
Develop analytical skills to interpret and apply tax law.

**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. Revised target for 2014-2015: 90% in Question 1, 80% in Question 2, and 85% in Question 3.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
In 2013-2014, the overall mean score on Question 1 was 90%, on Question 2 it was 64% (up from 43% in the prior year), and on Question 3 it was 81%. Targets of 80% were met or exceeded in 2 of the 3 questions.
### M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Interpret & Predict (O: 2)
Performance on exam questions in 8420/8410.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New course 8420 now replaces 8410. It includes foreign exchange risk, acquisitions and mergers, bankruptcy, etc. It is now a regular 3 credit course per semester. Mean score on exam questions was 82% for fall 2013 and spring 2014, and on the project, the mean score was 92% in fall 2013 and spring 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Analytical Skills (O: 4)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**
10/13/2008 Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) Assurance skills 2005-2006 0: Analytical skills (O:0) (Final)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 87% for the question related to valuation implications from asset impairments, and 95% for the question related to analyzing profit margins and asset turnover. Both exceeded the target of 75%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Assurance Skills (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8610
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**
The students performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score on outside research project of 85% in Tx 8120.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O6: Communication Skills**

xxx

### 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: Technology Skills**
Target is mean of 85% on exam questions.
**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**


**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, in ACCT 8040.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: Tax analytical skills.**

Research project mean score of 85% or above for the class.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Mean score on research project was 92.7% for spring 2014, and 91.52% for summer 2014. In the FTMPA Program, the course was taught over a period of eight weeks for three credit hours. This program structure began in Fall 2010. Each semester, the quantity of course material must be coordinated with the exam schedule, which leads to having an exam and then a two-hour lecture afterwards. Due to the compressed class times, students need a chance to work outside of the class on a graded assignment for a significant portion of their final grade instead of having their scores solely based on two exams. Action plan implemented includes giving only two exams and raising the weight of the research assignment to 1/3 of their overall grade. This new strategy is working, making the course more challenging and providing enhanced learning opportunities for students.

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

**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:** 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 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:** In-Progress
- **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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **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
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: Finished
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 the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing how an accounting standard affects parties other than preparers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
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: Finished
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: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Lucia Smeal

Reconfigure last class meeting.
Give students a reason for being attentive to the second two hours of the 4-hour course. Announce and give a quiz over NCI concepts for extra points on the exam just taken.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
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: Finished
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: Finished
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:** Finished
- **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

**Implementation Description:** Implement new course.

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2013

Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

**Emphasize judgment in applying standards.**
Class time will be spent emphasizing that accounting is not black and white, that there are grey areas that involve judgment in applying accounting standards, which leads to earnings management.

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

**Implementation Description:** Class time will be spent emphasizing that accounting is not black and white, that there are grey areas that involve judgment in applying accounting standards, which leads to earnings management.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

**Additional Resources:** Faculty time

**Enhance focus in class by disallowing use of laptops in classroom.**
Ensure greater focus on the lectures by banning the use of laptops that students were using to check email and other research other topics on the internet.

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

**Implementation Description:** 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.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2013

Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher

**Include tax research written assignment as 1/4 of students’ grade**
Include a tax research written assignment as one-fourth of the students’ grades to permit the students to convey their knowledge through another means besides exam testing under a compressed schedule (8 weeks). Project score should raise overall average.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Apply tax law: 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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Learning Outcomes
- Develop Financial Rep. Analyze and Interpret
- Communicate Technological skills
- Assurance Tax Analytical skills
- ACCT 8010 Financial Accounting
- ACCT 8020 Financial Accounting
- ACCT 8030 Managerial Accounting
- ACCT 8040 Federal Tax
- ACCT 8050 Auditing & Assurance
- ACCT 8090 International Acct. Practice
- ACCT 8102 Advanced Federal Taxation
- ACCT 8130 Advanced Accounting
- ACCT 8310 Seminar in MAS
- ACCT 8420 Special Topics Fin.
- ACCT 8700 Fin. Statement Analysis
- ACCT 8630 IT Auditing
- ACCT 8610 Advanced Auditing

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

As the visual below displays, the assurance of learning process has resulted in continual improvement in the 4 courses that have been assessed over the last four years. The quality of the MPA program is shown in the many learning outcomes that have improved over the past few years, as measured. The improvement in learning outcomes is due to the assessment action plans which have called for many changes in the education program such as expanding the scope of the course, raising the target level, revamping the curriculum of a course, including cases and projects so students better understand the application of a concept, and adding significant content which are shown below under the corresponding courses. The one area where we are currently not capturing but will soon is the student learning outcome related to technological skills, which was recognized as a felt need by the CPA firms from conversations at the advisory council meeting for the School of Accountancy. A survey of students and firms validated the gap in required excel skills and student knowledge. In 2013-2014, the school made a concerted effort to include Excel (and similar technology) in as many appropriate courses as possible. Once we know the specific excel competencies that are being included, we will develop the appropriate measures in 2014-2015. The assessment process creates a strong sense of awareness of the student learning outcomes, and makes one seek out innovative solutions so that we can improve the learning experience for the students and help them reach the targets measured. The diligent process calls for a systematic and timely collection of scores from tests so that changes can be made in a timely manner. All this increases the quality of the findings. Assurance of Learning: MPA program, 2010 - 2014 2010-2011 Finding: 48% on NCI questions. Innovation Action: Test question right after NCI chapter for credit. Finding: The mean score was 75% for the fast-track and 82% for the flex program. Not tested ACCT 8040 taught over 8 weeks for 3 credit hours. Spring 2011 mean: 84.3% 2011-2012 Finding: 86.6% on NCI questions. Action plan effective. Innovation: revamp the course from 1 hour per semester for 3 semesters (8410) to 3 hour course per semester, to remove the prolonged time between classes (8420), and replace outdated material. Target met on 4 of 6, except: interpreting the valuation implication from asset impairment (73%) and analyzing profit margins and asset turnover (73%). Change: Reduce number of quizzes (no dropped quizzes). Due to compressed class time, included a research project for ¼ of total grade. Spring 2012 mean: 88.57% 2012-2013 Innovation: expand content to include government financial statements. Mean score of 75% on valuation question, 84% on profit margins. Innovation: include team project to apply concepts analyze Fortune 500 company’s financials. Survey of supervisors, managers, partners at 4 large public accounting firms in Atlanta on preparedness of new hires in Excel: mean score 6.661 on a 10 point scale; new hires: 5.326 mean. Continued improvement in score: spring 2013 mean: 94.21% 2013-2014 Innovation: Require completed coursework for class participation credit. Result: 90%, 84%, 85%. Mean score of 92% on the project in fall 2013 and spring 2014. However, included in test, the score was less than 65%. Mean score of 87% on valuation question, 95% on profit
3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Faculty who teach the various courses in the program meet (as we did earlier this week) to (1) review results for the previous year’s program assessment, (2) discuss changes and innovations to reach targets, (3) what worked and what did not, (4) what learning outcomes to assess in the year ahead, and (5) what course best suits the outcome and develop measures and targets.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Based on the findings from 2013-2014, here are the changes underway for 2014-2015: 1. For the student learning outcome related to developing financial reporting systems, for course ACCT 8130, the target was met on 2 of 3 of the test questions related to consolidation. To help the students better understand the apply the concepts, two cases will be introduced in spring 2015 (one excel one research). A better understanding is expected to lead to a better performance on the learning outcome. In addition, the governmental/not-for profit accounting chapters (3 in all) were added to the same Advanced accounting course in 2013 because the topic is covered in the FAAR section of the CPA exam. The change in FAAR scores of the CPA exam will be used as a gauge for the effectiveness of the change in curriculum. 2. For the student learning outcome related to communication, the targets were met. Therefore, the student learning outcome related to collaboration will be measured instead. In ACCT 8420, a team project will be assigned where students will analyze the FASB comment letters. The contribution of each team member to the project will be measured. 3. For the student learning outcome related to interpreting and analyzing financial information, the targets were met in 2013-2014. New measures are being developed for assessment in 2014-2015 in the same course 8700. 4. For the student learning outcome related to technology skills, a certification of excel competency skills in D2L will be introduced for students in 8310. A 100% pass rate is required in specific competencies such as pivot tables, data sort, if/then, macros, formulas, etc. 5. For the student learning outcome related to tax analytical skills, course 8040 has met the target. Therefore, course 8120 will now replace 8040 and new assessment measures will be in place for 2014-2015.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**2013-2014 Psychology Assessment Data by Section**  
**Mission / Purpose**

Two courses offered by the Department of Psychology fulfill requirements in the new University System of Georgia Core Curriculum: PSYC1101 - Introductory Psychology, and PSYC1100 - Introduction to Biopsychology. The purpose of the first course is to prepare students to articulate historical and current theories regarding the complexity of human behavior. The purpose of the second course is to develop students’ understanding of the physiological mechanisms of behavior of living organisms.

**Goals**

**G 1: Area D: Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Technology**

Students have an understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning to reveal the physiological basis of behavior in living organisms.

**G 2: Area E: Social Sciences**

Students have the ability to articulate the historical and theoretical understanding of the complexity of behavior.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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.

**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.

### 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 mastery test questions to align with current CLEP exams for introductory psychology

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Chris Goode, Deborah Garfin

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Psychology BA, BS**

(As of 12/13/2016 06:09 PM EST)

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

**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.

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.

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).

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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Information and Technological Literacy**
Seventy-five percent passing with a grade of 75% or better.

---

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Psychology PhD**
(As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the PhD program in the Department of Psychology is to educate graduate students in various areas of psychology and provide specific training in scholarship, research, clinical, and other skills, consistent with the expertise of the current faculty. Five programs are represented: Clinical Psychology, Community Psychology, Cognitive Sciences, Development Psychology, and Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience. Our graduate students seek entry to our program hoping to become licensed clinical psychologists; psychologists in community, non-profit, or governmental organizations; college teachers in undergraduate institutions; and researchers in research settings including research universities. Our mission is to provide the appropriate education and training for a PhD psychologist in such settings.
Goals

G 1: Psychological Science
To train graduate students to be scientists (e.g., empiricists, critical thinkers) across domains (e.g., applied, theoretical).

G 2: Knowledge in Psychology
To train graduate students to be well-versed broadly in psychology (e.g., history of the field, research methodology) as well as experts in specific areas of concentration (e.g., clinical, child clinical, specific research program).

G 3: Applied Skills in Psychology
To train graduate students to be able to apply their skills across settings (e.g., research, instruction, applied) and within specific areas of individualized interest and concentration (e.g., community center for disadvantaged populations).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Theory and Content (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16)
Students will develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in the field of Psychology, the program area, and the research specialty area.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

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

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

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

SLO 2: Research Methods (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16)
Students will understand and appropriately apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Standard Associations
1.0 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4.0 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 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
1.0 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").

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

The average score should be between a 2 ("Met Expectations") and 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

The average score should be between a 2 ("Met Expectations") and 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**M 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt</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").

### Target for O2: Research Methods

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills

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").

### 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").

### 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").

### 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").

### M 6: PhD Dissertation Proposal GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)

During the oral presentation of the PhD. proposal, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations).

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

### Target for O1: Theory and Content

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O2: Research Methods

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### M 7: PhD Dissertation Defense GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)

During the oral presentation of the PhD. defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations).

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

### Target for O1: Theory and Content

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O2: Research Methods

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").
**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**M 8: PhD Dissertation (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting.

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**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 earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses knowledge of scientific and professional ethical issues.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**M 13: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)**
Psyc 9900T: Teaching seminar
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O4: Application**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**M 14: Teaching performance (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)**
Review of student-instruction course evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O4: Application**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**M 15: Publications and presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**
Publications and presentations
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 16: Annual evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

Faculty members of each program review all students in their program annually to determine how many students are performing satisfactorily on each learning outcome.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

### 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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Personal Development
- **Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC

#### Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Application
- **Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC

#### Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content
- **Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC

#### Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills
- **Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC
Discuss with Graduate Program Committee

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Evaluate Communication and Collaboration Skills training as evaluated with the General Exam

The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in communication and collaboration skills, especially training related to the skills assessed on the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Evaluate Communication and Critical Thinking Skills training as evaluated with the General Exam

The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in critical thinking, especially these skills as they are demonstrated on the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Evaluate Research Methods training as evaluated with the General Exam

The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in research methods, especially the skills that are assessed with the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Evaluate teaching performance

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Information and Technology Literacy

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Evaluate teaching performance

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.
Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development
Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Values in Psychology
Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Personal Development
Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate Theory and Content training as evaluated with the General Exam
Findings will be discussed by the Graduate Program Committee (Chairs of the 5 Psychology program) to identify whether training in theory and content should be improved, especially around the skills assessed by the General Exam.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

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: PhD Dissertation Proposal 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.
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Mission / Purpose
The Master of Public Administration (MPA) program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies prepares students to become leaders 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
SLO 18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law (G: 7) (M: 18)
Students able to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking, adjudication of administrative action, and judicial review of administrative action or demonstrate knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising, and employee compensation.

SLO 19: Evaluate the legal rights and responsibilities of public or nonprofit managers and employees (G: 7) (M: 19)
Students able to evaluate the legal rights and responsibilities of public or nonprofit managers and employees.

SLO 20: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (G: 7) (M: 20)
Students demonstrate ability to understand administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution avenues to resolve conflict and grievances.

SLO 21: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (G: 8) (M: 21)
Students able to identify and evaluate the major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

SLO 22: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (G: 8) (M: 22)
Students able to demonstrate how specific organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations.

SLO 23: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (G: 8) (M: 23)
Students demonstrate how to use organizational theories and related tools to solve practical management problems in a public and nonprofit agency.

SLO 24: Demonstrate ability to effectively analyze problems and develop solutions (G: 9) (M: 24)
Students will demonstrate an ability to use critical thinking skills to analyze problems and develop solutions to these problems.

SLO 25: Effective verbal and written communication skills related to public or nonprofit issues (G: 9) (M: 25)
Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate clearly and concisely through written or oral communication. Different classes will emphasize different aspects of communication skills depending on the nature of the material to be covered.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Describe and analyze the key models of government and administrative reform (O: 1)
In policy memos and on the final exam students will be able to describe and analyze the key models of government and administrative reform or demonstrate knowledge of important contemporary organizational and environmental challenges faced by leaders and managers of nonprofit organizations and the policy and management issues that now confront the sector (PMAP 8111 or PMAP 8210)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students at least partially meet this objective. In policy memos and on the final exam students will be able to describe and analyze the key difference between models of government and administrative reform driving public policy.

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.

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)
### 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

### 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

### 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

### 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

### 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 8141, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit administration and policy.

**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 8141 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.

**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.

**M 11: Demonstrated understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 11)**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

**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.

**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
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 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.

M 15: Demonstrated ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (O: 15)

All of the course requirements consisting of four written assignments, a midterm exam, a final exam, and a final project will document the students’ ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O15: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or nonprofit organizations

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students in PMAP 8161 will at least partially meet this objective. All of the course requirements consisting of four written assignments, a midterm exam, a final exam, and a final project will document the students’ ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation.

M 16: Demonstrated ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (O: 16)

On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8171, Public Management Systems and Strategies, will at least partially meet this objective. On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.

M 17: Demonstrated understanding of models of organizational structure and design (O: 17)

Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8171 will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

M 18: Demonstrated knowledge of contract and administrative law or nonprofit law (O: 18)

The research proposal and research paper will allow the student to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking, adjudication of administrative action, and judicial review of administrative action, or demonstrate knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising and employee compensation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8411 or PMAP 8203 will at least partially meet this objective. The research proposal and paper will allow students to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking,
target for Q21: 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 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.

Target for Q22: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations

On the midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

Target for Q23: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 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 the midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.
the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the
teacher's knowledge or skill. 82% of the students in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet this objective. On the midterm essay, the final
eay, and the case study students demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and
onprofit agencies.

**M 24: Demonstrate ability to analyze problems effectively and develop solutions (O: 24)**

Students will demonstrate an ability to use critical thinking skills to analyze problems and develop solutions to these problems. Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze problems and develop solutions using written, analytical or quantitative skills depending on the nature of the class. (All Courses)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O24: Demonstrate ability to effectively analyze problems and develop solutions**

Faculty teaching all core courses are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

**M 25: Effective verbal and written communication on public or nonprofit issues (O: 25)**

Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate clearly and concisely through written or oral communication. Different classes will emphasize different aspects of communication skills depending on the nature of the material to be covered.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O25: Effective verbal and written communication skills related to public or nonprofit issues**

Faculty teaching all core courses are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objectives at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the School of Public Health at Georgia State University is advancing health through leadership, scholarship, research and service to better the human condition and promote the common good, especially for urban communities and for global populations. Master's (MPH) students will become competent in the areas of knowledge considered core to MPH level graduates: biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health sciences, health services administration and the social and behavioral sciences.

Note: The Master of Public Health program began in the Fall of 2004. The first students graduated in Spring 2006.

**Goals**

G 1: MPH CORE

MPH students demonstrate application of core public health knowledge areas through a culminating experience.

G 2: MPH Analyze and Evaluate

MPH students will identify a public health area that they can analyze, evaluate, and design a culminating experience around.

G 3: MPH Create

MPH students use critical thinking, sound scientific inquiry, and scholarly writing to address public health problems through a culminating experience directed toward impacting research and/or practice.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts (M: 1)**

Students will articulate and utilize an understanding of core public health concepts from the five divisions of public health: biostatistics, epidemiology, social and behavioral sciences, health services administration, and environmental health.

Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to plan, implement and evaluate programs and services designed to address public health conditions of a population(s).

**SLO 3: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health (M: 1)**

Students will understand and employ an 'ecological approach' to public health, with emphasis on linkages and relationships among
the multiple determinants of health, to assure conditions that protect and promote the health of populations.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate communication and research skills consonant with the academic and professional field of Public Health.

**SLO 5: Apply Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)**

Students will apply critical thinking skills within the context of public health practice and research.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

The Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) requires all MPH students to demonstrate public health skills and integration of public health knowledge through a culminating experience. CEPH (2011) specifies that, "a culminating experience is one that requires a student to synthesize and integrate knowledge acquired in coursework and other learning experiences and to apply theory and principles in a situation that approximates some aspect of professional practice." Each GSU MPH student has the option of completing either a thesis or special capstone research project as their culminating experience options. Both culminating experiences are designed to test the student's competency in core public health knowledge, skills and abilities and to ensure proficiency in the student's area of specialization. The thesis must represent high standards of scholarly inquiry, technical mastery, and literacy skill. It should be a contribution to the student's area of study and should reflect the student's independent efforts with guidance from the thesis committee. The thesis may be written in a traditional or a manuscript format, as decided upon by the student and his/her thesis chair and committee. Additionally, every student who has completed a thesis will complete a final oral examination of his or her work and learning (final defense). The capstone is designed as a practical experience for students, and serves as an alternative to the thesis requirement for graduation in the MPH program. The goal of the capstone is to enhance students' public health knowledge and to improve students' proficiency in a specific public health area of interest. Students will integrate knowledge and skills acquired through their academic coursework and apply these principles and ideas to a particular public health problem or situation similar to that found in a professional work setting. The capstone project will require a final product (i.e. a community assessment report, a video, a website, a program evaluation, etc.) and may also require a written report of the experience, as decided upon by the student and his/her capstone chair and committee. Additionally, every student who has completed a capstone project will also complete a final oral examination of his or her work and learning (final defense). 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 an evaluation program that included a 4 point, 5 item rubric that links to SPH 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

21 out of 21 students (100%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.29.

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

19 out of 21 students (91%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.24.

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

19 out of 21 students (91%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.24.

#### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

20 out of 21 students (95%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.00.

#### 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

20 out of 21 students (95%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.00.
50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

17 out of 21 students (81%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.10.

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

**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

**Assessment Procedures Review**
The SPH has recently hired a Director of Accreditation and Evaluation, and has established an Assessment and Evaluation Committee. This committee will review all SPH assessment procedures, and recommend any necessary changes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment and Evaluation Committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Objective one--articulate and utilize an understanding of core public health concepts from the five divisions of public health--is learned in the five core courses every MPH student completes, with each course based on one of the five divisions of public health. Objectives two and three are also learned in these five core courses. Objective four is learned in the required public health research course all MPH students complete. All objectives, including objective five, are further learned, practiced, and mastered in the required practicum course, and required thesis/capstone course, as well as in the required concentrations and elective courses.

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Consistent with previous years, all findings met target goals. This speaks to the level of faculty mentorship available to MPH students, particularly when preparing for their final assessment. This is certainly a strength of this MPH program.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

The SPH has recently hired a Director of Accreditation and Evaluation, and has established an Assessment and Evaluation Committee. This committee will meet annually (in fall semesters) to discuss findings and disseminate them to faculty and stakeholders. Faculty and programs will then make data-driven changes, or know to avoid making changes to successful strategies.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

The SPH has recently hired a Director of Accreditation and Evaluation, and has established an Assessment and Evaluation Committee. This committee will meet soon have its first to discuss findings and consider changes to both the programs and the assessment process.

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2013-2014 Public Health PhD**
**As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

A Public Health PhD assessment plan (which will be based on the dissertation) is going to be outlined in early 2014-2015. The Public Health PhD program has not had any graduates, or dissertation defenses, so there has not been anything to assess. We hope to have our first Public Health PhD program graduate in the next two years.
Mississippi State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Public Policy BS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST
(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 and citizenship requirements for each level. The role of the individual as part of the larger community is also considered. Students become active participants in public service. This has been a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) course; however, this past year the faculty voted to change the CTW designation from this course to PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues. The change will take effect next year, removing the CTW designation from PMAP 3021.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate the variety of ways in which citizens can help to shape public policy.

SLO 2: Participate in public and community affairs (G: 1) (M: 2)
Through service learning students participate in public and community affairs. The students become active citizens of the community.

SLO 3: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy (G: 1) (M: 3)
As a CTW course, students develop writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy.

SLO 4: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students learn from leaders from all three sectors of society and how these leaders make changes within their organizational settings.

SLO 5: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students must demonstrate their understanding of important issue in leadership theory.

SLO 6: Compare leadership theory and practice (G: 2) (M: 6)
Students must demonstrate their ability to compare theoretical aspects of leadership with practical applications.

SLO 7: demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate (G: 3) (M: 7)
Student must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society.
SLO 8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (G: 3) (M: 8)
Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation and examinations.

SLO 9: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (G: 3) (M: 9)
Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

SLO 10: Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy (G: 4) (M: 10)
Students demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze important questions in public policy.

SLO 11: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 11)
Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

SLO 12: Apply scientific method to policy issues (G: 5) (M: 12)
Students must demonstrate their ability to apply the scientific method to policy issues.

SLO 13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research (G: 5) (M: 13)
Students must demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research.

SLO 14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW) (G: 5) (M: 14)
Students must demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.

SLO 15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (G: 6) (M: 15)
Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.

SLO 16: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention (G: 6) (M: 16)
Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Students demonstrate how citizens shape public policy (O: 1)
Students demonstrate how citizens can help to shape public policy. This is demonstrated on the writing assignments for the course (weekly memos), the ULearn discussion board sessions, and final report.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet the objective. This will be measured by weekly memos, ULearn discussion board sessions, and the final report.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Overall, 89.6% of students at least partially demonstrated the knowledge, 42.4% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.008.

M 2: Participate and report on public and community affairs through service learning (O: 2)
Students participate in service learning and report on activities in their agencies that demonstrate how citizens work in public and community affairs. This is measured using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O2: Participate in public and community affairs
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet the objective. This will be measured by using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Overall, 87.9% of students at least partially accomplished the objective, 54.0% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.11.

M 3: Demonstrate writing skills appropriate to public policy (O: 3)
Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy. This is demonstrated through weekly policy memos and a final paper that meet the CTW requirements of the course.

**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 this objective. Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy. This is demonstrated through weekly policy memos and a final paper that meet the CTW requirements of the course. **Overall, 82.9% of students at least partially accomplished the objective, 60.5% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.04.**

**M 4: Students demonstrate how leaders from all sectors lead organizational change (O: 4)**

On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations.

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

**Target for O4: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations. **Overall, 82.9% of students at least partially accomplished the objective, 60.5% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.04.**

**M 5: Students answer test questions on midterm and final exams on leadership theory (O: 5)**

Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper.

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

**Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially demonstrate this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper. **Overall, 82.9% of students at least partially accomplished the objective, 60.5% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.04.**

**M 6: Students compare theoretical approaches to practical applications of leadership (O: 6)**

Students write paragraphs after each class period describing practical applications of leadership with theoretical perspectives. This is also measured in the final application paper assignment.

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

**Target for O6: Compare leadership theory and practice**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in the Policy Leadership course will meet this objective. Students write paragraphs each week showing their ability to apply theoretical perspectives on leadership to their roles as emerging leaders. This is also measured in the final application paper assignment. **Overall, 82.9% of students at least partially accomplished the objective, 60.5% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.04.**

**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. **Overall, 82.9% of students at least partially accomplished the objective, 60.5% were excellent, and the mean score was 4.04.**

**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.
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.

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.

M 11: Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 11)

Students develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS. This is demonstrated using examinations and class assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O11: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students enrolled in the course 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.

M 12: Demonstrate ability to apply scientific method to policy issues (O: 12)

Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O12: Apply scientific method to policy issues

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in the course will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.

M 13: Demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research (O: 13)

Students demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research. These techniques include experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, and others. This will be measured using examinations and the major policy evaluation writing assignment.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students enrolled in the course 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.
M 14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research proposal as a CTW assignment (O: 14)

Students will complete a written evaluation research proposal to demonstrate how they would design an evaluation project for a public policy. This is measured by the major CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.

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

Target for O14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW)

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students will at least partially meet this objective. Students will complete a written evaluation research proposal to demonstrate how they would design an evaluation project for a public policy. This is measured by the major CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.

M 15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (O: 15)

Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in PMAP 4061, Introduction to Policy Analysis, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.

M 16: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy (O: 16)

Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured through a final written assignment.

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

Target for O16: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured through a final written assignment.

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

Core sequence: 4041-4061

WEAVE has identified weaknesses in the statistical methods, research design/evaluation, and policy analysis sequence in the core curriculum. These courses have traditionally been taught by doctoral students or part-time instructors rather than tenure-track faculty. We have probably not provided enough guidance or support for these mostly first-time teachers. This year, the School provided training for all new instructors in August and PMAP provided some classroom observations, feedback, and one-on-one counseling. The department will appoint a committee to study long-run improvements, which may involve assigning tenure-track faculty to teach the courses once a year, with prospective GTAs attending and assisting, and/or to provide more substantial support to GTAs through repeated observations and meetings.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Chair will appoint committee to discuss options.
Projected Completion Date: 03/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Greg Lewis

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Public Policy MPP
As of 12/12/2016 06:09 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**
This course is designed to introduce students to the conceptual methods used to analyze the need for change in the public sector.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>Understand different ways of categorizing policies (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2</th>
<th>Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students consider the influence of formal and informal actors on public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>Understand different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students understand different models of policy making such as the policy process model, as well as other models drawn from the public policy literature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4</th>
<th>Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5</th>
<th>Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6</th>
<th>Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7</th>
<th>Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts (G: 3) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing policy analysts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8</th>
<th>Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9</th>
<th>Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10</th>
<th>Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11</th>
<th>Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

**M 2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (O: 2)**
Students demonstrate understanding of how different actors are likely to influence policy decisions. This is measured by in-class policy debates and on written assignments.

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

**Target for O2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students will at least partially meet this objective.

**M 3: Students understand different models of policy making (O: 3)**
Students understand different models of policy making such as the policy process model, as well as other models drawn from the public policy literature. This is measured by examinations and written assignments.

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

**Target for O3: Understand different models of policy-making**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students in PMAP 8011 will at least partially meet this objective.

**M 4: Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (O: 4)**
Students in PMAP 8121 complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

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

**Target for O4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of...
M 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 5)

Students in PMAP 8121 do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

M 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 6)

The students' final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

M 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)

The students’ final paper and the midterm and final examinations in PMAP 8121 measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students' final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

M 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 8)

Students in PMAP 8131 use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131, Applied Research Methods and Statistics II, will at least partially meet this objective. Students use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

M 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)

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.

### M 10: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (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.

### M 11: 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.

### M 12: 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.

### M 13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (O: 13)

Students enrolled in PMAP 8521, Evaluation Research, will demonstrate the ability to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. On the two examinations, homework assignments and presentations students will demonstrate their understanding of the causes of bias in regression analysis.

### M 14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (O: 14)

Students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies are measured by examinations and the final project.
M 15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain (O: 15)

Students enrolled in PMAP 8521 can select the appropriate evaluation design for a particular evaluation domain.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.

M 16: Understand how to identify policy problems (O: 16)

The students enrolled in PMAP 8531 will demonstrate that they can identify policy problems. This is measured by the students' papers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O16: To understand how to identify policy problems

Faculty teaching all core courses are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

M 17: Understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives (O: 17)

Students enrolled in PMAP 8531 will demonstrate their understanding of the characteristics of different policy alternatives. This is measured by their performance of papers and two examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O17: To understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives

Faculty teaching all core courses are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

M 18: Understand how to construct a policy memo (O: 18)

Students in PMAP 8531 demonstrate how to construct a policy memo. This is done on several policy memo assignments and a final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O18: To understand how to construct a policy memo

Faculty teaching all core courses are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in core courses will at least partially meet this objective.
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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. |

| 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. |

| 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. |

| 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. |

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

**Doctoral Program Committee developed 3-part action plan**

The Doctoral Program Committee developed a three-part Action Plan to improve students’ performance on the major field portion of the comprehensive examinations. First, faculty members will update the reading list for students in each major field. Next, the Doctoral Program Committee will review admission criteria against performance on the comprehensive examinations. Perhaps some students were admitted in the past who should not have been. Finally, each major field advisor will conduct tutorial sessions for those students preparing for the examination. A special focus will be placed on the students who failed this year’s field exams.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Major Field Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field

Implementation Description: Faculty will complete these action plan steps prior to the beginning of the new academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Program Committee

---
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Master of Education Reading Specialist (RLL) is to prepare educators to become reading specialists who are informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice.

Goals
G 1: G-1 have a strong content knowledge of literacy theories and instruction
Candidates are informed educators who have a strong content knowledge of literacy theories and instruction.

G 2: G-2 have pedagogical knowledge and dispositions needed to design culturally responsive literacy environments
Candidates are professional educators with pedagogical knowledge and dispositions needed to design culturally responsive literacy environments and practices.

G 3: G-3 have knowledge of literacy practices and assessments that impact students' literacy growth and development
Candidates have knowledge of literacy practices and assessments that impact student growth and development in literacy.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

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

SLO 2: Demonstrates knowledge of SBRR principles (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.

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

SLO 3: Incorporates a wide range of curricular materials (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates incorporate a wide range of curricular materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of literacy development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

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

SLO 4: View professional development as a career long responsibility (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

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

SLO 5: Incorporates a variety of assessment tools to plan effective instruction (G: 3) (M: 4)
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction which have impact on students' literacy growth and development.

  Strategic Plan Associations
  2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
SLO 6: Evaluates self and others' teaching practices (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History (O: 1)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards one and two.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Over 80% of students averaged a score of 5.0 (advanced) on the portfolio rating standard.

M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations (O: 1, 2)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards one, two, and three.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric. Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Over 80% of students averaged 5.0, scoring a 5 (advanced) as measured by the rubric.

Target for O2: Demonstrates knowledge of SBRR principles
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students met the 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students met target goals of 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students solidified understanding of this objective, having met the target goals of scoring 5 when 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Based on students' outcome and evaluations of themselves and other's teaching practices, students scored 5 when 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Based on students’ assessment tools in planning effective instruction, students met target goals of scoring 5 when measured on the rubric.

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

**Redesigned Portfolio**

Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lori Elliott
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Redesigned Portfolio**

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **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 will 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
Goals

Mission / Purpose

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language, and Literacy ESOL - Online M.A.T 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 OnLine (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.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.
NA

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?
Assessment reporting of students' performance and impact to their program has been quite consistent with students performing and meeting target proficiency ranking for each assessment component. We learned that our program is still rigorous and challenging to what students will need after they leave our degree program; thus, we consider this a strength. In addition, a weakness could be the low enrollment to our program as state and district changes have cut programs to hire reading specialists.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.
Assessment findings are shared and discussed via M.Ed. Reading, Language, and Literacy unit faculty and via assessment reporting. As a result of these reporting, changes and/or improvements were determined for students in each academic year.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
Our program has continued to demonstrate improvement and impact for over 80% of students who scored 5 when measured for each assessment component. Students have met proficient requirements in our degree program. We continue to assess students' progress with advising and informational sessions twice a year to determine further changes to be added for the upcoming academic years.
**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.

**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.

**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.

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)**
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Target for O4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**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.

**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.

**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.

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

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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**Portfolio Support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>Jayoung Choi &amp; other MSIT faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Jayoung Choi &amp; other MSIT faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Jayoung Choi &amp; other MSIT faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Jayoung Choi &amp; other MSIT faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Georgia State University
Goals

G 1: Content Knowledge
Students will have knowledge of reading and ESOL.

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Students are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching reading and English to Speakers of Other Languages in their base certifications (Grades PreK-12).

G 3: Impact on student learning
Students are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on reading and the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition.

SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)
Students create learning environments which support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families. Students also demonstrate the effectiveness of the P-12 students’ learning of reading.

SLO 4: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.

SLO 5: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students (G: 3) (M: 6)
Students use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

Measures (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.

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.

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
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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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)
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Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
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- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Additional Resources: Additional faculty
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
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Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
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- 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.
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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 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: 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: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Strengthening Professional Standard
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, “students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility” has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

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

improving clinical practice
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
Implementation Description: Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving content knowledge
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in ESOL. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge in ESOL | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL
Implementation Description: Expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving content knowledge, Reading
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in Reading. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  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.
improving effects on P-12 student learning

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners' learning in P-12. This means that candidates will successfully learn content knowledge, on which they plan and implement rigorous lessons, which are followed by critical reflection on their teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (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 | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Planning Performance | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
Implementation Description: Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

closely monitoring students' progress in the EDRD 7600 course in terms of dispositions

In the course work, EDRD 7600, 88% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 53% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their EDRD 7600 course work. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 53% received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their dispositions as teachers and leaders. This means that expectations for them to develop positive dispositions are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work as well as in the program level.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions
Implementation Description: Expectations for them to develop positive dispositions as teachers and leaders are high in the courses and throughout the program and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course and program work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator & EDRD reading faculty for GOML

closely monitoring students' progress in the ERD 7600 course

In the course work, ERD 7600, 88% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 59% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their ERD 7600 course work. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 59% received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Also, 100% students in the final exit portfolio on the reading content received a score of 3. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in Reading. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | 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 2011-2012 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 throughout courses. 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):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
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Mission / Purpose
The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals
G 1: Content knowledge
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

G 3: Impact on student learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2)**

Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum).

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

GACE scores for 2013/14 ...

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

In the area of Content Knowledge, of our first standard on language learning and teaching including the history of teaching, teacher candidates obtained scores ranging from 3.5 to 5 with an average score of 4.2 for the entire cohort. Achieving a score of 3.5 or above reflects the rigor of our program and the strengths of our students. On our Content Knowledge second standard (Culture), our teacher candidates achieved scores ranging from 3-5 with an average score of 4.1 Our combined knowledge standards scores reflect that our target indicating that 90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient score (3) or higher levels was achieved as the combined average for the Content Knowledge standards was 4.15. Therefore, 100 % of candidates in 2013-14 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. On the four categories for content knowledge, a minimum of 62% and a maximum of 75% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4).

**M 3: Planning Performance (O: 2)**

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
In the area of professional and pedagogical skills, candidates attained portfolio scores ranging from 3 to 5 with an average score of 4.1. Therefore, 100% of candidates in 2013-14 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages professional dispositions as shown in their exit portfolio.

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.

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.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Students' advocacy portfolio scores ranged from 3 to 5 with an average of 4.07 attained. In their professional development standard the scores ranged from 3.5 to 5 with the average being 3.92. These two standards combined demonstrate teacher candidates' professional dispositions which together average 3.99 which shows that 100% of our candidates Therefore, 100% of candidates in 2013-14 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages professional dispositions as shown in their exit portfolio.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Forthcoming

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

Increase Collaboration and Communication
The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL Faculty and Supervisors: Amy Flint, Gertrude Tinker Sachs, Yan Wang and Eudes Aoulou

Increased Focus on Assessment
Candidates in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL Program performed moderately well on “Understanding and using assessment for learning.”
Evidence for demonstrating this standard was revealed in their electronic student teaching notebooks, supervisor observations and portfolio standards. To that end the TEEMS faculty will more systematically address issues of authentic assessment, rubric creation, and how assessment drives instruction. The faculty will do this in courses and in student teaching seminars.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 School year  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS RLL-ESOL faculty and supervisors: Gertrude Tinker-Sachs, Amy Flint, Teresa Fisher,

**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 readings 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 proficiently (Score 3) in professional and pedagogical skills through the “Clinical Practice at Midpoint”; however, a minimum of 19% and a maximum of 38% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4 or higher). Thus, in order to help our candidate increase their professional and pedagogical skills, ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in discussions and reflections about four areas, (a) knowledge of students and learning, (b) learning environments, (c) assessment, and (d) planning and instruction. More specifically, in TSLE classes, our candidates are asked to observe and interview English language learners about their language acquisition, to analyze interviews for a brief report, and to investigate the context where learning may take place. In addition, in EDRD reading classes, our candidates are asked to assess pre-k-12 students’ English language and literacy (especially reading) skills and conduct lessons based on their assessment of students’ language and literacy skills. By doing so, our candidate are likely to increase their knowledge of professional and pedagogical skills in ESOL.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in various kinds of learning tasks, assignments, and activities into TSLE content area courses and EDRD reading courses. Detailed descriptions are seen in the section “Description” above.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL  
**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty.  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Improving dispositions**

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**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  
**Measure (Key Assessment):** Effects on P-12 Student Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2015  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2013-2014 Real Estate BBA**  
As of: 12/13/2016 06:09 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)
Mission / Purpose
The BBA real estate major is designed for individuals entering careers in the real estate industry. It provides the student with the real estate knowledge and analytical skills necessary to support real property decisions in business environments as well as the requisite skills to effectively communicate them.

Goals
G 1: Graduates will have industry knowledge, analytical skills, and critical thinking through writing skills.
Graduates will have sufficient industry knowledge to support real estate decision making; analytical skills to make sound equity investment recommendations, value enhancing project funding strategies, and effective project development plans; and critical thinking through writing skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Students will demonstrate creative decision-making skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
To develop creative decision-making skills associated with the real estate industry, the student will 1) apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations, 2) evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances, and 3) use knowledge of real estate development to lay out efficient project development plans.

SLO 2: To demonstrate critical thinking through writing skills (G: 1) (M: 4)
The student will formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations (O: 1)
Measure 1: Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations. Criteria (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: Project, either individual or group
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
C1: BBA RE major students averaged 2.70; 83% met standard on exam. C2: BBA RE major students averaged 2.90; 100% met standard on project.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
C1: Students averaged 2.67; 94% met standard as measured by exam question. C2: Students averaged 2.50; 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
C1. Student average 2.57 100% students meet standard. C2. Student average 2.29 100% students 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 (RE4160) Criteria 2: Persuasively communicate interpretations and solutions to real estate problems (RE4160)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: To demonstrate critical thinking through writing skills

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
C1: BBA RE major students averaged 2.90; 100% met standard on a project. C2: BBA RE major students averaged 2.90; 100% met standard on a project.

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

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: Finished
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

Revise assessment plan to integrate CTW assessment
The CTW assessment is being merged with the program assessment. RE4160 has been designated a CTW course in addition to RE4700. The assessment of critical thinking through writing is being used to replace the assessment of effective written business communication in the BBA-Real Estate assessment plan and the assessment of critical thinking through writing is being moved from RE4700 to RE4160.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions | Outcome/Objective: To demonstrate critical thinking through writing skills

Implementation Description: Edit current assessment plan, circulate to faculty for approval vote, post plan to Weave, distribute to faculty. Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Department faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?
We continue to review individual measures to ensure they accurately assess learning. The individual questions and assignments used to assess broad and complex concepts are sometimes too narrow to accurately reflect student learning.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.
Course specific assessment findings are shared in writing with instructors to improve individual courses and teaching. The entire program assessment findings are shared among full-time faculty to consider changes in curriculum and assessment plan in faculty meetings.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
We continue to review all assessment measures on an ongoing basis.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Real Estate MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST
**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

C1: Student average 2.22 89% met standard in RE8020. C2. Student average 2.56 100% met standard in RE8030. C3 Student average 2.70 100% met standard in RE8040. C4 Student average 2.40 80% met standard in RE8060.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

C1: Student average 2.56; 100% of students meet standard in RE8030. C2: Student average 2.44; 89% of 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

C1: Student average 2.67; 89% of students meet standard on exam in RE8020. C2: Student average 2.00; 78% of students meet standard on exam in RE8020. C3: Student average 2.21; 93% of 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). (AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8090). 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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

C1: Student average 2.11; 89% of students met standard in RE8020. C2: Student average 1.78; 78% of students met standard in RE8020. C3: Student average 2.80; 100% of 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

C1. Student average 2.44 89% of students met standard in RE8030. C2. Student average 2.78 100% of students met standard in RE8030. C3. Student average 2.22 89% of students met standard in 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**

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

C1: Student average 2.36; 86% of students meet standard (RE8050) C2: Student average 2.43; 100% of students meet standard (RE8050) C3: Student average 2.43; 97% of students meet standard (RE8050)

**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**

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Instructors left the university and no replacements hired, so course in which outcome assessed was canceled.

**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**

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Averages on this measure. C1: 2.30 (RE8090). C2: 2.60 (RE8090).

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

### Continuation of new framework implementation plan

Review achievement targets. At present target is expressed as an average. The Department will review whether this should be modified to encompass a minimum percentage of students attaining target. This was signaled in last year’s Action Plan but not fully pursued because for a number of courses last year was the first implementation of the new framework. Support instructors in interpreting and implementing new criteria. This continues to be an action point and is considered particularly relevant where instructors are new to teaching the course.

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

### Review assignment and course content

Review the content of the assignment to determine if students have sufficient lecture on the topic before being given the assignment. Based on the review either change the topic of the assignment to ensure that the focus of the assessment is on the process of investigation rather than content or change the assignment to better match course content.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Application to real estate investment problems | Apply theoretical principles and skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor

### Revise assessment plan for one-year MSRE program

MSRE requirement changes have been approved by university and Board of Regents. The first cohort of students enrolling in the new program will enter Spring 2015. The current MSRE assessment plan will be reviewed by the faculty in conjunction with the revised program requirements to determine where adjustments need to be made.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty discuss, modify and approve.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We continue to review individual measures to ensure they accurately assess learning. The individual questions and assignments used to assess broad and complex concepts are sometimes too narrow to accurately reflect student learning.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Course specific assessment findings are shared in writing with instructors to improve individual courses and teaching. The entire
program assessment findings are shared among full-time faculty to consider changes in curriculum and assessment plan in faculty meetings.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We continue to review all assessment measures on an ongoing basis. Previous years' assessment findings are being used to prepare a revised assessment plan for the MSRE program. The revised plan will be implemented in 2015.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Rehabilitation Counseling MS**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The rehabilitation counseling program prepares students to help people from all cultures, races and backgrounds who have 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. Established in Cycle: 2013-2014 Active Through: 2017 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

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**
- 90% of students will pass the comprehensive exam and 85% will pass the CRC exam on the first attempt

**M 2: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
- Reviews during classes CPS 6050, 6450, 7430, 7660, 7680 as assessed by taped samples, site supervisor evaluation, forms 1005, 1006, comprehensives and CRC.
  
  **Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence**
- Successfully complete the internship sequence as judged by faculty and site supervisor.

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**
- Students will demonstrate knowledge about psychological diagnosis.

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**
- All students will select an internship site that provides services to people with disabilities

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**
- Ethical conduct foundation will be accomplished through coursework associated with the introductory class (6050). All students will pass this class.

**M 3: Evaluation of work with clients with disabilities (O: 1, 3, 4)**
- Demonstration will be examined by (a) At least 90% of students will successfully complete an assessment of rehabilitation potential of a “real” client, and they will have adequate grades for term papers on topics of disabilities in CPS 8410 and 8420. They will also achieve satisfactory written review of performance with clients in their practicum/internship sites by the faculty instructor and on-site supervisors. (b) Written evaluation and group evaluation experiential interaction in self-disclosure and core conditions, as well as CPS 7660 (form 1005) and 6410, (c) CPS 7430 assessment project, and (e) 80% of internship supervisors will rate students as good or better.
  
  **Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence**
- Successfully complete the practicum and internship

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**
- Successful completion by all students of helping skills, group and internship classes

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**
- Evaluation will occur through site practicum/internship classe supervisors and faculty. All students will successfully accomplish this goal.

**M 4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations (O: 3, 4)**
- Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse populations including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, etc.
  
  **Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**
- Students will engage in rehabilitation counseling with “clients” who receive services from community providers.

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**
- Students will obtain the foundation for this measure by taking and passing at least one class relating to cultural and diversity. Additionally, practice will be accomplished through role play in helping skills related classes and practicum/internship classes.

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

**Continued accreditation**
- The program will meet accreditation requirements and a community board of advisors will be included in the rehabilitation program planning.
Ethics class/DSM Training
The program evaluation from the past year has detected that the ethics training in infused in several classes and several areas of overlap exist. We have also noted that diagnostic training (DSM) could be enhanced. This issue was discussed with the rehabilitation advisory board and over the next year there are plans to enhance ethics training in the introductory class (6050), eliminate the "stand alone" ethics class and require the DSM training class.

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.

Reviews of student competence with clients
The assessment project and internship evaluations will be reviewed for adequacy of practical application of educational outcomes.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Students develop specific counseling skills in multiple classes including CPS 6410 CPS 8430 CPS 7663 CPS 7683 Diversity issues are discussed in many classes particularly CPS 7340

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Our students continue to have strong outcomes with all of our students in good standing, and all graduating. We have a better than 90% pass rate on the National Certified Rehabilitation Counselor examination (CRC)

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Faculty meet after each semester to discuss student progress. We have an advisory board of stakeholders. We have 1 to 2 on-campus meetings per academic year, and we also provide updates on the program.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We conducted focus groups with students, and we worked with our advisory board to move from a 48 to 60 credit Clinical rehabilitation Counseling program. We have obtained approval for this change from our department, college and GSU. We are currently awaiting final approval from the Board of Regents.
Most important accomplishments for year—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Reworked our curriculum to move from 48 to 60 credit 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.
Once we received final approval by the State we are planning on transitioning to a 60 credit Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling program.

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.
Gilbride presented at Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem, Israel.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Religious Studies BA**

* (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**

**G1: Knowledge of the Academic Study of Religion**

It is expected that students enrolling 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, Nagajaranj, Shankara, etc.) 4) Major Theorists in the Study of Religion (Elaide, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ Smith, etc.) 5) Representative Critical Theories and Methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological ethical, feminist, etc.) 6) Fundamental Technical Categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.) 7) Common Comparative Themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.) 8) Historical Role in Religion in Culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, secularism, art and music, etc.)

**G2: 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, avoiding vagueness/ambiguity, etc.) 2) Thinking and Writing Critically (outlining arguments, identifying conclusions, contextualizing author and text, 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.

**O/O 4: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion (M: 4)**
Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.

**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.

**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.

**M 3: Evaluation of RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies (Critical Thinking and Writing) (O: 3)**
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), 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.

**M 4: Evaluating RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies papers (Research) (O: 4)**
In Rels 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

**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  
**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

**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

**Better training of instructor**

**Inclusion of revision process**
Georgia State University
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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: Thorough grounding in the academic study of religion
It is expected that students studying towards an MA in Religious Studies achieve a thorough grounding in the academic study of religion, so that they may proceed to doctoral work in the field, teach religious studies in a community college or high school, or bring what they learned here to bear on whatever field they pursue. This entails knowledge of the religious traditions of the world (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam), fundamental historical religious figures (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) major religious thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.), major theorists in the study of religion (Elaide, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ Smith, etc.) representative critical theories and methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological ethical, feminist, etc.), fundamental concepts (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.), common comparative themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.), and the historical role of religion in culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, sycretism, art and music, etc.).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of the history of religions (M: 1, 5)
Ability to understand the role religion has played historically in both popular and elite culture, to extrapolate a general working knowledge of at least four religious traditions and to synthesize an in depth knowledge of two traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

SLO 2: Knowledge of theories of Religion (M: 2, 5)
Ability to explain, critique, and apply principles of at least three theorists or thinkers in the academic study of religion, and to demonstrate competence in major disciplinary concepts.

SLO 3: Methodological approaches to Religion (M: 4, 5)
Ability to understand and apply at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion.

SLO 4: Comparative Approaches to Religion (M: 5)
Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to at least one specific theme.

SLO 5: Reading Scholarly texts (M: 3, 5)
The ability to read scholarly texts critically and with comprehension.

SLO 6: Research in Religious Studies (M: 1, 5)
The ability to conduct effective scholarly research in religious studies.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 7: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 3, 5)
The ability to construct clearly written arguments and commentary.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Historical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 1, 6)
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a numerical grade (4.0 scale) on mastery of historical content. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of this content.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Knowledge of the history of religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of faculty evaluations of historical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Knowledge of theories of Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of faculty evaluations of theoretical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of faculty evaluations on critical skills scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Methodological approaches to Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of faculty evaluations on methodological issues scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Knowledge of the history of religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Knowledge of theories of Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Methodological approaches to Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O4: Comparative Approaches to Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Target for **O5: Reading Scholarly Texts**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Target for **O6: Research in Religious Studies**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Target for **O7: Critical Thought and Expression**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

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

### Monitoring Thesis Research

The Graduate Committee will implement changes in the process by which students conceptualize and research their theses, mandating more familiarity with research techniques, library resources, and alternative methodologies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

### New Assessment Criteria

The Assessment Committee will modify the existing Assessment procedure so that individual measures match more precisely with specific learning objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jonathan Herman, Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

### Scheduling Graduate Seminars

The Department will develop a long-range plan for developing and staffing a diverse range of appropriately configured graduate-only seminars.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond, Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

### Theory and Method

Continue integrating theoretical and methodological components into graduate-only seminars, in addition to the required course in advance theory and method.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  
  - Measure: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses | **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of theories of Religion

  **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

### Thesis Timeline

Establish a prospectus/thesis timeline, with specific benchmarks, clarification of methodology, research plan, etc.
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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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature
Be able to write a review literature related to their field of study and the various methodological approaches.

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.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to cultivate and develop future educational researchers who are capable of investigating complex problems of the 21st century.

This is in keeping with the university's overarching goal to be recognized as a dynamic academic community where teaching and research combine to produce leaders and create solutions to conquer the challenges of the 21st century.

**Goals**

**G 2: Employed in research related fields**

Graduates of the RMS master's program will be employed in research related jobs in their field.

**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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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. [see pdfs: EPS LOA Guide; LOA Form Degree Programs (Indicators 2, 3, 5)]

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.  
3.1 Enhance a research culture.  
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.  
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).  
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.  
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**SLO 3: Design a research study (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to: (1) select an appropriate design for addressing a research query; (2) 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.[see pdfs: EPS LOA Guide; LOA Form Degree Programs (Indicators 1, 3, 5)]

**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
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: 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: EPS LOA Guide; LOA Form Degree Programs]

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature

Mean of 2.2 on associated indicators for this objective.

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

Georgia State University
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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 critical thinking 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 using 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 profession 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 patient interviews. 2. Communicate in writing using medical terminology by addressing patient care plans to improve patient outcomes.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

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

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

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

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

### Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
3 Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)

### Strategic Plan Associations

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.2 Establish a Student Success Center.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5.1 Create an International Consortium of Universities for Critical Issues Challenging Cities.

### SLO 2: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy (M: 3, 4)

Students are to think logically and in a meaningful way so that their actions reflect their critical thinking. Students are involved with courses with computer clinical simulations that tests their decision making skills and information gathering skills in a simulated patient case study. Furthermore students critically think with laboratory assessment using computer aided mannequins in a team support group that allows input and feedback during patient simulation.

### SLO 3: Registry Credential (G: 3)

To prepare students for leadership positions in healthcare settings, students will demonstrate mastery of advanced level respiratory care knowledge by successfully completing a series of computer simulations and written examinations used to test their decision making 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.

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
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 student clinical seminar as part of their clinical practice.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Communication Skills
75% of students will achieve a minimum grade of 90% on their assigned oral case study presentation based on a standard rubric used by the faculty.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
During fall semester 2013, 16 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 76% 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 16 (81%) meeting the target score. For spring semester 2014, 12 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Using the same grading system 7 out of 12 (58%) achieved 90% or higher. Scores ranged from 81% to 95%.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
30 students were given 4 writing assignments 50 points each. After several revisions allowed there were 2 B grades and 28 A grades as final grades.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
23 of 23 students (100%) passed the CRT on first attempt. From review of the score report, national first-time new candidate passing rate is 80% and % of national average for this program is 125%. RT students average score on this competency IIIa was 4.30 while the national average was 3.39. The highest possible scores was 5.0. 19 of 23 (83%) students scores were 80% or higher. GSU average score for this exam is 86%, 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.
**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

21 of 23 or 91% passed the WRRT on the first attempt. From review of the score report, the average score on this competency was 3.16 with the national average at 2.51. 20 of 23 students (87%) scored higher than 80% on this matrix item. For this competency, 4.0 was the highest possible score.

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

**Capstone course**

Will continue to monitor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Capstone Course | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor for RT 4085
- **Additional Resources:** GTA as a CTW assistant for office hours and other assistance for students.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $2,000.00 (recurring)

**Case presentation**

Will continue to refine standards. Rubric added for review. RT Seminar Oral Presentation of Case Study

**Student**

**Disease**

**Semester**

**Date**

**Comments:**

Grade: 70-63=A, 62-56 =B, 56-53 =C, < 52=F

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty participate. Program Director responsible.
- **Additional Resources:** No

**NBRC WRRT Exam**

Will continue to refine analysis of competency. Since this is the first time we have been this specific with an item on the exam matrix, will follow for another year to determine any trends.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **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  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: NBRC Entry Level CRT  
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

**Implementation Description:** Planned  
**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director  
**Additional Resources:** not at this time  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Capstone Course 2011-2012**  
Continue to allow revisions to the paper and use of CTW rubric.  

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Capstone Course  
- Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

**NBRC WRRT Exam**  
Review this section of the exam in RT 4075/7075 which is a review course for the WRRT. New written computer tests purchased. Also have students take computer tests and identify areas of weakness. Tests allow students to test over specific areas of weakness. 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  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam  
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013

**Student case presentation activity**  
Prior to students presenting oral case study they will meet with assigned faculty to review the case study and faculty will identify any needs by the student. Power point slides will be reviewed for errors that would reduce the overall score of the case study presentation as well as any errors in data reporting and formatting. The faculty will also offer guidance by showing the student an example of a case study with a high grade and one with a lower grade and point out the inconsistencies to cause the lower grade. Further assistance can be obtained from senior students and provide examples of case studies that were previously presented. Director of Clinical Education and Medical Director will continue to present lecture on how to present a case study at the beginning of the semester for new students. We will revisit the rubric and fine tune each area of evaluation.

**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 in Fall 2015 with seniors presenting case study.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015  
**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. This action plan was not implemented as it was very time consuming for the faculty. We will continue to review the cases with the student and provide more input at the time of review prior to presentation since first year students have no experience with the case study presentation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Case Presentation  
- Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2015

**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
**Update Action Plan**

Continue with action plan from previous year. Also updated national board computer examinations to reflect the Matrix area IIIa.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** NBRC Entry Level CRT  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Communication Skills-Students write a case study and present it to the class and faculty. Students take medical terminology course and use this to communicate effectively in classroom and clinical practice. Students will write and report faculty patient care plans to faculty at the end of the clinical practice day and also to report to fellow therapist as they are leaving for the day. Courses that provide these opportunities are RT 3050, 3051, RT 4050, SNHP 3010. Currently interprofessional classes are being developed for nursing, nutrition and respiratory therapy to simulate learning environments in a simulation lab prior to entering clinical practice. to provide real time clinical exposure with all programs in the school. Critical Thinking Skills-Students practice patient computer simulations as part of their course work in the classroom and clinical practice. Courses such as RT 4075, RT 4060 require simulations to be completed as part of the course grade. Laboratory courses use real time simulation provided by simulation test lungs, lab exercises, ventilator equipment, group involvement and discussion questions that provide feedback to the instructor in courses RT 4111, RT 4112. Also RT 4070 Advanced Cardiac Life Support, RT 4080 Neonatal Care utilizes simulation to complete laboratory course work and simulated treatment utilizing mannequins and a simulated patient assessment lab that uses actors to simulate patients with respiratory illnesses. Students complete a national certification (Neonatal Resuscitation Program) in RT 4080 which is required prior to entering the delivery room in the hospital which is completed by faculty in our simulated delivery room lab. Registry Credential-Students take a review course RT 4075 to review written and clinical examinations in preparation for the medical board exams. End of year clinical exams tests the students clinical knowledge and requires passing in order to continue in the program. Second year courses focuses on advanced practitioner content to prepare students for this board exam. Courses such as RT 4111, 4112, RT 4060, 4075, 4070, 4050, 4051 utilize simulations, advanced medical computing, oral and written components to ensure the student is as prepared as possible to successfully complete the registry exam. Our passing rates are always above the national passing % and all students have passed all board exams by graduation.

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

1. Significance of Findings Strengths: Overall our greatest strength in the program is the established assessment findings that have excellent outcomes of the capstone course, NBRC entry level CRT and NBRC written registry exam. Weakness: For the communication skills where the student presents a case study the outcome is not being met. Again the problem as identified from last year is students do not have clinical experience treating respiratory care patients and since their first semester doing clinicals is the same semester some will do the case study, they are unfamiliar and uncomfortable with the information, how to present it and what outcomes they must determine even with the help of the instructor. Our medical director and director of clinical education do a review of the case presentation and gives lectures and examples of the components of the case study. Also it is a requirement that students meet with professors to review the case study. In some cases students still will not complete and accurate case study with all the components that are going to be graded, consequently the student gets a lower grade. As their confidence grows with more clinical experience their presentations will also show this confidence. I believe that the passing score needs to be reviewed. Students that present in later semesters have a distinct advantage over students presenting in the first semester so these students passing scores should be elevated to reflect that advantage. 2. There have been no major program changes. 3. There have been no recent changes in the assessment process. Faculty will meet to review the case study rubric again and assigning of grades from different semesters.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment findings are shared with faculty at faculty meetings and these are also presented to advisory committee members at the annual RT Advisory board meeting. The board is made up of committee members from area hospitals, private companies, faculty, students and medical director. Suggestions from the committee are always welcomed. Students presentations at this board meeting
are also welcomed and discussed. The suggestions are implemented and presented at the next board meeting the following year. Changes to course content is implemented by reviewing the NBRC exam matrix, suggestions from faculty, student evaluations and board members. Also in the yearly accreditation report thresholds must be maintained. If we fall below an acceptable threshold an action plan must be submitted and then outcomes must improve the following year. The yearly accreditation report is available for online viewing by all faculty and students.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

The only addition to the educational program is a course for interprofessional education and this will be for all programs in the Lewis School. No other changes are being considered at this time. We will review the rubric for the student case study presentations again but the faculty felt that this rubric was acceptable.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Maintained student admission numbers. 100% passing for first time takers for RT licensure exam 100% passing by graduation for advanced practitioner exam 93% student employed within 6 months of graduation Award from our accrediting agency for passing rate on the advanced practitioner exam (RRT) for RT students.

Challenges for Next Year--Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.
Budget issues. We will not be able to hire as many GTA's for lab assistants. We have one vacant faculty position and we will use this money to supplement our needs for GTA and PTIs but when that position is filled we will not be able to fund these positions. Our accrediting agency has reversed a decision to allow students to complete their board exams prior to graduation. Now the students cannot take the exam until after graduation which will hinder us from getting board scores in a timely manner and some students may not take the exam in a timely manner which may impact the passing rate of our program. Department chair retiring next year. National search for TT and chair position. It will be difficult to find the level of research faculty that is being advertised. These positions may remain open for several years requiring PTIs to be hired to teach courses.

Modifications in Measurement Methods--If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
The percentage of students achieving a 80% or greater was reduced to 75% for case presentation under Measures and Findings.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes--If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
No changes

University-wide Committee Participation--Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
One faculty member is on the university senate committee, all other faculty are members of school committees and 4 faculty chair standing committees in the school.

Publications and Presentations--Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
1 Completed Master's Theses 2 Completed Master's project 1 Doctoral Thesis 9 Abstracts 6 Awards 24 Presentations 4 Board of Directors 4 Editorial Board 10 Poster presentations 1 Book Review 5 Book Chapter 3 Program offering Student Tech fee internal grant Memory and Pulmonary Function Body Box $50,000 Doug Gardenhire: $14,756 WestMed Award 2 External Funding Awards Doug Gardenhire: $2500.00 WestMed Award Chip Zimmerman-core faculty on HRSA Grant $344,100 for 3 years 2 Internal Funding Grant Chip Zimmerman: Center for Instructional Innovation $3000 Lynda Goodfellow: $7000.00 for Intramural Grant Program Dr. Arzu Ari: •Editorial Board of the Eurasian Journal of Pulmonology •22 International Presentations Dr. Doug Gardenhire •Editorial Board: Respiratory Care Education Annual •Editorial Board: Internet Journal of Allied Health and Practice Dr. Lynda Goodfellow •National Asthma Education Certification Board •American Association for Respiratory Care-Director at Large •Associate Editor- Respiratory Care, •Refereed Podium Presentation: The Effect of Teaching Method on Mechanical Ventilation in Respiratory Therapy Education. European Respiratory Society, September, 2014, Munich Germany. •Keynote Address for SCRC Annual Meeting“2015 and Beyond: But 2015 is almost Here” •Book: Ducasse D, Bryant L, Goodfellow L. Survey of the Knowledge & Confidence of RT Students Regarding Smoking. Lambert Academic Publishing, 2014.

International Activities--Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
Faculty member elected as Chair of the New Drugs and Technologies Networking Group at the International Society for Aerosols in Medicine and also elected as Director of International Affairs of the Inhalation Treatments Networking Group at the Turkish Respiratory Society. Department has international students in the program and communicates and advises these students during the admission process, writes letters of recommendation for admission to for the student to get funding for tuition.

Contributions to Student Retention--Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
Mentoring students to prepare case study presentation at annual society meeting student section. Mentoring students to do poster presentation at annual Undergraduate Research Symposium Mentoring students to apply for Lambda Beta (Respiratory Therapy national honor society) Honor Society media award. Last year one of our students won this award. Assist students to get inducted into Lambda Beta Honor Society. Department purchases board exams, clinical simulation problems to enhance the students critical thinking process. Interprofessional education—all departments in the school interact with each other using patient simulations using real hospital scenarios to provide critical thinking.

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 provide lectures to hospitals for CEU credit and present lectures for Georgia Society for Respiratory Care. Present at health care fair/Capital Day to perform pulmonary function testing for attendees. Presentation to National Youth Leadership Forum on Medicine. Participation at National Smoke Out Day by handing our stop smoking literature and doing pulmonary function tests.
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Mission / Purpose

In support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Bryidine 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 an oral presentation and a written presentation assignment in core master's curriculum (RT 7030).

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All current entry-level integrated master's students have completed an oral presentation and a written presentation as required in this course.

### M 2: Demonstrate appreciation for critical thinking and research process (O: 1, 2)

Either through thesis, graduate project or advance practice option, oral communication, writing skills and critical thinking skills competence by faculty evaluation during thesis defense, presentation of project or advanced practice option critical thinking examination.

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, directed study project to directed study project committee members or successful completion of 2 advance practitioner examinations for advanced practice option to directed study committee member.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Four students completed advanced practice option successfully.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking in the application of research**

Graduate students will complete either a thesis or project.

### M 3: Understanding Health Policy in the US (O: 3)

Students will show mastery of contemporary concepts by participation in class discussions, debates, and successful completion of final written exam in HHS 8000 - Trends affecting Health Policy.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Understanding Health Policy in the United States**

Master's students will complete the final exam in HHS 8000 which is a comprehensive assessment of Health Policy in the US with at least a score of 80% or higher.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

9 students successfully completed HHS 8000 and met the target score.

### 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 critical thinking and 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 critical thinking and 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 critical thinking and research process | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking in the application of research

Responsible Person/Group: Robert Harwood

HHS 8000
Will continue to monitor. Course will continue to be part of curriculum with new faculty.

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 critical thinking and 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):
Measure: Demonstrate appreciation for critical thinking and research process | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

Measure: Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

Implementation Description: Will continue to monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Robert Harwood
Additional Resources: none

Development of thesis and project rubic
Develop a rubic 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 critical thinking and research process | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Evaluate rubic for oral and written assignment in RT 7030
Continue to have students complete an oral presentation and a written assignment in RT 7030 and be graded with developed rubics. We will evaluate the rubics to assure consistency in the oral and written assignments and assure the student is achieving the stated goal.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Communication Skills: Students present an oral and a written presentation in RT 7030 Advanced Mechanical Ventilation which is part of the core master’s curriculum. They also present to other programs presentations for understanding of course content in RT 7030 specifically to first year nursing students. Further communication skills are associated with RT 7995 which provides the student the opportunity to take 2 nationally administered examinations to achieve clinical expertise and complete the advance option for graduation. Understanding Health Policy in the US: Students take SNHP 8000 which is a comprehensive assessment of health policy in the US. Presentations and written assignments are part of this course to enhance the students mastery of the subject.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicating those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

1) Students continue to meet the desired results in each outcome. 2) no new findings from previous years 3) We added the Advanced Option tract last year for those students who wish to continue clinical practice after graduation. We found this is a popular and useful option allowing students to become certified in areas that can be useful in their practice and help meet the needs for the health care community. This is especially helpful for international students that are not allowed to take these exams once they return home. Few people in their country have these credentials and they find they obtain jobs because of these. Strength of the program: Less students taking thesis tract and developing an appreciation for the research process. Impact on student learning: Students taking the Advanced option tract have specific learning depending on the exam. This enhances that area of study which may not have been covered as extensively in their course work. A specific example is the Asthma Educator Certification Exam. Students learn about asthma in the disease course but not to the extent which they will have to study to prepare for this exam thus enhancing their critical thinking skills and clinical practice skills. Assessment process and the quality of findings: Since the exams are nationally administered the results are sent to us. These scores over different areas of the exam provide us with an overview of the content areas and provide feedback to where we may enhance the course content.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment findings are shared at faculty meetings and these are also presented to advisory committee members at the annual RT Advisory Board Meeting. This board is made up of community leaders, hospital directors, private companies, faculty, students, and medical directors. Suggestions from the committee are always welcomed especially from student representatives. Any suggestions that are implemented are then presented the following year to show outcome with student reps also providing input into the success of the plan. Changes to course content is implemented by reviewing the national exams content matrix. Also yearly accreditation report thresholds must be maintained and if we fall below these thresholds we must develop an action plan for the next year. The yearly accreditation report is available online for viewing by all faculty and students.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

No changes in the educational program or assessment process is planned at this time.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

Increased student admission numbers. 100% passing for first time takers for RT licensure exam 100% passing by graduation for advanced practitioner exam 100% student employed within 6 months of graduation. Award from our accrediting agency for passing rate on the advanced RRT examination for the second year in a row. Each student also passed 2 advanced practitioner credential exams.

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.

Budget issues. We will not be able to hire as many GTA's for lab assistants. We have one vacant faculty position and we will use this money to supplement our needs for GTA and PTI's but when that position is filled we will not be able to fund these positions. One staff position for admissions has been vacated. We will ask to fill this position for 2015 that can assist the department with admissions.

Modifications in Measurement Methods--If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement
Mission / Purpose

The MS RMI degree with a Specialization in Mathematical Risk Management (MRM program) prepares students for careers in quantitative risk management and financial engineering positions emphasizing risk management. Graduates will be qualified for positions in a variety of organizational settings including financial institutions, risk management consultancies, and in the treasury departments of non-financial corporations. The program achieves these goals by emphasizing the application of mathematics in economics and finance to address contemporary risk management problems through the appropriate diagnosis, analysis, pricing, and customization of solutions to risk management problems and opportunities broadly defined to include both financial and operational risk exposures. The MRM program differentiates itself from an MBA with a concentration in Risk Management and Insurance through: More rigorous coverage of mathematical and statistical theory, The development of programming skills in a variety of programming languages and econometric software, and Specific emphasis on the development of modeling skills of the financial and operational risk exposures of both of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities, asset-backed securities, and other complex financially engineered assets.

Goals

G 1: Students will develop technical expertise in specified areas
Students will develop an adequate level of technical expertise in the areas of financial economics, insurance economics, actuarial science and modern risk management theory.
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

**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).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
M 1: Exams in MRM 8320 (O: 1)

Each student will demonstrate through responses to selected questions from course exams expertise in the quantification and analysis of operational 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 One Rubric to a random sample of student exams submitted during each 4-year evaluation period. Criteria Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- No. 1 – Demonstrate Mathematical Expertise to Quantify Operational Stochastic Risk Exposures Achieve a score below 60% on selected Quantification Questions Achieve a score below 60% on selected Quantification Questions Achieve a score above 70% on selected Quantification Questions No. 2 – Demonstrate Mathematical Expertise to Analyze Operational Stochastic Risk Exposures Achieve a score below 60% on selected Analysis Questions Achieve a score between 60% and 70% on selected Analysis Questions Achieve a score above 70% on selected Analysis Questions

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Assessment plan is being modified. Data collection to begin under the new plan in Fall 2014.

M 2: Selected student projects in ECON 8780 (O: 1)

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in ECON 8780 Financial Econometrics the technical expertise in mathematical and statistical theory to quantify and analyze various financial stochastic risk exposures.

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

Target for O1: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure Two Rubric to a random sample of student projects submitted during each 4-year evaluation period. Measure 2 Rubric Criteria Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- No. 1 – Demonstrate Mathematical Expertise to Quantify Financial Stochastic Risk Exposures Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate
- No. 2 – Demonstrate Mathematical Expertise to Analyze Financial Stochastic Risk Exposures Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Assessment plan is being modified. Data collection to begin under the new plan in Fall 2014.

M 3: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 (O: 2)

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects and exam questions in MRM 8610 Financial Engineering 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 4-year evaluation period. Measure 3 Rubric Criteria Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- No. 1 – Value Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate
- No. 2 – Document Risks Associated with Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate
- No. 3 – Value Traded Assets and Liabilities Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate
- No. 4 – Document Risks Associated with Traded Assets and Liabilities Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Assessment plan is being modified. Data collection to begin under the new plan in Fall 2014.

M 4: Selected student case work in RMI 8370 (O: 3)

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected case work in RMI 8370 Financial Risk Management the ability to recommend appropriately the risks that should be managed and the tools available that will most efficiently achieve the firm’s objectives.

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

Target for O3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure Four Rubric to a random sample of student case work submitted during each 4-year evaluation period. Measure 4 Rubric Criteria Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- No. 1 – Identify Appropriate Risks to be Managed Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect Demonstrated expertise is adequate Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate
- No. 2 – Recommend Appropriate Tools to Manage Identified Risks Recommendations are inadequate or incorrect Recommendations are adequate Recommendations are better than adequate

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Assessment plan is being modified. Data collection to begin under the new plan in Fall 2014.

M 5: Selected projects in MRM 8620 (O: 3)

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Models 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.
**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. Measure 5 Rubric Criteria:
- Standard 1 = Meets Standard
- Standard 2 = Exceeds Standard
- Standard 3 = No. 1 – Identify the Limitations of Risk Management Models
- Demonstrated expertise is insufficient or incorrect
- Demonstrated expertise is adequate
- Demonstrated expertise is better than adequate

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Assessment plan is being modified. Data collection to begin under the new plan in Fall 2014.

### 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)

**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:** In-Progress
- **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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2015
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Economic & Financial Theory Action Plan**

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. 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:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

**Measure:** Projects and exams in MRM 8610 | **Outcome/Objective:** Economic and financial theory expertise
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

In terms of assessment plan, our addition of the Programming Bootcamp course emerged out of discussions about assessment findings, but it was not directly related to any measures or findings in our plan. We intend to update our plan to be more ambitious and more closely aligned to overall objectives instead of more course focused. We will include measures with the intent of capturing the benefits of the boot camp introduction (if any). In particular, we may compare the performance of MRM and MAS students in required classes for both (MRM8610, MRM8320), since MRM students are required to take the boot camp though not the MAS students.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Improvements made based on assessment plan. One major change we implemented – that was discussed under “Question 2” in the previous assessment – is the introduction of a new required 2-credit class in the weeks before the first semester commences, the Programming Boot Camp (MRM8000, “Introduction to Analytical Programming and Numerical Methods”). As discussed in the previous assessment plan, “programming skills have become increasingly important for placing our graduates,” yet the students’ backgrounds differ considerably. The boot camp not only provides a rigorous introduction to this important skillset and levels the students’ backgrounds, but it allows the instructors to focus on models and techniques rather than having to focus on implementation details. Future changes under consideration. In the previous assessment, we discussed the replacement of MRM8620 (“Quantitative Financial Risk Modeling”). The key issue is that MRM8620 was intended as an implementation class for MRM8610, which however is also mandatory for our MAS students, making a proper coordination difficult. Furthermore, the programming boot camp will acquaint students with programming. Thus, the question remains whether MRM8620 contributes to the program in an effective fashion. Possible alternatives would be to have MRM8620 and MRM8630 as separate classes on interest rate and credit risk, respectively. Currently, both aspects should be covered in MRM8630 although the limited time does not allow for a detailed treatment of credit risk. A separate class will allow to not only discuss conventional material such as such as the pricing of credit derivatives but to also discuss issues related to counterparty credit risk that are gaining increasing significance in the marketplace. Alternatively, we could leave MRM8630 as is but offer MRM8620 as a capstone seminar class with varying topics (akin to AS8810 in the MAS program). Possible topics include counterparty credit risk, calculation of capital requirements, or banking Economic capital models.
# 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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips and Marty Grace
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

# Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Risk Management & Insurance BBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

BBA-RMI PROGRAM MISSION: The BBA in Risk Management and Insurance (RMI) is designed to prepare students to: (1) Apply quantitative models to the measurement of business risks, (2) Assess the hazard risks that are common to business organizations, (3) Apply the enterprise risk management process to managing risk in business organizations.

**Goals**

**G 1: Quantify business risk using modeling tools**
Students will be able to quantify business risk by applying appropriate modeling tools.

**G 2: Assess common business risks**
Students will be able to assess the common property, liability and personnel risks of a business organization.

**G 3: Apply forecasting techniques to loss data**
Students will be able to apply forecasting techniques to loss data to project the future impact of risks on a business organization.

**G 4: Apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options**
Students will be able to apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options as an aid in decision-making.

**G 5: Explain and apply enterprise risk management process**
Students will be able to explain the enterprise risk management process and apply it to actual business situations through case study.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identification and structuring of risky situations (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to recognize risk and uncertainty and their impact on individual, business, and societal decision making. Pertinent risks include those related to the person and property, leverage, longevity, securing future consumption, and asset transfer. Students will be able to take an uncertain situation and determine the nature of the problem(s) to be solved.

**SLO 2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to take an uncertain situation, and: (1) recognize mathematical, financial and/or statistical tools to be used in solving; and (2) use quantitative tools to model risks and craft alternatives to address them.

**SLO 3: Comprehension of the business risk management process (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)**
Students will have technical comprehension of the business risk management process, including the identification and evaluation of loss exposures, the analysis of the various risk control and financing techniques available to manage the exposures, decision making under conditions of uncertainty, control mechanisms to monitor the results of the risk management program.

**SLO 4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process (G: 1, 5) (M: 3)**
Students will have theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. Students will be able to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Performance on selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2)**
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in RMI 3750 Probability Theory and Simulation Analysis in Risk Management an understanding of the sources of uncertainty in a business application.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: Identification and structuring of risky situations
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for O2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 2: Selected Projects and identified exam questions in RMI 4300 (O: 3)
Students will be given the task of identifying and prioritizing the hazard risks of a given business organization through the use of a Risk Mapping approach to risk assessment.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O3: Comprehension of the business risk management process
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 3: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 (O: 4)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 Enterprise Risk Management theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process and the ability to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assignments to include added focus on making recommendations and conclusions
RMI 4350 is a CTW course. Course assignments will be revised to focus more on providing the student with practice and feedback on making recommendations and conclusions.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350
- Outcome/Objective: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Martin Grace and Harold Weston

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Robinson College of Business BBA
As of: 12/13/2016 06:09 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

In June of 2014 the Robinson College of Business College engaged a consultant to work with a select leadership team in redefining the Mission and Goals of the undergraduate program. This portion of the project has a completion date of August 2014.
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Effective Analytical Skills (G: 1) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate analytical skills in solving business problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Effective Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Effective Use of Computer Technology (G: 1, 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will show the ability to effectively use and manage technology of business related purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Effective Team Membership (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will exhibit a positive attitude toward continual learning upon completion of the BBA program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Ethics and Social Responsibility (G: 1, 4) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Further Education – Self Report (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Undergraduate Steering Committee, as part of the renovation of the UG program, decided to re-construct the Exit Exam that was given to graduating seniors during the 2013-2014 Academic Year. This decision was taken after a review of the exam used by the Undergraduate Steering Committee and not measuring the Exit Exam results in the functional business areas. This decision resulted in the construction of a new exam. The new Exit Exam received its beta testing the Spring and Summer of 2014. In this exam students were not asked questions about their future intentions with respect to graduate or professional school, which was the proxy used in prior years to measure attitudes toward life-long learning.

**M 2: Ability to Work on Teams (O: 4)**

Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always 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. Sometimes participates in group discussions and sometimes exceeds expectations.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This measure was not taken in the 2013-2014 cycle.

**M 3: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)**

Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always 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.

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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

This measure was not taken in the 2013-2014 cycle.

### M 5: Written Communication Skills (O: 2)

The rubric for this item was modified in the 2010-2011 cycle. The prior rubric as well as the current rubric are linked in the Document Repository. For this item the rubric titled "New Rubric of Assessment of CTW papers on Assessment Criteria for Written Communications" was used. For this item 33 students papers produced for the CTW classes in the Spring Semester of 2011 in the RCB were selected. Of these papers 32 were assessable using the rubric developed for this and other questions in assessment. The results of that assessment with the names removed are included in the results matrix for the 2010-2011 cycle and are linked here from the Document Depository.

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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

A total of 20 assignments were used in this assessment. 5 papers each were randomly drawn from 4 different senior-level CTW classes that were conducted in 4 different departments of the RCB in the spring semester of 2014. 2 of the papers were deemed not usable for this purpose leaving 18 to be evaluation with the rubric. 5 papers, or 27.7% of the sample, were rated a 4, 9 papers, or 50.0% of the sample were rated 3. Thus, 77.7% of the papers were rated a 3.0 or higher. This is just below the target of 80% for this measure. The other 4 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 in the Document Repository. For this item only the measure "Systematically & Logically Interpret Data" were used. For this item 32 students papers produced for the CTW classes in the Spring Semester of 2011 in the RCB were selected. Of these papers 30 were assessable using the rubric developed for this and other questions in assessment. The results of that assessment with the names removed are included in the results matrix for the 2010-2011 cycle and are linked here from the Document Depository.

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

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

A total of 20 assignments were used in this assessment. 5 papers each were randomly drawn from 4 different senior-level CTW classes that were conducted in 4 different departments of the RCB in the spring semester of 2014. 2 of the papers were deemed not usable for this purpose leaving 18 to be evaluation with the rubric. 3 papers, or 16.6% of the sample, were rated a 4, 11 papers, or 61.1% of the sample were rated 3. Thus, 77.7% of the papers were rated a 3.0 or higher. This is just below the target of 80% for this measure. Of the other 3 papers were rated a 2 and 1 papers was rated a 1.

### M 7: Ability to Use Technology (O: 2, 3)

To what extent did the BBA program enhance students’ ability to use technology? This will be measured by the students' self-reported ability on the two questions of the Use and Manage Technology Factor on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey. Q 67

**Source of Evidence:** Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

#### Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills

To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

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 initiatives 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 foci 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 learnt in the prior Action Plan initiatives will be incorporated, but these 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. See Implementation Notes for a description of actions taken through e 2013-2014 cycle.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Ability to Function in a Team Environment | Outcome/Objective: Effective Team Membership
- Measure: Ability to Use Technology | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
- Measure: Effective Use of Computer Technology
- Measure: Ability to Work on Teams | Outcome/Objective: Effective Team Membership
- Measure: Effective Analytical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
- Measure: Ethics and Social Responsibility | Outcome/Objective: Ethics and Social Responsibility
- Measure: Oral Communications Skills | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
- Measure: Written Communication Skills | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills

Implementation Description: It is anticipated that this initiative will take five years to design and implement. Work will be done by the new Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Programs, the re-constituted undergraduate steering committee, and the instructional staff 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.

Budget Amount Requested: $10,000.00 (recurring)
Mission / Purpose
The Executive Doctorate in Business program offered by the J. Mack Robinson College of Business of Georgia State University helps executives develop these capabilities by teaching them how to apply relevant knowledge and research skills to contemporary business problems. It also addresses the lifelong learning needs of intellectually active professional adults who already possess advanced degrees in their fields but wish to continue their education to the highest level.

Goals
G 1: Executive Doctorate in Business Goals
The Ph.D. program of J. Mack Robinson College of Business will develop in graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring: (1) education in theory; (2) education in general research techniques as well as research techniques specific to a discipline; (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues; and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Seeing the big picture (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will advance the knowledge and expertise required to identify, understand, and successfully tackle the interdisciplinary, big picture issues that characterize global business management today.

O/O 2: Honing the skills (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will develop in the student the skills in formal social inquiry required to define and address complex issues and to disseminate knowledge related to their profession in a variety of professional and public outlets “to influence professional activity and public policy.”

O/O 3: Giving the global perspective (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will give an interdisciplinary, globally oriented perspective that is unavailable in traditional advanced degree programs.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Performance in coursework (O: 1, 2, 3)
The program will have six content courses to provide students with knowledge about global business leadership and five courses on research practices, design and analysis to equip the students with the understanding required to undertake formal research. Students are expected to maintain a 3.0 average in coursework. Students must earn a C or better in all courses. Students who do not meet these requirements or who are struggling to meet them are counseled out of the program.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 2: Group projects (O: 1, 2, 3)
During the second and third semesters, students participate in research projects in groups of two to three people, under the supervision of a senior researcher. Each project will address a contemporary business issue and be conducted with the objective of publishing the results.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 3: Independent research (O: 1, 2, 3)
During the fourth, fifth and sixth semesters, each student engages in an independent research project under the supervision of a senior researcher. This project addresses a business issue affecting the student's firm. Each student will produce and defend a doctoral thesis with the expectation of publishing it.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Robinson College of Business MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 06:08 PM EST
(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.
## 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.

### M 2: Environmental Opportunity Analysis (O: 1)

This measure contains two sub-parts that respectively look at the level of sophistication in a student's ability to understand and analyze a firm's resources and capabilities in the context of a competitive environment. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to common mid-term and final exam questions in the MBA program's final strategy courses, MBA 8820, PMBA 8820, 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 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
### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met

The legal and ethical dimension of this measurement were the focus for 2013-2014. The evaluation took place in the MBA strategy courses. Two flex format MBA 8820 sections (n=88) were included as well as two sections of PMBA 8820 (n=62) and the GPMBA section (n=18) of Strategy. This year we implemented an ethics refresher into the strategy courses in hopes of improving the abysmal performance in previous years. The refresher consisted of a discussion of an ethical decision-making model along with a case discussion incorporating the model. For the work used in the evaluation, we continued to not prompt the students to address ethics in the case analysis used for this assessment. Performance on the ethics and legal aspects of the rubric did improve, and could be considered above the target for legal. There were inconsistencies, however, in the implementation and selection of cases used for the assessment. This has resulted in one section performing extremely high on both the legal and ethical dimensions. Even in the high performing outlier section, legal performance was stronger than performance on the ethical dimension. The other sections were below the target. A detailed breakdown of raw scores and percentages is in the Rubric Analysis document attached for the academic year 2013-2014. We did not assess the other components of this measure this year.

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

#### 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. 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date:</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Environmental Opportunity Analysis</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions</td>
<td>04/2010</td>
<td>RCB Assessment Committee; MBA Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Data-driven analytical decision making course

A data-driven analytical decision making course will be added to the front end of the curriculum to improve competency related to critical analysis. The course will stress the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data with an emphasis on applications across the functional areas of business.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date:</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Critical Success Factor Analysis</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions</td>
<td>12/2014</td>
<td>Dean's Office and Department of Managerial Sciences in consultation with MBA Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: Qualified and available faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Ethics decision making model
An ethical decision making model was introduced into Strategic Management (MBA/PMBA/GMBA 8820). The model was developed by Professors Susan Willey, Nancy Mansfield, and Peggy Sherman, professors of legal studies in RCB. A case with a clear ethical dilemma was selected for use in the assessment. In the previous cycle, the case lacked a clear ethical dimension.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2014

MBA 8000 - Restructure
MBA 8000, Managing in the Global Economy, will be restructured around a managerial economic decision making format to provide a framework for integrating across functional areas, global borders, and organizational boundaries. Faculty believe that the current format provided an overview of the relations between these areas, but they believe that the course should also provide an economic framework.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical Success Factor Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students can analyze relevant questions
- Measure: Environmental Opportunity Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students can analyze relevant questions
- Measure: Student Ability to Develop Corporate Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Students can propose alternative solutions

Projected Completion Date: 12/2014

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

a. Much of the underperformance in all Subparts of Measure 1 and Measure 2 can be attributed to the need for students to obtain greater fundamental skills to effectively analyze quantitative and qualitative data within a relevant framework. Much of the underperformance in Subpart 1 and Subpart 2 of Measure 3 can be attributed to the need for students to develop a better framework within which to effectively analyze critical problems across functional and global boundaries. A review of the curriculum and discussion with students indicate sufficient exposure to relations between functional areas and to the global dimensions of business, but the need for a better decision framework within which make decisions across functional and global boundaries. The factors contributing to the underperformance in Measure 1 also likely contribute to the underperformance in Subpart 1 and Subpart 2 of Measure 3. In response to Subpart 3 and subpart 4 of Measure 3, we concluded that students need a more robust legal and ethical decision-making framework to facilitate the integration of legal and ethical dimensions in their decisions.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment findings are discussed with the MBA Steering Committee, focused faculty task forces, and selected students. Faculty and the MBA Steering Committee determine and implement curriculum changes. Students are included in the conversations as their comments can provide added insight into the gaps in the curriculum, connections within the curriculum that are not being made, and the location of learning weaknesses within complex, integrated assignments. Of course, student comments also provide insight into what is working too.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

We are proposing (in 2014-15) two new courses that are designed to address underlying issues we all performance on all of the measures used in this assessment with the exception of the legal and ethical dimensions. See actions plans and analysis question #2 for more details.
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As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: Creates new knowledge (M: 3)
The candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about an area of business in his/her major area of inquiry.

SLO 4: Professional Engagement (M: 6)
The candidate will be actively engaged with the community of scholars in the discipline.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Comprehensive understanding of subject (M: 2, 4, 5)
Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research. Students should be able to conduct original research in collaboration with college faculty.

O/O 2: Competency in research (M: 1, 7)
Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research. Students should be able to conduct original research in collaboration with college faculty.

O/O 5: Placement in research-oriented institutions
Successful placement of graduates is contingent on many factors. Admissions committees in each academic unit must seek applicants who are interested in research (as well as academically qualified). Students must be actively engaged in research from the outset of their studies and should be actively mentored by a research-active faculty member. Students should attend conference and present papers in order to gain recognition of faculty from other research universities. Students are expected to produce a thoughtful and well-researched dissertation. Once placed, alumni should remain active researchers.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubric - Research Paradigm (O: 2)
Criteria #1 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Target for O2: Competency in research
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

Findings  2013-2014 - Target: Met
86.6% of 15 students were rated as performing at a 4 or 5 level on the rubric.

M 2: Rubric - Contexts (O: 1)
Rubric criteria #2 will be applied to student work at the time of the dissertation defense.

Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

Findings  2013-2014 - Target: Met
Met. 80% of the 15 students received a score of 4 or 5 for this measure.

M 3: Creates knowledge (O: 3)
Criteria #3 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Target for O3: Creates new knowledge
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

Findings  2013-2014 - Target: Met
Met. 86.7% of the 15 students received a score of 4 or 5 for this measure.

M 4: Knowledge of literate (O: 1)
Criteria #4 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Met. 86.7% of the 15 students received a score of 4 or 5 for this measure.

M 5: Cognate knowledge (O: 1)
Criteria #5 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Not Met. 71.4% of the 14 students received a score of 4 or 5 for this measure.

M 6: Involvement in community (O: 4)
Criteria #6 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O4: Professional Engagement**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**
Not Met. 69% of the 13 students received a score of 4 or 5 for this measure.

M 7: Rubric - Use of technology (O: 2)
Criteria #7 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Competency in research**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Met. 84.6% of the 13 students received a score of 4 or 5 for this measure.

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

**Monitoring student mastery of body of knowledge**
Academic units will continue to evaluate students with the comprehensive examination. Units are being encouraged to have a formal review of students at the end of the first year. Students will be evaluated through the preliminary dissertation defense and the final oral defense of the dissertation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D. coordinators in each academic unit

**Pedagogical training**
All students who are slated to teach must take the Teaching Seminar course. Student evaluations from the courses taught by doctoral students are reviewed by the academic unit and discussed with the student. Each academic unit has a teaching mentor who works with students concerning all aspects of teaching, including course preparation and classroom management.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D. unit coordinator and department chair

**Placement of graduates in research institutions**
Successful placement of graduates is contingent on many factors. Admissions committees in each academic unit must seek applicants who are interested in research (as well as academically qualified). Students must be actively engaged in research from the outset of their studies and should be actively mentored by a research-active faculty member. Students should attend conferences...
Mission / Purpose
The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose over-arching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents, to evaluate school counseling programs, and to coordinate the resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, program evaluation, advocacy and the curriculum of the school.

Goals
G 1: P-12 Student Learning and Development
School counselors are committed to their students and to their learning, growth and development. To this end, school counselors use their skills to assist students in individual, small group, and classroom guidance settings. School counselors also monitor and evaluate student learning and development to provide the most effective school counseling programs.

G 2: Professional Practice/Experience
School counselors reflect on their practice and learn from that experience.

G 3: Learning Communities
School counselors are participating members of learning communities. This participation allows them to share their expertise and to gain valuable ideas from other practicing school counselors.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
School counselors understand and practice effective counseling skills that contribute to P-12 student learning and development.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 2: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev (G: 1) (M: 2)
In order to assist all P-12 students in school success, school counselors must monitor, manage, and evaluate student learning and development. Student learning and development as assisted by school counselors takes place through school counselors’ leadership in individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance activities, parent and teacher consultation, using community resources, and advocating for students.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 3: Professional Reflection and Learning (G: 2) (M: 3)
School counselors reflect continually on their professional practice. This reflection allows them to learn from their experiences, including those practices that are effective and those that need to be revised.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 4: Participates in Learning Communities (G: 3) (M: 4)
School counselors participate in learning communities, including classroom groups, mentoring relationships, feeder school groups, and other appropriate learning groups. In this way, school counselors can share their expertise with others, as well as learn from other school counselors.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills (O: 1)
Students will provide direct services (demonstrate effective individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance and consultation skills) to students, parents and teachers in the school setting. An audio tape of one such session will be critiqued by the
class to indicate effective counseling skills that will promote student/parent/teacher learning and development. Students must also complete a tape critique form that provides the purpose of the session, a summary of the session, their strengths and what they learned from the experience.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills**

At least 90% of the students will earn a Satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the supervision session summary forms submitted.

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

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling Faculty will monitor students’ grades on projects and other measures used to assess competence. In addition, this faculty will consider other ways to assess competence with regard to the outcomes and objectives.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev
- Measure: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes | Outcome/Objective: Participates in Learning Communities
- Measure: Supervision Session Summary Form | Outcome/Objective: Professional Reflection and Learning

**Implementation Description:** The School Counseling faculty will monitor the outcomes/objectives.

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty

**Additional Resources:** At least one additional school counseling faculty member.

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling Faculty will monitor students’ grades on projects and other measures used to assess competence. In
addition, this faculty will consider other ways to assess competence with regard to the outcomes and objectives.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Action Research Project | **Outcome/Objective**: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev
- **Measure**: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills
- **Measure**: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes | **Outcome/Objective**: Participates in Learning Communities
- **Measure**: Supervision Session Summary Form | **Outcome/Objective**: Professional Reflection and Learning

Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty

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: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty members
Additional Resources: One additional school counseling faculty member.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Identification of Assessment Findings: What impact have recent changes in the educational program had on the quality of the findings?

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.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The assessment process is very exhaustive and rigorous 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.

3. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans. All standards were met by the students this year; thus, we view our curriculum and teaching effectiveness as high. No operational improvements or changes are called for at this time.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

All standards were met by the students this year; thus, we view our curriculum and teaching effectiveness as high. No operational improvements or changes are called for at this time.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 School Counseling MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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 system-wide 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/ground rules and consequences, maintaining an open/relaxed atmosphere, reflecting content and feelings of group members, inviting and/or encouraging all group members to participate, using appropriate summary/closure techniques, and effectively terminating the group experience. Students use individual counseling and small group counseling to promote academic development, career development and personal/social development.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

#### SLO 3: Demonstrates Interpersonal Skills used in Counseling (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students demonstrate interpersonal skills learned during CPS 6410 including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions, and closure.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

#### SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity (G: 3) (M: 4)
Research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals. Towards this end, students enrolled in CPS 7340 will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend learning and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. Students must attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Students must observe verbal and non verbal behaviors and initiate social interactions. In addition, students will read journal articles or book chapters that relate to the cultural group identified in the field project. The experience will be described in a paper.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

#### SLO 5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship (G: 3) (M: 5)
Interns must demonstrate their ability to respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests. Interns must be sensitive to school, community and cultural norms, understand the counselor’s role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution, and effectively use knowledge of culture, advocacy, and social justice to create academic, personal/social, and career development programs that meet the needs of diverse populations.
**SLO 6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal (G: 4) (M: 6)**

In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and rationale for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations.

**SLO 7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrshp, Action Research (G: 3, 5, 6) (M: 7)**

Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Students analyze the demographic data from their school and determine where gaps exist between demographic groups in achievement, access to classes, or other services, formulate a plan that is academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts.

**SLO 8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills (G: 6) (M: 8)**

Students must demonstrate the following classroom guidance skills: defining session goals, structuring the group, using age appropriate materials, using a variety of activities, keeping the group on task, employing effective classroom management skills, pacing the lesson appropriately, and using appropriate summary/closure techniques.

**SLO 9: Knowledge of Consultation & Collaboration (G: 7) (M: 9)**

Students must demonstrate their knowledge of consultation and collaboration, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families, teachers, and communities to empower them and build partnerships, and conducting programs to enhance students’ development needs.

**SLO 10: Demonstrates Consultation & Collab. Skills (G: 7) (M: 10)**

Students must demonstrate the following consultation and collaboration skills: establishing rapport, structuring the interview, responding empathetically, reflecting content, providing encouragement/support, identifying mistaken goal of behavior, defining and focusing on problem areas, helping to develop a plan of action or treatment strategy, helping the consultee learn to advocate for self as appropriate, planning for follow-up session, and using appropriate closure techniques.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

CPS 6020/6030 provides an overview of the 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive exam.

**M 2: Site Supr. Eval of Indiv & Small Group Counseling (O: 2)**

Site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate their intern’s skills in individual and small group counseling. Evaluation consists of case consultation, listening to tape recorded sessions and/or direct observation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Skills in Counseling and Guidance**

At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the over-all area for individual counseling. At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the over-all area for small group counseling. Site supervisors will provide the ratings.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the over-all area for individual counseling and for small group counseling.

**M 3: Final Video Tape (O: 3)**

Students are evaluated on their effective use of counseling skills via a final video tape role play in CPS 6410. This tape should reflect skills learned during the semester, including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions and closure.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Interpersonal Skills used in Counseling**


At least 90% of the students will earn a score at or above the cut-off score of 25.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the multicultural experience activity.

**M 5: Site Supr. Eval. of MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrshp (O: 5)**

Site supervisor's for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate students on their ability to articulate, model and advocate for an appropriate school counselor identity and program; demonstrate a commitment to helping all students excel; appreciate and value human diversity; show respect for students' varied talents and perspectives by designing and implementing prevention and intervention plans related to the effects of atypical growth and development, health and wellness, language, ability level, multicultural issues and factors of resiliency on student learning and development; respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests; sensitivity to school, community and cultural norms; help students feel valued and learn to value each other; understand the counselor's role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution; be culturally self-aware and understand the impact of biases, prejudices, processes of intentional and unintentional oppression and discrimination on the student's academic, personal/social, and career development; effective use of knowledge of culture, advocacy, and social justice to create academic, personal/social and career development programs that meet the needs of the diverse population; and other aspects of multicultural awareness, advocacy, and leadership in the school setting.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship**

At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**M 6: Appraisal Case Study (O: 6)**

In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and the rational for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations. Case studies are evaluated based on the previously stated issues as well as on organization, written expression, appropriate use of citations and references and on integration of course material.

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

**Target for O6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal**

At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the case study.

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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.

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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

96% 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for consultation and collaboration skills.

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

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling faculty members meet regularly (twice per month - or more) in order to assess other issues that may arise that are not currently being addressed in our training program. This is a portion of our continuous improvement plan that we implement in accordance with our national accrediting bodies: NCATE and CACREP. As we maintain and monitor our training program, we make decisions collectively, and in accordance with our national standards, when courses or other training experiences need to be altered.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling faculty members meet regularly (twice per month - or more) in order to assess other issues that may arise that are not currently being addressed in our training program. This is a portion of our continuous improvement plan that we implement in accordance with our national accrediting bodies: NCATE and CACREP. As we maintain and monitor our training program, we make decisions collectively, and in accordance with our national standards, when courses or other training experiences need to be altered.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty members

**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: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty members

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Based on the results from student performance on the GACE and optional NCE exam (100% pass rate in each on first attempts), we believe the program content and assessment process is strong. Student assessments in content courses reflect the distal data from the previous mentioned exams. We believe the emphasis in Career course on College and Career Readiness and our increasing emphasis on theory to practice in all of our skills courses has had a positive impact on our student performance. The responses from our advisory committee confirms this contention.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

All standards were met by students this year; therefore, we view our curriculum and teaching effectiveness as strong. No operational improvements are called for at this time. While we have made no major changes in course offering, we have adjusted the content in the courses to closely match the changes in Georgia’s school assessment (i.e. College and Career Readiness Performance Index [CCRPI]). College and Career Readiness (CCR) is a national school initiative. We believed that the information and experience our students received in this initiative would improve our students’ ability to participate and lead the field in school counseling. This is evident by our 100% hiring placement of this year’s students in schools in Georgia and surrounding state schools. This information was not on the GACE assessment nor the NBCC exam, however, it is information that we thought would be used in school counselor evaluation for school counselor’s hired for the 2015-2016 school year. In fact, our graduating students reported that the CCR was important in securing their positions in school counseling in the Atlanta metropolitan area. By increasing our faculty by splitting the two new hire faculty between Mental Health and School Counseling our program is moving to meeting the needs of a 60 credit hour program to meet CACREP 2016 requirements.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.**

A second school counseling faculty member was added to CPS school counseling program. This faculty member is an assistant clinical faculty member. The program has had an increase of 8 students to the MEd school counseling program for the 2014 new cohort. and has sustained growth in in the EdS program. The program has also proposed a move from 48 hours in the MEd program to 60 hours to take effect for the 2016 MEd school counseling cohort. That proposal is in the final stages and we are awaiting approval from the board of regents. The move to 60 hours will keep us in compliance with the new CACREP requirements and the new requirements for Licensure for Professional Counseling. The increase in hours and students has allowed us to search for an addition School Counseling faculty member. The program has had an increase of 8 students to the MEd school counseling program for the 2014 new cohort. and has sustained growth in in the EdS program. The program has also proposed a move from 48 hours in the MEd program to 60 hours to take effect for the 2016 MEd school counseling cohort. That proposal is in the final stages and we are awaiting approval from the board of regents. The move to 60 hours will keep us in compliance with the new CACREP requirements and the new requirements for Licensure for Professional Counseling. The increase in hours and students has allowed us to search for an addition School Counseling faculty member. The college of education has approved that line, our goal is to have a new member by the 2015-2016 school year. 100% of our 2013 cohort who took the NCE exam students passed on the first try. We also had 100% of that 2013 cohort secure fulltime employment as a school counselor for the 2014-2015 school year.

**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 challenge is to maintain or exceed the goal of 25 students in the 2015 school counseling cohort. We also want to continue with the success in passing rate for the comprehensive exam, the NCE exam and hiring rate for our students. We would like to have secured an additional faculty member which will swell our ranks to three.
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 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic skills in children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Implements Data Based Decision Making (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
<th>Students will understand responsibilities related to professional, legal, and ethical duties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Effectively utilizes technological applications (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will understand and utilize technology effectively.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children’s mental health.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Students will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Internship Portfolio (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

The Internship Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports consultation reports, assigned activities, the site-based supervisors' rating and university-based supervisors' rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.

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

#### Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, & learning

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration

100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2013-2014 - 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: 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, & learning
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency

#### Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.
### Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met

100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### M 3: Supervisor Ratings (O: 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 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, & learning**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate**

100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.
Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Target for O10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

M 4: PEF Disposition Survey (O: 5)
Students complete the Professional Education Faculty's unit-wide Student Disposition Survey at multiple points in the program (prior to practicum, at the conclusion of practicum, exit from the program, and 1 year post-graduation).
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities
Student survey responses will demonstrate an understanding of their professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities as school psychologists.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This survey has been discontinued by the PEF.

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
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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. 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.

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 consulation.
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
Graduates acquire and demonstrate adequate mastery of a subspeciality that strengthens their skills as psychologists.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Diversity Awareness &amp; Sensitive Service Delivery (G: 1) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work as professional school psychologists in a pluralistic, diverse society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD students must completed a pre-dissertation research project as part of the program and prior to taking the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Use and conduct research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their pre-dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013-14 3 students completed their pre-dissertations successfully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Successful completion of dissertation research (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A doctoral dissertation that represents independent scholarly research is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Use and conduct research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students who defend their dissertation will be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013-2014 6 students successfully defended their dissertations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Successful completion of comprehensive examination (O: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive examination that assesses knowledge of advanced principles of psychology, school psychology, ethics, and professional practice must be passed prior to graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013-14, one student took and passed the comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of the principles of psychology and school psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 students took and passed the comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Use and conduct research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of the use and conduct of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 students took and passed the comprehensive examination, which includes a section on research design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective intervention practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 students took and passed the comprehensive examination, which includes a section on intervention.</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 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 students took and passed the comprehensive examination, which includes a section on consultation.</td>
<td></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 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 students took and passed the comprehensive examination, which includes a section on assessment.</td>
<td></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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 4.5 of 5 on diversity awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 5 of 5 on the ethics rating</td>
<td></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 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 5 of 5 on the item related to understanding the practice of psychology and being ready for independent practice.</td>
<td></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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 5 or 5 on this item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 5 or 5 on this item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O6: Intervention
100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 5 or 5 on this item.related to intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O7: Consultation
100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2013-2014 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1 intern in 2013-14 obtained a rating of 4.5 of 5 on this item related to consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

We are accredited by APA and just completed the self-study. We also had the departmental APACE evaluation last year. The school psychology PhD program is quite strong and our student outcome data are uniformly strong. We have had an unusual situation of late in that we just graduated a large number of students—have very few students in the last half of the 6 year program, but have good numbers of students in years 1-3. That is why our data for 2013/14 are so unevenly distributed. We expect things to even out over the next 2 years. We have a much more comprehensive assessment system as part of the APA accreditation process. For WEAVE we identified a few key indicators and use them. In all cases our student outcomes are at or higher than the targeted levels.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

We have bi-weekly faculty meetings and discuss program issues, including student outcomes. We assess each student formally at least once per year as a faculty and provide feedback to the student. That evaluation includes examining the results from key program assessments. We have a monthly meeting with doctoral students and include aggregated feedback on outcomes when doing so will not identify a particular student. We engage in a highly detailed and lengthy process of self-study every 5-7 years as part of our APA accreditation. We just completed it. The complete self-study package was over 1000 pages long. A site visit by three external reviewers is part of the process. We engage in the APACE departmental review. We just completed that review last year. It included a site visit by three external reviewers.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Although not exactly in response to this year’s data, the problem does appear in this year’s data. We are working to even out our distribution of students and total size of the program. Given that it is a 6 year long program, it takes time for such efforts to bear fruit.
Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
We graduated 6 PhD students! We published and presented with our students. We placed 5 students in academic/research positions.

University-wide Committee Participation--Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate). 3 faculty members are on the senate- Varjas, Perkins, Roach.

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.
The faculty is active internationally, especially Dr. Varjas, E.g., Meyers, Truscott, Varjas, Perkins all presented at the 2013 International School Psychology Association conference in Porto, Portugal.
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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 they will enable them to plan and implement lessons that are interdisciplinary in which they teach learners how to show respect for science, each other, the school and the community.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (M: 1)

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.

### 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.

### 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.

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

**Clinical Practice**
Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 33% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 33% scored at the exceeds level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.
- **Additional Resources:** No additional resources needed.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Effects on P-12 Learning**
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.
- **Additional Resources:** No additional resources needed.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Planning - Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as 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
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Content Knowledge**
Linked to Content Knowledge: Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 62.5% scored at the exceeds expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

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

**Relationships (Measure (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
Effects on P-12 Learning
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 12.5% at the exceeds level, and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Learning

Implementation Description: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio. Students will be notified of the sessions through email.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All Science Education Faculty
Additional Resources: No additional resources are needed.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds and exceeds expectation levels and 25% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirement for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400 which meant that the students completed the portfolio requirement while enrolled in a methods course. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

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

Relationships (Measure (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)
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (G: 3) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will be able to create engaging learning environments where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 that 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.25 rating, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving at rating of Beginner or below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments**

1. For the For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 4.00 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 receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 or below.

**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.
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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):

Measure (Key Assessment): Objective 1 - Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Faculty member teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas

Projected Completion Date: 07/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: MAT Science Ed Unit

Concern over issues in the community and its assessment

Even though the portfolio data indicates that this objective has been met, there was conflicting data coming from the observations. The issue seemed to be that if a supervisor did not see direct evidence of this objective in the lesson observed, the candidate was given a low score on the observation. In the portfolios, the candidates were able to show evidence in the artifacts they provided of meeting this objective. The point needs to be communicated to the supervisors that this objective needs to be assessed in the larger context of the whole practicum experience and not within the thin slice of a few observations.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):

Measure (Key Assessment): Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

Implementation Description: Certainly, the supervisors and faculty need to continue to emphasize this area of teaching practice. However, it seems important that the supervisors need to be given some guidance in how to think about assessing this objective. This guidance will be communicated by science education faculty, particularly the program coordinator.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: All science education faculty can help in terms of communicating the significance of this objective to the candidates -- which they have been doing effectively. It will be a priority for the program coordinator to discuss the guidelines for assessing this objective with the supervisors.

Additional Resources: None  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: Assistance with Teacher Work Sample

A. Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: The results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) indicate that students need additional assistance in the following areas: Instructional design and planning and assessment. Data showed that students needed clearer explanations of the TWS and the integrated nature of the assignments. The following actions will be taken to help students improve their knowledge and skills in assessment, instructional planning and instructional design. Students will receive more assistance with the TWS assignment in the methods courses and the methods course assignments will be aligned with the TWS.

During Professional Advisement Week, students will also receive help with the TWS.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):

Measure (Key Assessment): Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences

Implementation Description: Students will receive more assistance with the TWS assignment in the methods courses and the methods course assignments will be aligned with the TWS. During Professional Advisement Week, students will also receive help with the TWS.

Projected Completion Date: 04/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: All science Education Faculty  
Additional Resources: None  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Using Assessment Data

Impact on Student Learning and Assessment: Students showed acceptable performance on this standard; however, closer examination of the data revealed that there are some minor deficiencies with the interpretation of student assessment data. In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a
class.

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

Relationships (Measure (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 subgroups 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 assessments 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. Methods classes will be modified to include some format of classroom management.
Responsible Person/Group: All professors teaching the science methods courses.
Additional Resources: None at this time.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Social Foundations MS
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Mission Statement: Social Foundations of Education is a broadly conceived field of educational study that derives its character from a number of academic disciplines and interdisciplinary studies. At Georgia State University, the disciplines involved in social foundations inquiry are history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, and political science; the interdisciplinary field is cultural studies. The purpose of social foundations study is to bring intellectual resources derived from these areas to bear in developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education, both inside of and outside of schools.

Goals
G 1: Designs and Conducts Research
The student demonstrates the ability to design a major research study, appropriate at the Masters level.

G 2: Social Foundations Masters’ Program Goals
Social Foundations Masters’ Program Goals The faculty of the Social Foundations master's program expects that graduating students will: 1. possess a foundation of broad general education based in the major academic disciplines of Social Foundations, 2. understand, respect, and value the multicultural backgrounds and diverse educational needs of students in our schools, 3. understand and apply research to problems effecting educational institutions, 4. identify and evaluate critical educational policy issues, 5. possess the knowledge and skills to assess professional literature, academic studies, and reports and provide a reasonable summary understanding of the findings and likely policy implications, 6. possess basic methodology skills necessary to carry out a successful master's thesis, 7. use technology to access resources, communicate and collaborate with colleagues, and present information in scholarly situations, 8. demonstrate in writing and oral presentation an ability to interpret, question, reflect upon, and engage with the underlying issues within contemporary educational theory and practice, 9. question the implicit norms and assumptions of contemporary schooling.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: The student will complete a thesis or project (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
The student has completed a thesis or project advancing an original point of view as a result of Social Foundations research.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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**
Three students completed the thesis/project.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
Findings: SF LOA Data for 2013-2014 (fall 2014, spring 2014, summer 2014) Master Thesis/Project LOA # 5Q1 5Q2 5Q3 5Q4 5QS 5 Comment 254 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 Mean 2.80 3.00 2.80 2.67 2.40 SD 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.58 0.55 Master Thesis/Project Outcomes: 1. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a high level (2.8 on a 3 point scale) of understanding as to how to develop appropriate research question(s) and methodology. 2. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a superior level (3.0 on a 3 point scale) knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field which they investigate in their thesis or project. 3. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a high quality writing (2.8 on a 3 point scale). 4. Social Foundations Masters’ students are able to orally present their research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience (2.6 on a 3 point scale). 5. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a good, but not superior, potential for making a contribution to the discipline through their thesis or project (2.4 on a 3 point scale).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 2: Evaluation items and Findings (O: 1)**
LOA Items and Scale Evaluation Items 1. Addresses research question(s) with appropriate methodology (ies). Responds to goals 6, 7, and 9. 2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Responds to goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9. 3. Document adheres to the standard of quality writing. Responds to goals 7 & 8. 4. Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. Responds to goals 7 & 8. 5. Potential for contribution to the discipline. Responds to goals 1, 3, 4, 8 and 9 Response scale: 3 = Exceeds 2 = Meets 1 = Does Not Meet N/A = blank Findings: SF LOA Data for 2013-2014 (fall 2014, spring 2014, summer 2014) Master Thesis/Project LOA # 5Q1 5Q2 5Q3 5Q4 5QS 5 Comment 254 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 Mean 2.80 3.00 2.80 2.67 2.40 SD 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.58 0.55 Outcomes: 1. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a high level (2.8 on a 3 point scale) of understanding as to how to develop appropriate research question(s) and methodology. 2. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a superior level (3.0 on a 3 point scale) knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field which they investigate in their thesis or project. 3. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a high quality writing (2.8 on a 3 point scale). 4. Social Foundations Masters’ students are able to orally present their research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience (2.6 on a 3 point scale). 5. Social Foundations Masters’ students demonstrate a good, but not superior, potential for making a contribution to the discipline through their thesis or project (2.4 on a 3 point scale).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 3: unnecessary duplicate of #2 (O: 1)**
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

**Action Plan**
No changes are planned. However, at our annual April retreat the unit will discuss whether we have a common understanding of item 5: "Potential for contribution to the discipline." This was the item which scored the lowest. While the expectations are higher for doctoral students to produce contributions to the discipline, we should agree on whether we can expect that masters' students should achieve a high level (3 on a scale of 3) on this item or whether this year’s outcome of 2.4 out of 3 is sufficient.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

NA

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The Masters' Student evaluation rubric is used as a direct observation for rating the student's written work and oral defense. In the past we used a variety of measures from core courses required of our students but found the data difficult to interpret and compare because the courses and expectations were so different. The current 5 item measurement tool assesses students based on the Masters' thesis or thesis project, which is the capstone activity for the Masters' program. All students must complete either the thesis or the project in order to graduate. Master's thesis or thesis project in Social Foundations fulfill the College's Comprehensive Examination requirement by both (1) completing a thesis or project and (2) completing an oral defense of the thesis or project.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

NA

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

No changes are planned. However, at our annual April retreat the unit will discuss whether we have a common understanding of item 5: "Potential for contribution to the discipline." This was the item which scored the lowest. While the expectations are higher for doctoral students to produce contributions to the discipline, we should agree on whether we can expect that masters' students should achieve a high level (3 on a scale of 3) on this item or whether this year's outcome of 2.4 out of 3 is sufficient.
Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

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, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed:
http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
http://oie.gsu.edu/academic-assessment-and-review/2013-2014-assessment-cycle/ Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Social Studies Content Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Historical Inquiry - Option 1 0 1 0 0.250 2.000 0.500 Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 2 (100%) Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 (50%) 1 (50%)

Target for O2: Curriculum Standards
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Curriculum Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Curriculum Resources 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Culturally Appropriate Curriculum 2 (100%) Curriculum Resources 2 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

Target for O3: Learning Environment
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
### Target for O4: Knowledge of Students

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Knowledge of Students Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Data-driven Assessment and Differentiation 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Student Self-Assessment 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Data-driven Assessment 1 0 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.500 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Learning Theory 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Family Communication 0 1 1 0 0 2.500 2.000 0.500 High Expectations and Differentiation 2 (100%) Learning Theory 2 (100%) Family Communication 1 (50%) 1 (50%)  

### Target for O5: Assessment

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Data-driven Assessment and Differentiation 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Student Self-Assessment 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Data-driven Assessment 1 0 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.500 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Learning Theory 0 2 0 0 0 3.000 3.000 0.000 Family Communication 0 1 1 0 0 2.500 2.000 0.500 High Expectations and Differentiation 2 (100%) Learning Theory 2 (100%) Family Communication 1 (50%) 1 (50%)  

### M 2: Unit-Wide Dispositions Rubric (O: 6)

Faculty evaluate candidates on demonstration of empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.  
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O6: Disposition**

All students will achieve a (4 = Strength, that means that the disposition is a pervasive trait of the student or 3 = Developing that means the student is aware of and values that trait.)

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students assessed received either a 4, or 3 on all portions of the dispositions rubric indicating a met target.

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

#### M.Ed. Collaboration

MSIT is in the process of combining the master's degree programs in the department with the Educational Leadership department to create an innovative master's degree program highlighting the social studies as well as urban teaching and leadership with a coaching and / or leadership endorsement.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ad Hoc Committee
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Recruitment

We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Social Studies Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Revise Portfolio Assessment

We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Social Studies Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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 | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure | 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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Overall, our two graduates for this reporting period performed reasonably well. One student achieved at or above the expected levels and the other had a few areas at the “advanced” levels that may need evaluation. However, extreme caution should be used when deriving any conclusions, patterns, or generalizations from two students.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Our faculty are more concerned with the absence of applications and new students. We had no applications for this reporting cycle and currently have no new students. Fortunately, the COE hired a marketing expert who may assist us with this dilemma.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
We graduated all our active students!

Challenges for Next Year--Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.
Recruiting new students or closing the program. Unfortunately, recent changes in teacher certification and continued negative effects of the recession are limiting our applicants.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Social Studies Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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.
### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Content and Curriculum (O: 1)**

Data for the objective of Content Knowledge are taken from the Final StudentTeaching Evaluation Instrument. The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum II/III (student teaching). Students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student's mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors.

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

**Target for O1: Content and Curriculum**

100% of students will score at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 80% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 90% of students scored at the highest level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard. 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 edTPA. 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 edTPA during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and 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 edTPA 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 edTPA 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 90% of students scored at the highest level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard. 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, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate’s teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates' semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent in a high school (grades 9-12), the teacher candidates gradually takes on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

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

**Target for O3: Clinical Practice**

100% of students will score at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 60% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.

**M 4: Dispositions (O: 4)**

The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Social Studies MAT programs, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

**Target for O4: Dispositions**

100% of students will score at the level of Acceptable and 70% of students will score at the level of Exceptional on this standard.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the 2013-2014 school year, 75% of students performed at the Exceptional; while 15% of students performed at the Acceptable; 10% of students performed at the Marginal level for this standard. 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

For the 2013-2014 school year, 85% of students performed at the level of Proficient and 15% of students performed at the level of Advanced Performance for the edTPA. 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.
### Maintain Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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### Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to continue to promote 100% competency. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content and Curriculum | Outcome/Objective: Content and Curriculum

**Classroom Management**

The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

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

Implementation Description: Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chantee Earl McBride
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chantee Earl
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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

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 proficient and advance performance 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,
we will continue to focus on the use of primary source documents, historical landmarks, and artifacts in the teaching and learning of social studies has been added. This continued 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.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

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 the 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.

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2013-2014 Social Work BSW**

*(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)**

Student 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
95% earned 24 (B) or better.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
90% earned 20 (B) or better.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
81% of students received 16 (B) or better.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
98% of students received 80 (B) or better.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
73% of students received 24 (B) or better.

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: 03/2014

Human Behavior Theory
Integration of human behavior theory with research paradigms and relevant resources is needed.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Student Portfolio
  Outcome/Objective: Human Behavior & Social Environment

Implementation Description: Lead faculty will ensure course content is modified to emphasize this topic in classroom instruction and in the development of student eportfolios. Extended training and guidance from The Exchange re: eportfolio creations.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Jan Ligon

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Each year, the BSW Program Committee (all BSW faculty) reviews the outcome measures and develops an action plan to address any programmatic deficiencies, i.e., not meeting our benchmark. Full faculty addresses the concerns and lead faculty, as appropriate, implement the needed changes. They are responsible for ensuring that all faculty teaching sections of that particular course are also making these changes. We note that from year to year, our outcome measures do shift re: meeting or not meeting the benchmark. In light of this, we held a faculty retreat to address competencies across the curriculum.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We expect our faculty to make course changes (e.g., instructional material, assignments, required readings) based on the assessment findings after committee review and faculty discussion - both scheduled each fall. The BSW committee then follows up with the faculty member to ensure the changes are in place. Previous year measures are then compared with the next year’s measures to see if there was improvement.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Social Work MSW
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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 2013-2014** - Target: Met
95% received a 4 (B) 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 2013-2014** - Target: Met
95% received an 8 (B) or better.

**Findings 2013-2014** - Target: Met
95% received an 8 (B) 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 2013-2014** - Target: Met
100% received 12 (B) 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 2013-2014** - Target: Met
100% received a 6 (B) 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 2013-2014** - Target: Met
100% received as (B) 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
Responsible Person/Group: MSW Program Committee

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.
Responsible Person/Group: MSW Program Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Each year, the MSW Program Committee (all MSW faculty) reviews the outcome measures and develops an action plan to address any programmatic deficiencies, i.e., not meeting our benchmark. Full faculty addresses the concerns and lead faculty, as appropriate, implement the needed changes. They are responsible for ensuring that all faculty teaching sections of that particular course are also making these changes. We note that from year to year, our outcome measures shift slightly re: meeting or not meeting the benchmark. In light of this, we held a faculty retreat to address competencies across the MSW curriculum.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We expect our MSW faculty to make course changes (e.g., instructional material, assignments, required readings) based on the assessment findings after committee review and faculty discussion - both scheduled each fall. The MSW committee then follows up with the faculty member to ensure the changes are in place. Previous year measures are then compared with the next year’s measures to see if there was improvement.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Sociology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Goals
G 1: General Education Goal
Students will learn to critically analyze the complexity of social behavior, and how historical, economic, political, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: critical understanding (G: 1) (M: 1)
Common embedded questions on objective exams are designed to allow students to demonstrate their critical understanding of key sociological concepts and theories, and about social conditions and problems.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

SLO 2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems (G: 1) (M: 1)
Through common embedded questions on objective exams, students demonstrate their ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems, both locally and globally.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.
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 Soc 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 1101 (418 students), and 11 sections of 1160 (545 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92% of students in 1101 and 93% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 78% of students in 1101 and 93% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues correctly," 91% of students in 1101 and 94% in 1160 answered questions correctly. Edit Finding Add Action Plan Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) 1. 2007-2008 Help
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: critical understanding
At least 80% of students should answer questions correctly.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Target: At least 80% of students should answer questions correctly. This goal was exceeded for the 2013-2014 academic year.

Target for O2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems
At least 80% of students should answer embedded questions correctly.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
This targeted was exceeded for the 2013-2014 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
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc.. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?
We met our goals for the assessment of the core. We have not made any program changes.
4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We have not made any changes to our assessment process.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Sociology BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST

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

**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.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Acquisition of Knowledge (G: 8) (M: 1, 2, 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 (SOCL 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

<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 the paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

This target was not met with only 35 percent of students scoring excellent or very good in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in the paper. However, this percentage is an increase over last year.

M 2: SOCI 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)
Assessment is based on professors' evaluations of: students' course papers (in which they develop research proposals) and/or final exams. Students' work is assessed on each outcome/objective measure. 99 students (in four sections) were assessed based on their course papers or final exams. In terms of demonstrating "analytic skills," professors assessed 24% of students' papers as excellent; 39% as very good; 22% as good; and 15% as poor. In terms of demonstration of "critical thinking," the professor assessed 31% of students' papers as excellent; 36% as very good; 19% as good, and 14% as poor. In terms of "communication skills," the professor assessed 23% of students' papers/exams as excellent; 36% as very good; 27% as good, and 14% as poor. Three of the professors (the fourth omitted this measure) evaluated 74 students' papers in terms of their demonstration of "acquisition of knowledge": 26% of these papers/exams as excellent (a score of 4); 36% were judged to be "very good" (a score of 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).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in the paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

This goal was exceeded with 85% of the students scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their papers/exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their analysis of social problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

This goal was met and exceeded with 80 percent of students scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

This goal was met with 79 percent of the students scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their communications skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

This goal was met with 78 percent of the students scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

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; 28% as good; and 7% as poor in this area. The professors judged 29% to be excellent in their demonstration of critical thinking skills (able to analyze and interpret data). They assessed 35% of students as very good; 30% as good; and 6% as poor in this area.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**

This goal was partially met with 68 percent of student scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of analytic skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

This goal was met with 78 percent of the students scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.
Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
This goal was met with 71 percent of the students scoring "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

**M 4: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper (O: 1, 3)**
This measure is based on professors' evaluations (using a 4-point scale) of students' demonstration of "acquisition of knowledge"; their ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems; and their ability to analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international issues, based on their performance on their final exams or papers. The work of 293 students (in five sections) was assessed. In the area of "acquisition of knowledge," professors judged 18% of students' work to be excellent; 43% to be very good; 42% to be good, and 7% to be poor. In terms of demonstrating an ability to analyze (and suggest solutions to) contemporary problems, professors judged 18% of students' work to be excellent; 43% to be very good; 43% to be good; and 6% to be poor. In the second (global) measure, professors judged 18% of students' work to be excellent; 44% to be very good; 42% to be good, and 6% to be poor.

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

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge**
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their acquisition of knowledge.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
This goal has been partially met with 62 percent of the students scoring "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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
This goal was partially met with 61 percent of the students scoring "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
- Measure: Analysis of Social Problems
- Measure: Sociological Theory (SOCI 3030) Final Exam or Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge

**monitor student performance**
Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased (but is only slightly less than our target in this category -- 67% instead of 70% achieving assessment as "excellent" or "very good" in critical thinking). The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 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 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

**monitor student performance**
Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: SOCI 3020 (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 3020 (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**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

The analysis of assessment findings demonstrated that we have met our stated goals for the Sociology BA program. We have not made any program changes.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Since we met our program goals, we have not implemented any changes to our educational program or the assessment process.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2013-2014 Sociology MA**
**As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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.

**SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1)**
The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.

**SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1)**
The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.

**SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1, 3, 4)**
The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

**SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1)**
The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.

**SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1)**
The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Masters Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**
The student's original Masters Thesis and Thesis Defense are used for assessment by the Thesis Chair.

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

**Target for O1: Data Collection**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O3: Research Reports**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O6: New Research Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."
**Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O10: Facts and Information**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O12: Social Problems**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O13: Global Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**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."

**Target for O3: Research Reports**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O6: New Research Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**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

**Target for O1: Data Collection**
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

**Target for O3: Research Reports**
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

**Target for O6: New Research Questions**
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
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."

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O3: Research Reports**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O6: New Research Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O10: Facts and Information**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O12: Social Problems**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O13: Global Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**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.
Target for O9: Concepts and Theories
50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.

Target for O10: Facts and Information
50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.

Target for O12: Social Problems
50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.

Target for O13: Global Questions
50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.

M 3: Methods Component of Doctoral Exam (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)
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.

Target for O2: Analytical Techniques
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

Target for O5: Data Analysis
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

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
- Measure: Data Collection | Outcome/Objective: 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
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Spanish BA

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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Spanish MA

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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Speech BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**
Speech communication explores the construction, diffusion, analysis, and impact of messages as they occur among individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures in the media age. Students will learn major theories and concepts within this discipline that they will then use to create, perform, and critique the effectiveness of various types of communicative acts.

**Goals**

**G 1: Communication Development/Strategy**
Students understand the development and strategic aspects of human communication.

**G 2: Communication Research**
Students understand the communication research tradition.

**G 3: Communication Competence**
Students utilize communication competence and critical thinking skills.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Human Communication Models (G: 1)**
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,
**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 comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Intercultural Paper (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students studied intercultural concepts throughout the semester. During the last half of the semester, they 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Communication Variations</strong></td>
<td>Average of 4 (out of 5) for majority of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Intercultural Communication Competence Training Module (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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' ability to understand the variations between cultures as evidenced in the mass media. The rubric assesses students on six categories: Cultural Self-Awareness, Cultural Worldview Frameworks, Empathy, Verbal and Nonverbal Communication, Curiosity, and Openness. However, because the &quot;Openness&quot; 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Communication Competence Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Average of 3 (out of 4) by majority of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Comm &amp; Diversity Annotated Bibliography (O: 6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Scholarly Publication Summarization</strong></td>
<td>Average of 4 (out of 5) by the majority of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Persuasion Oral Presentation (O: 8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 4.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O8: 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

**Target for O9: Writing Skills**

Average 2 (out of 3) by majority of students.

**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

**Target for O10: Adaptation to Diversity**

Average 4 (out of 5) by the majority of the students

**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

**Target for O11: Message Critique**

Average 3 (out of 4) for majority of students.

**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.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty
Develop Measure for Objective #7: Research Critique

One of our objectives states that we want students to be able to appropriately critique the research process and arguments/conclusions presented in scholarly publications. For this cycle, we did not collect data to measure this objective. For the next cycle, we need to identify specific courses and assignments that could give us the necessary data to measure this objective. Also, we will discuss the annotated bibliography assignments with faculty teaching upper division/research courses. We will encourage faculty to move beyond having these be summary assignments to having them require research critique.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Meet with Speech Area faculty to discuss classes and assignments that will give us the necessary measures.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Area Faculty

Develop Rotation for Measuring Objectives

This year, we completely revised our mission, goals, and learning objectives. So, this was our first effort at measuring our new goals and learning objectives. In this cycle, we measured 8 of the 11 objectives set forth in our new Assessment Plan. For the upcoming cycle, we need to measure the 3 objectives not measured in the cycle. Also, we need to develop a rotation for when objectives will be measured so that the 11 objectives are measured consistently over time.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will develop a rotation for objective measurement.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Gather additional data

One of the goals of the Speech Major is equip students to summarize scholarly research. The target was not met for this objective. To better understand whether this an ongoing and/or widespread issue with our students, we should gather more data from additional assignments

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

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
**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Science in Sports Administration degree seeks to prepare students with professional skills, research, 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

**Target for O1:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization.

Students will develop an organization manual and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

30/30 students met the specified target level of performance

**Target for O2:** Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze a sport organization's problems

Students will develop a case study and provide solutions to the problems identified for the organization; students will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

64/64 students met the specified target level of performance

**Target for O4:** Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance

Students will create an investment portfolio and perform a financial analysis of a sport organization; students will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

28/28 students met the specified target level of performance

**Target for O6:** Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process

Students will develop legal briefs and perform at an acceptable level or higher as stated on the rubric associated with this project.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Partially Met

52/54 students met the specified target level of performance

## M 2: Students will create a marketing plan (O: 3)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing and the ability to apply this information by creating a marketing plan.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing.

Students will score at least 70 points on the project using a rubric established for evaluation

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

51/51 students met the specified target level of performance

## M 3: Papers (O: 5)

Students will write a research paper on a contemporary issue in society related to sport. Students will discuss at least one cultural issue (race, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability) in the paper.

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

**Target for O5:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport

Students will write a research paper on a cultural issue related to sport and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Met

26/26 students met the specified target level of performance

## M 4: Presentations (O: 6)

Students will participate in a mock trial and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for the project.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O6:** Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process

Students will score 19 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation of the mock trial

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target:** Partially Met

51/54 students met the specified target level of performance

## M 5: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
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Students will complete a culminating essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content.
### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
42 students completed the exam question and 41 met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 7; 25 students scored 8; 15 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 the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
42 students completed the exam question and 41 met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 7; 25 students scored 8; 15 students scored 9.

### Target for O3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing.
The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
32 students completed the exam question and 31 met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 0, 7 students scored 8; 20 students scored 9, 4 students scored 10.

### Target for O4: Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance
The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
29 students completed the exam question and 28 met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 0, 1 student scored 7, 15 students scored 8; 12 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 the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
32 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 0; 7 students scored 8; 21 students scored 9; 3 scored 10.

### Target for O6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process
The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
14 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 0; 5 students scored 8; 8 students scored 9; 1 student scored 10.

### Target for O7: Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and apply sport business concepts
The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met**
29 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 0; 15 students scored 8; 12 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.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Findings revealed that the comprehensive exams and classwork are still appropriate measures for the graduates for the program. The strengths in using the assignments and comp exams allows for a broad-based understanding of the main points of our program. We have had a few adjunct teachers fill in these core classes this past year, so it was positive to see that they were still maintaining the same level of rigor and assignments in the core classes.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

At this time, there are no changes in the educational program. There are not plans to change the way we measure student outcomes as they currently reflect the core courses.
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 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
5 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.5 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 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 4: 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
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 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
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**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**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 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 a score at a level of at least a 3 out of 4 on research article presentations.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students received a score of at least a 3 out of 4 on 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 a 3 out of 4 on the literature review and discussion portions of their research project.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students received a score of at least a 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 2013-2014 - 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of students received at least a 3 out of 5 on end of semester evaluations completed by their clinical supervisor.

**Target for O4: Provide opportunities to practice administration and management in athletic training.**

Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of students received at least a 3 out of 5 on end of semester evaluations completed 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

All students (11) received at least a 3 out of 4 on all exams in KH 7580. All students (19) received at least a 3 out of 4 on all exams in KH 8300.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   SMD Matrix 0 = Not addressed 1 = Minor (mentioned, some readings, short discussion) 2 = Moderate (expanded time, readings, discussions, graded assignments/examinations) 3 = Extensive (Key course focus, variety of learning activities, multiple assessments) KH8330 KH7500 KH7530 KH7580 KH7660 KH8265 KH8300 KH8780 KH8820 KH900 Research Searching the literature 0 0 0 2 0 2 0 0 0 0 3 Citations 0 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 3 Evaluation 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 Research Design 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 2 Statistical Analysis 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 3 1 Ethics 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Presentation skills 0 1 1 2 0 1 0 0 3 2 Writing skills 0 1 1 2 0 2 0 0 3 2 Evidence Based Practice 0 1 0 2 1 2 2 0 1 3 Domains of Athletic Training Injury/illness Prevention and Wellness Protection Anatomy 1 1 3 1 0 0 1 2 1 0 Ex Phys 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Biomechanics 0 1 1 0 0 1 3 0 0 Immediate and Emergency Care CPR 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Spine boarding 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Clinical Evaluation and Diagnosis Gait analysis 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 Sensitivity/specificity of special tests 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Treatment and Rehabilitation Tissue Healing 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Ultrasound 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 E-stim 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 Diathermy 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 Heat/cold 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 Laser 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Drug Therapy 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 Surgical Procedures 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 Organizational and Professional Health and Well-being State Practice Laws 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Legislation 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Professionalism Volunteering 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Professional shadowing 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Surgical Observation 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Ethics 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Continuing Education 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 Conference Attendance 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

   1) The significance of our findings in light of the desired results is that we met our goals and our students are demonstrating their grasp of higher level concepts related to Sports Medicine. 2) The significance of our findings in light of findings from previous years is that we improved upon results from previous years and appear to be delivering the necessary concepts in a better manner. One such example is the introduction of a cadaver dissection component in our anatomy course. The dissection component allowed students to better understand the anatomical structures and their role in human movement and injury. 3) The significance of our findings in light of recent changes in the education program is strongly due to the fact that we hired a new faculty member. Our new faculty member has restructured two of our classes which improved our student learning outcomes.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is
used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Our assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty during our annual program meeting. The two faculty members discussed each course they taught in the past year and mention strengths and weaknesses realized while teaching the course. Then once information is compiled the two faculty members discuss any thoughts on program changes such as course sequencing, course content, course delivery, course credit hours, and any development of new courses in the hopes of further improving and strengthening the educational program.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

We will be submitting several program changes as a result of this year’s assessment findings: 1) increase credit hours of anatomy course to better cover course material (3.0 to 4.0 credit hours) - credit hour will be removed from Therapeutic Modalities course (3.0 to 2.0 credit hours) as a larger emphasis needs to be placed on anatomy. 2) development of new course titled: Lab Techniques for Sports Medicine - during research course it was realized that the students need specific instruction on the use of lab equipment available to them to use during data collection for their research projects. 3) removal of Exercise Physiology course - it was realized that Exercise Physiology concepts are not used by our students during their clinical work and therefore, could be removed - our students would be better served by a lab techniques course than another Exercise Physiology course from their undergraduate programs.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

New faculty member restructured two classes and we introduced a cadaver dissection component to our anatomy course and as a result all goals were met.

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 challenge for this upcoming year is the large increase in student enrollment with only two faculty members.

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

N/A

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).

Of our two faculty members, one is serving on the University Senate. The two committees in which she is assigned to is the Research and Athletics Committees.

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.

One faculty member published his research in two international journals.
**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 added annual meetings with each student to discuss strengths/weaknesses of the program and clinical sites. In addition we discuss any concerns the student has about his/her progression within the program as well as their future career goals. These meetings were added in hopes of retaining our students and assisting in any job placements upon graduation.

**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).

One faculty member served on the search committee for the head athletic trainer position at Clayton State University. Both faculty members served as reviewers for several scholarly publications. One faculty member served as a co-chair of a professional regional committee. Our students are required to volunteer their time and expertise to various athletic events in the Metro-Atlanta area twice a semester, every semester. One such event is the Peachtree Road Race.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Taxation MTX**

As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Taxation (M.Tx.) program offers a variety of courses that provide students with opportunities to develop research, technical and communication skills that tax professionals need to excel in their careers.

**Goals**

**G 1: Tax Research**

Students will be competent tax law researchers.

**G 2: Technical Tax Knowledge for Practice**

Students will be knowledgeable in the technical areas of tax law for professional practice.

**G 3: Strong Communications Skills**

Students will be effective communicators both in written communications and in oral presentations and will be able to document their research conclusions.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: To develop ability to conduct tax research (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Expected outcomes of above stated program objectives: (1) The student should be able to identify tax issues; (2) The student should be able to locate relevant authority for resolving tax issues; and (3) The student should be able to correctly evaluate primary tax authority. The assessment method for this learning objective is performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030).

**SLO 2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge (M: 4, 5)**

Students will demonstrate technical knowledge of tax law in the key areas of corporations and partnerships.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate professional communications skills. (M: 6)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to correctly and effectively document and cite research conclusions in writing and in oral 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 2013-2014**

- Target: Met
  - Fall 2013 78.60 Spring 2014 75

**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.
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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Fall 2013 90.4 average on Final Research Exam for locating authority. Spring 2014 85.69 average on Final Research Exam for Locating Authority.

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 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Fall 2013 89.74 Spring 2014 92 average

M 4: Knowledge of Corporate Tax Law (O: 2)
Performance is measured by class average on final examination 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 2013-2014 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2013, 88; Spring 2014, 84

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. Target is 75%. Assessment changed for Spring 2014 to average of 10 key questions on the final exam.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge

Class average of 85%.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
Fall 2013, Buckhead -- 87.2 Spring 2014, Buckhead -- 88

M 6: Professional Writing Assignments (O: 3)
The assignment in Tx 8020 requires students to complete 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. The target is a class average of 85% on the packet.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

Tx 8120
Since there is insufficient time to cover all current topics, consider eliminating the corporate tax return project or providing it as an additional exercise for students desiring the compliance experience.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Devise 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 a 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: Finished
Priority: High
### End of program assessment

Devise and end of program assessment test to be assure student learning.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We hope to devise a test to be delivered in D2L to all graduating MTx students.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Tad Ransopher

### Technology Skills

Students will now be required to complete Excel projects in Accounting for Income Taxes and all tax return problems. Other courses in the program will be encouraged to assign Excel problems where appropriate.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Projects will be submitted to the Professor of each course where a technology project is assigned.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Tad D. Ransopher and Joe Reinkemeyer

### Written Communication

Students will now write a Client Letter and Tax File Memorandum for the Advanced Federal Taxation Class. This project will help assess the students writing skills.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Tad D. Ransopher

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### 2. Analysis of Assessment Findings

Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

1. Our desired results were not net in total. This was due, in large part, from the registrar not enforcing the prerequisites passed by the Graduate Program Council. We discovered that the students were not adequately prepared to cover some required material in corporations and partnerships. (2) In the report. (3) Recently, we took the Masters in Taxation program to the Buckhead campus which has allowed the department to better enforce the prerequisites. The assessment process revealed that we attempted assessment too early in the program and as a result, most faculty were not prepared to assess their courses. What was learned: (1) The assessment process revealed the weakness resulting from the lack of prerequisite enforcement. The strength of the assessment process is that it identified the issue of the learning process. (2) The impact on the program has been that we will assess more classes at the end of the program to ensure student learning. (3) We have implemented a new writing requirement that will better evaluate the student writing skills.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

1. The changes that we are implementing in the assessment process will now rest solely with full-time faculty and not with the adjunct professors. We have found that the professionals that teach in our program lack the time to devote to the assessment process. There have been significant delays in getting assessment reports and understanding the assessment process. We are also implementing an assessment tool towards the end of the program to better analyze student learning. These action plans have been outlined in our report.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Teaching & Learning PhD -- Teacher Education**

As of: 12/13/2016 06:09 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).

**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).

**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 standards 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: 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 standards 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)**

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Teaching & Learning PhD--Language & Literacy**

*(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 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**

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 language and literacy 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 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 2013-2014** - 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 2013-2014** - 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 2013-2014** - 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.
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Students demonstrate research knowledge in the professional core. They must take five research courses, and complete a dissertation. Students write for publication and present research at national and international conferences. EPRS 8500 or EPRS 8530; two EPRS courses; two advanced research courses. Students demonstrate professional and pedagogical skills for teacher education through research and teaching internships (EDCI 9660). Students also teach courses at the undergraduate level to apply their professional and pedagogical skills. Students take 30 hours in their major field. Students must complete a residency plan that requires them to complete all 6 areas: 1. Participate in ongoing research and scholarly experiences 2. Submit a research/scholarly manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal as primary or lead author (or as an author with substantial contribution to the research study and manuscript) 3. Participate in identifying and applying for a grant/fellowship 4. Present at a research/scholarly conference 5. Engage in university teaching internship 6. Serve the institution and/or profession Students demonstrate their professional service and engagement by serving on various unit committees, writing manuscript reviews for national and international publications and conference proposals, serve on local, state, and national committees, and serve on a range of projects directed by faculty. Students demonstrate engagement with technology both through teaching online and taking online courses. They communicate regularly on committees through Skype, Blackboard Collaborate, and email. They also belong to a unit-wide listserv.

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

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. As a result, students will be highly prepared to conduct research studies and write up their findings to larger audiences.
3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Faculty discuss assessment findings twice a year during Professional Advising Week. Students are evaluated on a rubric for each of the outcomes. Improvements are made based upon these discussions.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

Based upon faculty discussion of assessment findings for program improvement, the program was successful in recruiting more full-time students. Of the 9 students admitted in this assessment cycle, 5 are full-time. Increased visibility in international spaces is also noted. Students presented and/or worked in Southeast Asia, worked in South Africa, Bahamas, China. Students also interact with international scholars and other graduate students through projects focused on international literacy.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

Language and Literacy continues to admit strong doctoral students. Three students were awarded Southern Region Educational Board scholarships ($20,000/year) for four years. Students are publishing in highly respectable journals. Students are presenting at international and national conferences. Students are highly engaged in work that involves international spaces. Two students were hired from national searches.

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.

Budget restrictions will challenge the unit in financially supporting doctoral students, especially international students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2013-2014 Teaching & Learning PhD--Mathematics Education
As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 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, 4)
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.
## 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 2013-2014 - 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a level of exceptional knowledge (High Pass).

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 3)
Candidates are assessed using a mathematics education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 2, 4, and 5 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a level of exceptional knowledge (High Pass).

**Findings 2013-2014 - 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: 2)
Candidates are assessed using a mathematics education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standard 9 from the rubric.

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

**Target for 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 2013-2014 - 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).

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

**Continue to Monitor**
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Service and Engagement | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement

Implementation Description: Monitor
Projected Completion Date: 10/2015
Responsible Person/Group: All mathematics education faculty members
Additional Resources: None

Continue to Monitor
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Engagement with Technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

Implementation Description: Monitor
Projected Completion Date: 10/2015
Responsible Person/Group: All mathematics education faculty members
Additional Resources: None

Continue to Monitor
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Research Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research Knowledge

Implementation Description: Monitor
Projected Completion Date: 10/2015
Responsible Person/Group: All mathematics education faculty members
Additional Resources: None

Continue to Monitor
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

Implementation Description: Monitor
Projected Completion Date: 10/2015
Responsible Person/Group: All mathematics education faculty members
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.
NA

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?
NA

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.
NA

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.
NA
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 1: MusEd Goal #1 (Ph.D.)</th>
<th>1. Our graduates will be informed teachers who know the content in music needed for teaching students in P-12 schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 2: MusEd Goal #2 (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>2. Our graduates will be informed teachers who know the content in music teacher education needed for teaching undergraduate students in teacher preparation programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3: MusEd Goal #3 (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 4: MusEd Goal #4 (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: MusEd Objective #1 (Ph.D.) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: MusEd Objective #2 (Ph.D.) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2.) Our graduates will be able to teach undergraduate students, develop coherent syllabi, evaluate student work, provide model lessons, and institute appropriate assessment practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: MusEd Objective #3 (Ph.D.) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: MusEd Objective #4 (Ph.D.) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4.) Our graduates will be able to demonstrate the application of theory and philosophy to the decisions made during pedagogy and assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: MusEd Assessment Measure #1 (Ph.D.) (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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: &quot;MusEd - Clinical Practice (Ph.D.).&quot; Minimum Score: 3 of 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: MusEd Objective #1 (Ph.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 4 points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Two students completed formal internships in 2013-14 (signified by taking EDCI 9660). The scores were 3.7 and 3.8 of 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: MusEd Assessment Measure #2 (Ph.D.) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Measure: Ph.D. students will teach an undergraduate course at least once during their program of study at Georgia State University. Rubric: &quot;MusEd - Undergraduate Teaching (Ph.D.).&quot; Minimum Score: 3 of 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 taught by two Ph.D. students.

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 the faculty to complete the 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 during the final semester of course work as determined by the faculty academic advisor. Week One: Written Project (Research Methodology, Analysis & Interpretation) 2500 minimum words (approximately 8 pages) in strict accordance with the current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The above minimum word count does not include the required title page and references. The paper topic will be assigned by Friday at noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Two: Written Project (Music Education Pedagogy and Research) 2500 minimum words (approximately 8 pages) in strict accordance with the current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The above minimum word count does not include the required title page and references. The paper topic will be assigned by Friday at noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Three: Oral Examination Duration: 90 minutes Part One: Prepared Responses o The Ph.D. student will be assigned to answer four questions, one related to each of the four semesters of MUS 8960 (Proseminar in Music Education). The student will be assigned to speak to each question for ten minutes each (40 minutes total). For each question, the student may prepare a single side of a 3x5 index card (4 cards total) for reference during the presentation. o The four questions will be presented to the Ph.D. student seven days prior to the scheduled oral examination. Part Two: Identification o The Ph.D. student will be asked to identify 25 items discussed in MUS 8960. These may include terms, people, movements, publications, philosophies, studies, and all manner of related topics within music education. Following successful completion of the Comprehensive Examination, Ph.D. students are required to form their Dissertation Advisory Committee. Instructions can be found online at the website of the..."
**Additions of Comprehensive Exam Prerequisites**

The changes announced previously have been finalized, and the first students for whom the changes will be effective will take the comprehensive examination in either Spring 2015 or Fall 2015. 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.

**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: 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 taught-taught by two Ph.D. students.

**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 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 noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Three: Oral Examination Duration: 90 minutes Part One: Prepared Responses 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").

**Additions of Comprehensive Exam Prerequisites**

The changes announced previously have been finalized, and the first students for whom the changes will be effective will take the comprehensive examination in either Spring 2015 or Fall 2015. Again, the changes were the addition of two prerequisites to the written and oral portions of the exam and 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.
2. Analysis of Assessment Findings:

Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Our assessment findings suggest that the mentoring of Ph.D. students (as instructors) by full-time faculty members has been effective. We see no need to make modifications at this time. Due to undergraduate program growth, we anticipate the need for Ph.D students to observe fieldwork in the future. This will require the development of additional mentoring models.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):

Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

All assessments in the music education program are developed, presented, discussed, and finalized by the graduate faculty in the program. These are then presented to the full program faculty, discussed, and ratified. The process is overseen by our Coordinator of Assessment in Music Education, the primary service responsibility of one full-time faculty member.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:

Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Because of the success of our previous strategies, we see no need for change at the moment. We will be implementing the described changes to the comprehensive examination process in the coming year as students near the end of their program. We do anticipate the need to develop additional mentoring strategies for Ph.D. students who will observe preservice fieldwork (necessary due to undergraduate program growth).
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.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge of Science Education
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
All students of students have met this target.

M 2: Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (O: 2)
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 3 and 4 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Science Teacher Education
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher)

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
All students of students have met this target.

M 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 3)
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 5 and 6 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement in Science Education
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
All students of students have met this target.

M 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology (O: 4)
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standard 7 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology in Science Education
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met
All students of students have met this target.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### 1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Students demonstrate research knowledge in the professional core. They must take five research courses, and complete a dissertation. Students write for publication and present research at national and international conferences. EPRS 8500 or 8530; two EPRS courses; two advanced research courses. Students demonstrate professional and pedagogical skills for teacher education through research and teaching internships (EDCI 9660). Students also teach courses at the undergraduate level to apply their professional and pedagogical skills. Students take 30 hours in their major field. Students must complete a residency plan that requires them to complete all 6 areas: 1. Participate in ongoing research and scholarly experiences. 2. Submit a research/scholarly manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal as primary or lead author (or as an author with substantial contribution to the research study and manuscript). 3. Participate in identifying and applying for a grant/fellowship. 4. Present at a research/scholarly conference. Engage in university teaching internship. 5. Serve the institution and/or profession. Students demonstrate professional service and engagement by serving on various unit committees, writing manuscript reviews for national and international publications and conference proposals, serve on local, state, and national committees, and serve on a range of projects directed by faculty. Students demonstrate engagement with technology both through teaching online and taking online courses. They communicate regularly on committees through Skype, Blackboard Collaborate, and email. They also belong to a unit-wide listserv.

#### 2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

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 which is specific to science education PhD students and designed to meet the interests and methods for science education research. As a result, students will be highly prepared to conduct research studies and write up their findings to larger audiences.

#### 3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Faculty discuss assessment findings twice a year during Professional Advising Week. Students are evaluated on a rubric for each of the outcomes. Improvements are made based upon these discussions.

#### 4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

Based upon faculty discussion of assessment findings for program improvement, the program was successful in recruiting more full-time students.

### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

Science education continues to admit strong doctoral students. Students are publishing in highly respectable journals. Students are presenting at international and national conferences. Students are highly engaged in work that involves international spaces.

#### 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.

Budget restrictions will challenge the unit in financially supporting doctoral students, especially international students.

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-2014 Teaching &amp; Learning PhD--Social Studies Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As of: 12/12/2016 06:09 PM EST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the 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: knowledge and skills**
2: Knowledge and skills of teacher educators and scholars

**G 2: Researchers**
1: Competent Researchers in Social Studies Education

**G 3: professional organizations**
3: Contributors to professional organizations

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Professional & Pedagogical Skills**
Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

**SLO 2: Research Knowledge (M: 1)**
2: Demonstrates Research Knowledge

**SLO 3: Professional Service**
3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Comprehensive Examination (O: 2)**
At completion of coursework, students complete a comprehensive examination where they respond to 4 essay questions.

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

**M 2: Doctoral Dissertation and Defense**
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

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14):** Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

   The faculty of the T&L PhD in SSE adapted the comprehensive examination process to include an option for students to work with a faculty member on a publishable manuscript. We have had great success with 5 publications in 2013 and 6 publications in 2014.

2. **Analysis of Assessment Findings:** Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

   We have had great success in helping students understand the publication process. The process, however, is labor intensive and requires considerable one-on-one mentoring of doctoral students.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14):** Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

   The two faculty who are members of the PhD in T&L SSE routinely discuss assessment findings, and we adapt our program to improve the program. We have weekly discussions about the doctoral program.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

   As noted earlier, we adapted the process for comprehensive examinations to include a publishable manuscript as part of the examination process. Students are given the choice to work toward this goal, and most accept this choice as they are incented to have the publication count as one of four comprehensive examination questions.

### Annual Report Section Responses

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


---
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**Mission / Purpose**
The UACM is a rigorous program that seeks to serve the needs and aspirations of elementary students schooled in urban contexts by eradicating deficit perspectives through the development of pedagogically competent, equity-oriented, empowered teachers who are change agents inside and outside the classroom.

The UACM beliefs:

- We believe that teachers have the ability and power to provide experiences in which children succeed. This success provides the confidence and competence for children to continue to succeed.

- We believe that in order to foster these successful experiences, teachers must engage and connect with students. This connection is demonstrated by treating children with respect, by having high standards and by helping children to believe that they can achieve.

- We believe that in order to foster successful experiences, teachers must be knowledgeable about the child's culture and must actively integrate this into the best practices of teaching and learning.

- We believe that from structure comes freedom. The teacher must create a purposeful, structured environment in which children are free to explore, experiment, and learn.

- We believe that teachers need to establish an environment in their classrooms where children are respectful of each other, their environment and the adults in their lives.

- We believe that teachers should respect the language of their children and have knowledge of its background and principles. We also believe that teachers should model and expect mastery of mainstream American English for their students.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions**
Master's candidates will have the content and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions to be able to plan and implement effective, culturally responsive instruction.

**G 2: Teaching as a Profession**
Master's candidates will develop as reflective and collaborative professionals.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Shows commitment to student learning & development (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Educator is committed to students and their learning and/or development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**SLO 2: Applies expertise for learning and development (G: 1) (M: 2)**
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

**SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (G: 1) (M: 3)**
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

**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.

**SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities (G: 2) (M: 5)**
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

### 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.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.32 on a 4.0 scale. The program met expectations for this assessment. All candidates' overall average score met final expectations. In examining the data, candidates fell below acceptable in greater number on the element of meaningful purpose and vision. As a result, faculty will refine its initial screening protocol to better ensure candidates' ability to meet this element. (See Document Management for 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.

**Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.93 on a 4.0 scale. All candidates met expectations for this assessment. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See Document Management for 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.

**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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.59 mean score on a 4.0 scale. All candidates met expectations for this assessment. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on the element of Plan Learning and Teaching Experiences were required to redo that element to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See Document Management for 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.

**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 active engagement as a member of the teaching profession.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.62 mean score on a 4.0 scale. All candidates met expectations for this assessment. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates’ ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See Document Management for 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 05: 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

100% of UACM Master’s candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.72 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 Document Management for detailed aggregated data)

---

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

#### Add MEd Orientation to Summer Semester

The program faculty will add a MEd Orientation to the summer semester prior to starting ECE course work in the Master's year of the Program of Study. The orientation will focus on the program schedule and major activities/projects. The major activities/projects include: the mentorship experience and the capstone project. Candidates will also be introduced to the program text (The New Teacher), which will be read across all of their ECE courses. This orientation will allow candidates to grasp the Master's program scope and sequence prior to starting their career as teachers. As currently implemented, when the orientation is done on the first day during the fall semester, candidates become overwhelmed with all of the information they receive as they negotiate being a first-year teacher.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning & Develop | **Outcome/Objective:** Applies expertise for learning and development
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning | **Outcome/Objective:** Manages and monitors student learning/development
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in professional learning communities

**Implementation Description:** The MEd. Orientation will be scheduled in July of each year.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Monitor and Maintain

The Early Childhood Education UACM MEd (GATAPP) Program has met all of its objectives. Program faculty will continue to monitor and maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** Shows commitment to student learning & development
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning & Develop | **Outcome/Objective:** Applies expertise for learning and development
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning | **Outcome/Objective:** Manages and monitors student learning/development
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in professional learning communities

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2011

- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Start Fall Mentorship Earlier

As a part of the UACM MEd (GATAPP) mentorship course, university mentors initially spend an entire day to help induct our new Master’s candidates into the teaching profession. Mentors guide our Master’s candidates in the area of lesson planning, classroom management, assessment, organization, and school politics. The earlier this experience is in the fall the quicker candidates are able
to negotiate the learning curve of being a new teacher. We plan to start the mentorship experience the first week students (PreK-5) report back to the GSU classes. 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. After analyzing the data for the past two years, we will continue to implement this approach as part of standard program practice.

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

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

**Implementation Description:** Target date is the first week students (PreK-5) report back to GSU classes.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** N/A  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Once a Week Classes**

We have adjusted the program schedule to better meet the needs of our student. All of our students are first year teachers, and previously our program required them to come to GSU twice a week for classes. Our students now only come to GSU on Mondays for longer period of time relieving them some of their burden. We will interview students on the effectiveness of this new schedule.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** 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 & 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

**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  
**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 MEd (GATAPP) program will implement a new assessment system called Livetext for program assessment storage and reporting. The program is now moving to using Livetext for all key assessments with the new cohort beginning in fall 2011. All program faculty have been trained in livetext.

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

**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: 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 & 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: 08/2014
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Program Director
Additional Resources: None

Field-Based Approach
From analyzing our program data, student and faculty feedback, we believe that the UACM Master's Program would be more effective if there was a tighter theory to practice focus. During faculty planning meetings, we analyzed program data, student feedback, and research literature to determine the approach. In an effort to strengthen the induction element of the Master’s program, we have decided to revisit course content offerings. In the first year of the program, students receive a heavy emphasis on literacy methods, therefore, in year two we have shifted to providing less additional content and increased support in the field through online learning communities and virtual office hours.

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

Review program interview protocol
As a result of analyzing the data for dispositions, we decided to refine our initial screening protocol to better assess candidates' commitment to the focus of the program mission and the populations we serve.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
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
Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: UACM faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Since the last assessment report, the following changes have been made: Rubrics have been refined to be more sensitive to student learning and are being utilized. Furthermore, the field observation rubric has been aligned with the state mandated teacher observation rubric (TAP) and has been piloted for additional refinements. We have also committed to providing additional professional learning as a standard practice for the program, as this addition has been proven useful for the effective development of our candidates. Overall, the program continues to benefit from its assessment process that demonstrate the strengths of candidates’ learning, their abilities to meet student instructional needs, and their professional development as educators. The quality of our findings reside not only in the data themselves but in the faculty commitment to review, refine, and innovate towards improving the success of the candidates and subsequently the success of their students.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year’s assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years’ action plans.

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) learning and teaching environments (teaching and learning project); (b) fostering positive learning environment (field observation); and (c) fostering dispositions grounded in the long term vision necessary for ongoing success in our schools (dispositions) We have moved from in progress to finished on three action plans and have made additional or refined in progress action plans. The UACM faculty continues to build and improve upon its solid foundation towards further enhancing the candidates’ Master’s program experiences through a purposeful and responsive induction model, as they enter their first year of teaching. To those ends, we participate in monthly faculty planning meeting to analyze program data, candidate feedback, and research literature to determine the best approaches for supporting candidates’ growth in their ability to be effective teachers. With respect to program improvements to the structure of the program in bridging the gap between theory and practice, we plan to do the following: a.) adjust the program schedule to better meet the candidates’ need to concentrate on practice; b.) utilize learning communities to support practice and reflection; and c.) continue to provide candidates an opportunity to participate in a summer GRA position to improve research knowledge, ability, and application. Additionally, given the central role of dispositions, program faculty will also revisit and refine candidate selection process by examining the program interview protocol.
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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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module (G: 1) (M: 1, 6)
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 new resources and/or strategies for content area teachers, and some discussion or activities related to diversity, equity issues, and technology use in the classroom.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module (O: 1)

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 new resources and/or strategies for content area teachers, and some discussion or activities related to diversity, equity issues, and technology use in the classroom. Copy of the assignment 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 Rational (For example, you might design your PD around specific topic based on the feedback you get from content teachers at 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 explained well. Objectives included but not necessarily aligned with the needs of the teacher. Rationale is vague. There is no clear goals stated for the PD. Standards (1, 25%) GPS and/or CCSS stated clearly through the PD activities. Standards are aligned with the goals and the activities. GPS and/or CCSS addressed through the PD are stated but not aligned with the goals and/or activities. Failed to state the relevant GPS and/or CCSS addressed through the PD. PD Plan (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1 GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 Design and implementation reflect key practices of effective professional development. Opportunities are differentiated and build upon varying levels of expertise and prior knowledge of teachers across the entire P-12 continuum. Design and implementation reflect, to some degree, current research in teacher professional development, teaching and content standards, and needs of teachers. Design builds on some teacher knowledge and prior experience. Design lacks to reflect effective professional development practices. Little or no regard is given to teacher knowledge, expertise, or prior experiences. Activities (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 Variety of activities are used to address the goals of the PD. Activities are designed in a fashion to encourage active participation of the teachers and create an interactive atmosphere. Some variety of activities is designed. They lack to address one or two goals of the PD. They are designed somehow to be interactive. Only one or two types of activities are designed. They lack to address all of the PD goals and more in a static nature.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module

100% of program completers will meet or exceed expectations on the measure.

Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Assessment not administered during the reporting cycle.

M 2: Planning: Teacher Leader Work Sample

Planning: Teacher Leader 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 planning. The Teacher Leader Work Sample (TLWS) assignment is part of EDCI 7680. EDCI 7680 is a field-based course where the M.Ed. students (teacher leaders) host a preservice student teacher from GSU for their student teaching experience. The TLWS from EDCI 7680 is designed to parallel an Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assignment given to preservice teachers to complete during their student teaching experience in their teacher leader’s classroom. The purpose of this TWS project is to provide opportunities for student teachers to show how they use information about the learning-teaching context and students’ individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. The teacher leader’s TLWS assignment happens at the same time and engages teacher leaders in planning, enacting, and reflecting upon their role as a mentor who is supporting their student teachers’ work on the TWS.

Target for O1: Teacher Leader Work Sample

100% of program completers will meet or exceed expectations on the measure.

Assessment not administered during the reporting cycle.
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 your student teacher’s progress toward your learning goals. 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 evaluate the teaching and learning of your student teacher. Teacher Leader Standards: 1.01, 1.05, 1.07, 1.10, all of standard 4 and 5 Teacher Leader Work Sample: Planning Rubric Teacher Leader Work Sample: Planning Rubric Unacceptable (1 pt) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Planning Teacher Leader Work Sample**

100% of program completers will meet or exceed expectations on the measure. The Teacher Leader Work Sample (TWS) assignment is part of EDCI 7680. EDCI 7680 is a field-based course where the M.Ed. students (teacher leaders) host a preservice student teacher from GSU for their student teaching experience. The TWS from EDCI 7680 is designed to parallel an standardized TWS assignment given to preservice teachers to complete during their student teaching experience in their teacher 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 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 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, 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. Mentor/mentee meetings, 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. 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 evaluate the teaching and learning of your student teacher. Teacher Leader Standards: 1.01, 1.05, 1.07, 1.10, all of standard 4 and 5 Teacher Leader Work Sample: Planning Rubric Teacher Leader Work Sample: Planning Rubric Unacceptable (1 pt) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Reflection Journal (O: 3)

Reflection Journal Rubric

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 are 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)

M 5: Reflection Journal (O: 3)

Reflection Journal

This assignment is used in the program. This assignment is used during the residency experience in EPEL 7680B. 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 are 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)
synopsis of completed module with strong reflection

Somewhat detailed synopsis of completed module with moderate reflection

Less than detailed synopsis of completed module with moderate to lacking reflection

No synopsis of completed module with lacking reflection

Demonstrated and articulated the importance and research-based decision making through completion of the inquiry project (Teacher Leader Standard 1,2,6,7) (1, 10%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.2 GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.3 GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.4

Exceptional completed assignment with strong reflection

Above average completed assignment with moderate reflection

Acceptable completed assignment with moderate to lacking reflection

Unacceptable completed assignment with lacking reflection

Student's writing performance (1, 10%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.3

Clear, accurate writing and organization. No errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Inclusion of relevant authors.

Clear, accurate writing and organization. Few errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Lack of inclusion of relevant authors.

Somewhat clear, correct writing and organization. Few errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Lack of inclusion of relevant authors. Multiple errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Lack of inclusion of relevant authors.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Reflection Journal**

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the measure.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The assessment was not administered during this cycle.

**M 6: Content Based Curriculum Module (O: 1)**

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the assessment.

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

**Target for O1: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module**

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the assessment.

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Assessment not given during reporting cycle.

**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 were modified to better support the roles required of school leaders and teacher leaders. EPEL 7680a now focuses on preparing students better understand data. EPEL 7680B now focuses on action research and specifically, research designed to give educators a stronger understanding of their own cultural proficiency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Because the program is still in the first year of implementation, there are not data to report for the majority of the measures.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

There are no data to report or analyze based on last year's action plans.
**Mission / Purpose**

Women's Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women's Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

**Goals**

G 1: 1) Develop Critical Thinking Skills
Students should develop critical thinking skills, which include the ability to read and write clearly and carefully, and they should be able to evaluate and analyze claims presented in various textual sources.

G 3: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives
Students should develop a basic understanding of broad feminist/womanist interdisciplinary perspectives.

G 2: Develop writing skills
Demonstrates the ability to analyze concepts through writing clear, concise, well-argued and well-organized papers.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

| SLO 1: Critical Reading Skills (G: 1) (M: 1) |
| Demonstrates critical reading skills through the ability to grasp the main point(s) and supporting arguments of an academic or narrative text. |

| SLO 2: Thesis Development (G: 1, 2) (M: 2) |
| Shows the ability to develop a clear and coherent thesis that directs the entire paper or exam response. |

| SLO 3: Evidence (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2) |
| Provide sufficient evidence for the argument laid out in the thesis statement. |

**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 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 (G: 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 |
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.

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.

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.

Target for O4: Writing skills

We measured writing skills here with 2 elements on a rubric -- the first involves evidence, organization, and development, clear and sufficient evidence; it should also demonstrate appropriate grammar and syntax. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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.

**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 a 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**

**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.

**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.

**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
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Julie Kubala, director of undergraduate studies

**Develop materials to enhance writing instruction**

I am presently in the process of collecting materials to enhance writing instruction in the classroom. I have a draft of these materials that I piloted in 2 courses last semester, but given the small sample size, it is unclear whether these materials have actually improved student performance. We are hoping that by increasing writing instruction in the classroom, we will help students develop their writing skills, particularly in terms of the collection of evidence.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

**rework targets**

Since the only target that was not met involved the baseline papers, I think the important thing here is to focus on the improvement, rather than having targets for the baselines themselves, as we don’t actually have any control over students abilities when they join our classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** 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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Women's Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women's Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

**Goals**

**G 1: New and innovative ideas**

To develop innovative approaches to relevant issues and debates within the field.

**G 2: Critical Thinking through Writing**

To be able to display critical thinking through writing skills, such as organizing material clearly, developing ideas clearly and carefully, and providing sufficient evidence for claims.

**G 3: Demonstrate knowledge of field**

Demonstrate the knowledge of and ability to use appropriate interdisciplinary theoretical perspectives within the fields of feminist/womanist scholarship.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### SLO 1: Research Questions (G: 1) (M: 5)
Students should demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist/womanist scholarship.

### SLO 2: Evidence (G: 2) (M: 4, 5)
Students should demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills by providing sufficient evidence for claims and developing their arguments clearly and carefully.

### SLO 3: Organization (G: 2) (M: 2, 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.

**Target for O5: Application of skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 1/2 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

**Target for O6: Critical thinking through writing skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

#### M 2: Creative Project (O: 3, 4, 5)
The basic idea is for you to further develop an idea from class that you want to in a creative fashion. Presenting the creative project is an important point of the project; be sure you can talk about why you chose what you did in a way that makes sense in terms of the class. 1) Be sure to consult with me about your individual topic! 2) You may use any variety of artistic or creative means to present the project; however, be sure you can communicate clearly their relevance to the class. 3) I am not qualified to grade you on artistic merit; therefore the grade will focus mainly on organization and contribution to the ideas of the class. 4) Be sure to include an analysis of the complexity of these ideas. It should be approximately 5-7 pages. 5) Be sure that your analysis is focused and coherent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Organization**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Target for O5: Application of skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).
### M 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

### 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2013-2014 Women's Studies MA**

**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, gender, or sexuality 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**

**G 1: Interdisciplinarity**
WGSS MA graduates will be interdisciplinary scholars; this means that they will be conversant in feminist epistemologies (i.e., they will understand and be able to articulate a critique of masculinist forms of knowledge, and to critique the power dynamics inherent to the production of knowledge). They will also be able to ask broad questions that transverse traditional disciplines.

**G 2: Knowledgeable in the field of WGSS**
WGSS 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**
WGSS 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Our students received a 3.71 with one student receiving a 5 and two students receiving a 3. The remaining students received between a 3.25 and 4.

### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average of 3.78 with all students receiving a 3 or better.

### 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 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average of 4.125 with all the lowest student scoring a 3.6 and the highest student receiving a 4.6.

### 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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average of 3.86 with three students receiving a 4.5, two students receiving a 4 and the remaining student receiving a 3.25 and 2.5.

### M 3: Annual Evaluations/Student CVs (O: 2)

Students are required to turn in CVs for the annual evaluation process. From these data, we will collect information about how many conferences students are attending in order to present their own research, how many publications they have succeeded in getting accepted and/or published.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Met**

Our students delivered 13 conference papers in 2013-2014. For the overall student body (17), this averages to .76 conference papers per student. The actual number of students presenting at conferences was 9 which is over half our student body. One student had an article submitted for publication, which means 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

**Findings 2013-2014 - Target: Not Met**

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.
Out of 11 graduating MA students, 4 are currently enrolled in PhD programs, 1 is currently applying to PhD programs and 2 have job placements in related fields. Therefore, 63% of our students went on to pursue a PhD or work in a related field. The remaining 4 students are pursuing different career paths.

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

**early intervention**
We have found that some of our students come in to the program with poor grammar skills, but it is not until they begin to write their thesis proposal or later that they finally seek out support from outside sources, like the Writing Studio.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Overall Critical Thinking through Writing
- **Measure:** Thesis | **Outcome/Objective:** Overall Critical Thinking through Writing

**Implementation Description:** We will identify students who have particular problems with grammar in the first year, and preferably the first semester of the program, and refer them to the Writing Studio in the first semester.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Core faculty in Women’s Studies  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**increased focus in proseminar on RQ**
Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar spent a lot of time on the literature review and on writing abstracts, but not as much time on defining a research question.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Overall Critical Thinking through Writing
- **Measure:** Thesis | **Outcome/Objective:** Overall Critical Thinking through Writing

**Implementation Description:** The proseminar will incorporate more peer review with more focus on writing skills and organization. Core classes will also provide more feedback on writing skills and organization.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor for proseminar and WSI core faculty

**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**emphasis on core courses**
Like the “evaluating arguments” outcome, in this area first years collectively scored lower than second years (with first years achieving an average of 3.84 compared to second years who achieved an average of 4.56). It makes sense, then, to focus on the core courses, all of which are offered (and required) in the first year. These are already the courses in which students are expected to gain a solid understanding of feminist and womanist theoretical frameworks. Instructors of these courses will be advised to emphasize the theoretical frameworks with our first year students.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Feminist Epistemology  
  | Theoretical Frameworks
- **Measure:** Thesis | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Questions  
  | Theoretical Frameworks

**Implementation Description:** Instructors will implement the action plan in a way that makes sense in the context of their course.

**Responsible Person/Group:** All core course instructors

**Additional Resources:** NA  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**focus on reading for graduate school in core courses**
While the first year students collectively met the goal of achieving a 3.5, it is clear when looking at the separated results that the
weakness in this area lies in the first year class (second years scored very high -- 4.75) and could be attributed to the fact of just having entered graduate school. Our plan to address this, then, will be focused on the core classes (WST 8001 Feminist Theories), WST 8002 (Globalization and Gender), WST 8003 (New Directions in Feminism), and WST 8004 (Feminist Methodologies). These are required courses for all first year students, and are the classes in which the largely acclimate to the program and to graduate school. Instructors of these core courses will put a greater focus on teaching strategies for reading at the graduate level, including assignments such as critical responses, in which students must summarize the argument before providing analysis.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Feminist Epistemology
Measure: Theoretical Frameworks

Implementation Description: Instructors for each of the courses will implement this action plan in whatever way makes the most sense for their class, given the structure of their assignments.

Responsible Person/Group: All instructors of the WST core classes.

Additional Resources: NA
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

focus on proseminar

The exit interviews and annual evaluations (specifically the CVs) are designed to measure the main goal of fostering successful scholars and practitioners of Women's Studies. These skills (presenting at conferences, applying to PhD schools, publishing papers, etc.) are desired outcomes of the Women's Studies Proseminar, which we instituted a few years ago to accommodate a variety of needs among our students (including helping them move more quickly through the program). Therefore, when we don’t meet these goals, it makes sense that we would re-evaluate the structure of the WS proseminar to see if it can adjust to fit the needs of the students. So far, the feedback from students in exit interviews is that the Proseminar is extremely helpful, and they don't suggest any changes in it. From the perspective of the faculty, we also think that it is achieving its main goals (progress toward graduation seems to have improved significantly). We will wait another cycle to see what the findings are next year, since these set of data have a significant number of students who did not take the Proseminar (about 1/3). If the target remains unmet next year, we will re-evaluate to see if we should adjust the expectation or if we should revise the Proseminar.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Annual Evaluations/Student CVs | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing
Measure: Exit Interviews | Outcome/Objective: Placements

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2013-14): Describe where in the program students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs. All SLOs should have specific classes and/or educational activities linked to them. A curriculum map or matrix can provide an effective visual summary and may be attached to the report.

Students are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the student learning objectives in our core classes, comprehensive exams, and the thesis writing process. Each core class is writing intensive and requires a substantial final paper. Students practice forming research questions, CTW, theoretical frameworks, and feminist epistemologies in each course. In addition, our Feminist Theories class hones students CTW and knowledge of theoretical frameworks. The Feminist Epistemology course hones their knowledge of both CTW and feminist epistemology. The comprehensive exams test students knowledge on feminist epistemology and theoretical frameworks. The thesis writing process further practice in writing, formulating research questions, developing theoretical frameworks, and discussing feminist epistemology. Student placement is achieved through the year-long proseminar course in which class sessions are devoted to CV writing and applying to PhD programs.

2. Analysis of Assessment Findings: Where appropriate, discuss the significance of the findings in light of (1) the desired results, (2) findings from previous years, (3) recent changes in the educational program or the assessment process, etc. What did you learn from the assessment? In particular: (1) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

Overall, our findings are consistent with the previous year. We still need to meet our goal of placing students in appropriate positions or PhD programs, but this year is consistent with the previous year in terms of overall results. The assessment reveals a weakness in our goal of student publishing, and resolving this unmet goal with be the subject of a discussion in a core faculty meeting. The main improvements in our program is the addition of the proseminar, instituted approximately 6 years ago. We have also formalized advising processes so that students stay on track to complete their degree in a timely manner. Overall, our assessment process tracks our main goals of graduating MA students on time.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2013-14): Describe how assessment findings are shared and discussed among program faculty and other stakeholders. In particular, make clear the process that is used to analyze assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Assessment findings are shared in core faculty meetings. Goals and outcomes are discussed.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that are planned or being implemented in response to this year's assessment findings. Be as specific as possible with regard to the nature and timing of the changes to be made as well as their linkages to the assessment findings. Also, briefly summarize the status of previous years' action plans.

We have formalized the annual evaluation of students for several years. We can use this information to track accomplishments of students during their time in our program. We have included a section in the proseminar to teach students to submit papers for conferences, and a high number of our students have attended and participated in conferences as a result. We continue to update
the comprehensive exam procedure to maximize its benefits to our students. We have included a study guide in our proseminar to help guide students in their preparation for comprehensive exams. We have been very successful in achieving our action plan of moving students through the program. Increased mentoring and focus on the proseminar have been instrumental in achieving this goal. The goal of moving students through the program in a timely manner is one that we are continuing to stress and work towards.