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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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

For Accounting 2101, the mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 70.38%. (Fall 2013 72.66% Spring 2014 67.82%). For Accounting 2102 the mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 66.3%. (Fall 2014 61.3%, Spring 2015 70.1%) Analysis from 2101: 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. Analysis from 2102: The learning objective target was not met with a small decline from prior year. (71.5% to 66.3%) Although not as robust as desired, the Learnsmart online tool provided an improved learning experience for students due to fewer glitches. Weather related issues created the largest disruption from loss of class time during the spring semester. Some sections did not miss any class time, while the 8:00 Tuesday/Thursday section missed 3 classes. The night time sections missed the equivalent of two classes. The disparity in class time created an uneven environment between classes. As in the previous year, the spring sections were a much more engaged group compared to the fall sections with 12% greater class attendance and greater discussion board participation.

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

Solve operating problems by identifying relevant information from the accounting system and using appropriate tools.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean score of 70% or higher

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2101, the mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 70.97%. In 2102, the mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 60.7%. (Fall 2014 50.0% Spring 2015 68.4%)

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

Comprehend the usefulness of accounting information to stakeholders making business decisions.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

Mean 70% on higher exam questions.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In 2101, the mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 70.40%. In 2102, the mean score for five final exam assessment questions was 71.4%. (Fall 2014 70.8, % Spring 2015 72.0 %)

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

Perform the steps in the accounting cycle.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

4111--Student Mean Score was 82.51%

### M 5: Analyze, value, and record operating activities (ACCT 4111 & 4112). (O: 2)

Analyze, value, and record operating activities.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

4111-Student Mean Score was 82.59% 4112-The results from the exam scores associated with operating activities were that 67% of the questions were answered correctly. This is significantly lower than our target of 80% accuracy, but a slight improvement from our previous year result of 66%. This objective is jointly tested between ACCT4111 and ACCT4112 with only a small part of this objective tested in this course.

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

Analyze, value, and record the investing activities of a business.

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 LT Assets and Investments (Questions 4-12) over 80%

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**
The results from the exam scores associated with investing activities were that 76% of the questions were answered correctly. Though this is below the 80% target we are not far from our objective and this is a slight improvement from last year's result of 75.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

The results from the exam scores associated with financing activities were that 71% of the questions were answered correctly. This is a slight improvement from last year's result of 70%. Though our assessment tool indicates that we are not far from our target and that there is some progress being made one thing is becoming clear- there is significant variation in our AOL findings across the various instructors of this course. Specifically for this objective one instructor's mean student score is 65% and the average for the other instructors is 74%. A similar result can be observed in past periods as well. Some attention needs to be paid to ensuring the quality of instruction across all sections of the course.

**M 8: Analyze data to provide insights about business operations and performance (ACCT 4111 & 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)**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

4111--Student Mean Score was 77.37% 4112--The results from the exam scores associated with Excel functions were that 81% of the questions were answered correctly. This beats our goal of 80%. This is the first period that we are accessing this objective in this course so we will us this result as a basis for comparison in future periods. The current excel assignment provides limited practice using excel functions- additional problems would likely be helpful.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

**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.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

- Trend is improving over time, but dropped this year: o Avg. AY 2011 = .68 o Avg. AY 2012 = .70 o Avg. AY 2013 = .68 o Avg. AY 2014 = .72 o Avg. AY 2015 = .64 Min = 53% Avg. = 64% Max = 80% • The minimum scores were: o Q3, misapplied MOH (avg. = .53) o Q14, materials purchases budget (avg. = .53). o Q13, cash collection (avg. = .59) • Scores continue to be lower in Spring relative to fall.

**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 8 multiple-choice questions (questions 1,2, 15-20) during the fall and spring semesters.
Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met
Trend is improving over time, but dropped this year. Avg. AY 2011 = .59, Avg. AY 2012 = .61, Avg. AY 2013 = .64, Avg. AY 2014 = .66, Avg. AY 2015 = .58. Min = 40% Avg. = 58% Max = 81%. The minimum scores were: Q2, absorption costing (avg. = .40), Q15, DM quantity var (avg = .49), Q16, DL efficiency var (avg. = .56). Scores continue to be lower in Spring relative to Fall.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The mean score was 72.2, a 7% increase over the prior year, most likely attributable to the new spreadsheet skill progression exercise. ACT 4610--The mean was 88.7%. Students were highly engaged in the exercise and performed very well on the assignment.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The mean score was 76.3.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met
Students achieved a 70% or higher average on quizzes containing 20 tax research topics. Students achieved a 70% or higher average on 19 out of 21 specific learning objectives. OBJECTIVES REQUIRING CONTINUED ATTENTION: Emphasis in the areas of (1) qualified retirement plan distributions; 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The objective was met--81.4%. Students performance across the objective exceeded the target of 75%.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
92.1%

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
77.2%

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
74.8%. The prior rate was 70%; therefore there was a 4.8 percentage point increase or 7% improvement. The mean is insignificantly below the target. We note significant improvement in achievement of this objective to a level which is substantially in line with the target. Our addition of an in-class exercise on opinion formulation was successful in helping students improve at this historically challenging task.

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% or higher on the memorandum.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
98%

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ACCT2102 and ACCT2102**
See Action Plan for Measure 1.

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

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

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

**ACCT4210**
See Action Plan for Measure 8

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

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

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

**ACCT4510**

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

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

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
Projected Completion Date: 12/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Borthick

**Redesigning Introductory Courses**
We are redesigning the introductory courses, which will include adopting different textbooks with advanced online resources for students and revising course learning objectives.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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 assessment plan for 2015-16 is attached and outlines where the SLOs are taught throughout 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.

The School of Accountancy's BBA assessment plan for 2015-16 is in the repository. The plan was updated primarily to assure the infusion of critical thinking throughout the BBA Accountancy program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Accountancy PhD
As of: 12/13/2016 08:46 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

Goals
G 2: Discipline knowledge - evaluate research
Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research.

G 3: Discipline knowledge - conduct research
Students should be able to conduct and present original research in collaboration with faculty.

G 4: Research competency
Students should be able to conduct original research individually.

G 6: Placement
Students should target accounting faculty positions at institutions where the research skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.

G 5: Teaching competency
Students should develop a high level of competence in conducting university level teaching.

G 1: Recruiting
The PhD program should compete for the best and brightest students both within the University and globally.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Knowledge of Philosophy of Science (G: 2) (M: 2)
Each student will have a strong knowledge of philosophy of science to understand the basic aim and purpose of academic research.

SLO 3: Critical evaluation of research (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate research by providing comments to presenters at internal workshops.

SLO 4: Comprehensive exams (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students will successfully pass their comprehensive examinations as judged by the PhD committee.

SLO 5: Collaborative research activity (G: 3) (M: 5)
Students will conduct research with faculty in order to develop research skills and experience the publication process.

SLO 6: Research presentations (G: 3) (M: 6)
Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Dissertation defense (G: 4) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully defend their dissertation before a faculty committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Teaching - training (G: 5) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of 9200, Seminar in University Teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Teaching - competency (G: 5) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop their teaching competency by teaching and obtaining feedback via SEIPs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Placement - teaching (G: 5) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will place in institutions where the teaching skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Initial placements - research (G: 6) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will accept positions at research institutions, preferably at AACSB accredited schools offering doctoral degrees in accounting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Incoming Student Credentials (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will track incoming student credentials such as average GMAT, average GPA, and institution where previous degrees were received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Average GMAT and GPA (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will gather the average GMAT and GPA of our incoming class to determine if these averages are increasing and whether they are comparable to other PhD programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Research - Training (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All incoming students will take BA 9330, Philosophy of Science for Business Research, in their first semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Knowledge of Philosophy of Science</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of incoming students will take BA 9330 in their first semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Critical Analysis Seminar and workshops (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students in their first three years of the program will attend Critical Thinking Seminar to critically evaluate workshop papers. All students beyond the first year will provide comments to presenters during workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Critical evaluation of research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students in their first three years of the program will take the Critical Analysis seminar to gain skill in critically evaluating working papers. All students beyond the first year will provide comments to presenters during research workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 are learning to perform critical research analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Comprehensive exams (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully pass their comprehensive examinations as judged by the PhD committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Comprehensive exams</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of students will pass comprehensive exams on their first attempt. Of those failing and allowed to retake the exam, 50% will pass on their second attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the students taking comprehensive exams in the past five years, 80.0% (8/10) have passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Research with faculty (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will collaborate with research-active faculty to conduct research and experience the publication process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O5: 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 2014-2015 - 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 nine graduates in the past six years, two have had research in the publication process. 22.2% is below our target of 50%.

---

**M 6: Research presentations (O: 6)**

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

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

**Target for O6: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

All students beyond the second year have presented their research projects internally. Of the nine students who have graduated in the past six years, five (56%) have presented research at external research conferences. This meets our target of 50%.

---

**M 7: Dissertation Defense (O: 7)**

Successful defense of the dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.

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

**Target for O7: Dissertation defense**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of the graduates in the past six years have defended their dissertations in the first attempt. Of the four students currently on ABD status, one has defended her dissertation proposal and two are on track to defend their dissertation proposals within the next year. One student continues to be in peril of not completing her dissertation after defending her dissertation proposal.

---

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

Each student will successfully complete BA 9200, Seminar in University Teaching.

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

**Target for O8: Teaching - training**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 9: Teaching - competency (O: 9)**

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 O9: Teaching - competency**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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. This 100% average surpasses our target of 50%. Of the four students at ABD status, however, only one has taught an upper level course. 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 10: Placement - teaching (O: 10)**

Students will place at 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 O10: Placement - teaching**

80% of graduates will place at institutions with AACSB accreditation.
Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Of the nine students who graduated in the past six years, all have placed at institutions with AASCB accreditation. This exceeds our target of 80%.

M 11: Initial placements - research (O: 11)
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 O11: Initial placements - research
At least 50% of graduating students will place at research institutions.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Of the nine students who graduated in the past six years, six have placed at research institutions. At 66.7%, this meets our target.

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

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

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

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: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The Ph.D. Program Coordinator will ask students for a list of collaborative research at the beginning of each fall.
- Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. Program Coordinator

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: In-Progress
- 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: High
- 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

Attendance at the Miami Rookie Camp
All students going out on the market in a given year will attend the Miami Rookie Camp in December and present their dissertation paper.

- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

- Implementation Description: The coordinator of the PhD program will meet with each student going on the market and make sure they attend the Miami Rookie Camp.
- Responsible Person/Group: PhD Coordinator

Additional Resources: The School of Accountancy should provide up to $1,000 funding for students to attend the Miami Rookie Camp.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

O/O 1: Incoming Student Credentials The academic background of an incoming student lays the groundwork for learning opportunities. Thus, I have added this outcome and placed it first. SLO 2: Knowledge of Philosophy of Science To help students understand the basic aim and purpose of academic research, I have added the requirement for the new Philosophy of Science seminar (BA 9330). SLO 3: 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 4: Comprehensive exams Since the comprehensive exams test knowledge taught in the accounting doctoral seminars, the seminars prepare the students for success. SLO 5: 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 collaborate research projects. SLO 6: Research presentations All students are required to present their 2nd year research paper at an internal workshop by the fall of their 3rd year and are encouraged to present their research at external research conferences. SLO 7: 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 8: Teaching - training In their first semester, all incoming PhD students complete a Seminar in University Teaching (BA 9200). SLO 9: 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 10: 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. SLO 11: Initial placements - research All PhD students work closely with their supervising faculty member to apply at research institutions and achieve visibility at such institutions.

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 one student learning outcome/objective that we have failed to meet is SLO 5: Collaborative research activity. For our PhD students to be successful in their research careers, they need experience conducting research projects and going through the publication process while still in their program. Thus, collaborative research activity continues to be a critically important objective for our PhD program in accountancy. Because research collaborations require research active and experienced faculty, the recent batch of retirements and transfers of senior faculty does not bode well for our achieving this objective. We are currently engaged in a recruiting campaign to hire a senior financial accounting faculty member to provide service for the School of Accountancy and work with our PhD students. We have improved our performance on the passing of the dissertation defense (SLO 7). Over the past 6 years we have met our goal of 75% passing on the 1st try and 100% passing by the 2nd try. It still looks like one PhD student will not complete the program by their 5th year due to personal reasons for taking a break from her program. This will positively impact the PhD program. In particular, the program is poised to attract, train, and graduate PhD students with strong research and teaching capabilities. Of particular note is the addition of the weekly Critical Thinking Seminar, which has increased the participation of PhD students at research workshops and increased the ability of the students to critically analyze research. Another significant initiative has been the addition of the first semester Seminar in University Teaching, which provides each PhD student with specific training in university teaching. We have also continued the annual review (typically in the beginning of the fall semester), where each PhD student meets with the Program Coordinator to discuss their progress in the program.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Each year, the assessment findings for the PhD Program in Accountancy are shared with the School of Accountancy Doctoral Program Committee (composed of the PhD Program Coordinator and two other research-active faculty in the SOA). The assessment findings are also shared with the Director of the School of Accountancy on a regular basis. Both the SOA Doctoral Program Committee and the SOA Director make helpful suggestions to help improve the PhD program and/or assessment process.

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 anticipated, moving up the deadline for applying to the PhD program from March 1 to January 8 allowed us to compete more strongly with other research universities for high-quality applicants. The PhD Information Session we conducted the past 2 years has also helped us recruit high-quality students from our own masters programs in accounting. The biggest challenge for the PhD program continues to be to attract senior faculty who are research active and can supervise PhD students throughout their program. We have had successful recruiting years the past two years in the rookie market, and have added high-quality rookie faculty to the
Adding these high-quality rookie faculty did much to establish the future of our PhD program. We continue to implement an action plan to recruit senior accounting faculty to maintain the quality of the PhD program in the near term. The previous years’ action plans continue to yield impressive results for the PhD program. Of particular note is the addition of the weekly Critical Thinking Seminar, which has increased the participation of PhD students at research workshops and increased the ability of the students to critically analyze research. Another significant initiative has been the addition of the first semester Seminar in University Teaching, which provides each PhD student with specific training in university teaching. We have also continued the annual review (typically in the beginning of the fall semester), where each PhD student meets with the Program Coordinator to discuss their progress in the program. These action plans have put the PhD program on a solid footing going forward. We have added two new action plans to improve the placement of our students into top-tier research institutions. First, we have added an action plan to have ALL of our students on the market attend the Miami Rookie Camp. Hopefully, we will be able to provide some travel support for such purposes. Second, we are planning to develop a website for the doctoral students so that they can market themselves more effectively. This website will contain their current credentials and achievements. These two action plans should improve the placement of our PhD students.
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**Mission / Purpose**

**BBA-AS PROGRAM MISSION:** The BBA in Actuarial Science is designed to prepare students to: (1) Have a broader foundation of business courses and quantitative analytical training; (2) Have introductory-level knowledge on actuarial valuation of insurance liabilities and financial valuation of assets, integrating the actuarial contingencies and the time value of money; and (3) Pass the first two professional exams offered by the Society of Actuaries/Casualty Actuarial Society.

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

**RMI DEPARTMENT VISION:** To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education.

Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the design and implementation of risk management strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

**Goals**

**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 1: Broader foundation and quant. analysis skills**

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

**G 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance improved in Fall 2014 but is still, on average, below the target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Identified Exam Questions in AS 4230 (O: 3)
Each student will demonstrate thorough 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring and Summer 2015 students assessed. Rated performance at 2.0. Only 25/40 earned the majority of points points of the first 7 of the 10 take home questions. 22/40 scored an 84 or above, indicating significant progress on the more difficult duration, convexity and immunization problems which is very strong performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

Performance is still below targets, but an improvement from last year. 19% of students passed one exam, 15% passed two exams and 1 student passed 3 exams indicating 37% 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

Add online problems

A large set of online multiple choice questions from previous SOA exams will be added to the study material in AS 4340.

- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Selected and Identified Quiz Questions in AS 4340
  - Outcome/Objective: Structure and solve problems

CAE Remediation Report actions-phase 1

3 immediate actions - 1. Reimbursement of both passed and failed exams 2. Reimbursement of Infinite Actuary courses 3. Public recognition of all AS students who pass exams

- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Completion of first 2 professional actuarial exams
  - Outcome/Objective: Completion of first two actuarial exams

- Projected Completion Date: 01/2015

CEA Redmediation Report - phase 2

3 actions - 1. Embedded survey in upper level actuarial classes 2. Required once-per-year advising 3. GRA to track down student placements

- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Completion of first 2 professional actuarial exams
  - Outcome/Objective: Completion of first two actuarial exams

Course requirement change

Course will be removed as a requirement for RMI majors. This will allow the course to be modified to improve its value to AS majors.

- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Selected Projects in RMI 3750
  - Outcome/Objective: Structure and solve problems

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.

Given the importance and implications of exam pass rates on both the program and graduates, the BBA_AS faculty will focus on improving student performance on measure #4, professional exam performance. Changes planned include: 1. Required once-per-
Year advising 2. Mentoring of freshmen and sophomores 3. Embedded survey in upper level AS courses 4. Public recognition of all majors who pass exams 5. Reimbursement for passed and failed exams and for Infinite Actuary courses 6. Updating data on graduate placements. In response to performance concerns on Measure 2, the department will create a course specifically for AS majors. Performance on this measure by AS students is strong, but could be improved and the performance expectation increased if the course provided more challenge. In the current format, increasing the rigor would mean failing many non-majors who also take the course. Non-majors are already very challenged by the course.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Actuarial Science MAS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:46 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

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

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

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

**Goals**

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

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

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

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

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

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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

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

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

Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case studies from current events in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

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

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case examples using real company balance sheets in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 3: Performance on project (AS 8810 Graduate Seminar) (O: 1, 3, 4)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on a project in the AS 8810 Graduate Seminar an understanding of the following: (1) Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies; (2) The regulatory environment, the role of rating agencies and investors; and (3) Different accounting (financial reporting) requirements (statutory, GAAP and fair value). Further, graduates will have the ability to explain technical concepts to non-actuarial associates or clients.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Explanation of technical concepts
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on a project in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on a project in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for O4: Enterprise Risk and Integration
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on a project in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: To develop Critical Thinking**

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

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

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Service Learning Papers (O: 1, 2)**

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

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O1: Analytic**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Eighty-five percent of students scored '3' or better on the analytical skills portions of the paper.

**Target for O2: Communication**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
One hundred percent (100%) of students scored ‘3’ or better on the communication skills portion of the paper.

**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)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 African American Studies BA**

*As of: 12/13/2016 08:46 AM 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: 1) 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; 2) 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 receive a rating of 3 or higher.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

AAS 3975: 100% of the students (n=6) scored ‘4’ or better on the analytic skills outcome. AAS 3980: 100% of the students (n=10) scored ‘3’ or better on the analytic skills outcome.

### Target for O2: Communication skills

AAS 3975: 100% of the students scored ‘4’ or better on the communication skills outcome. AAS 3980: 80% of the students scored ‘3’ or better on the communications skills outcome.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

One-hundred percent (100%) of the students scored ‘3’ or better on the Communication skills portion of the paper.

### Target for O3: Acquisition of knowledge

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

AAS 3975: One hundred percent (100%) of the students (n=6) scored ‘3’ or better on the Acquisition of Knowledge outcome. AAS 3980: 80% of the students scored ‘3’ or better on the Acquisition of Knowledge outcome.

### 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
**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
Goals

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will be able to articulate verbally and writing emergent areas of research in the field of African American studies.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Research Proposal (O: 1, 2)
AAS 6010 Research Methods teaches first year graduate students how to critically analyze, synthesize, and deconstruct empirical literature to communicate the central tenets of a research problem/opportunity as it pertains to a social issue affecting the African American community. The Mock Review of the research proposal is the experience by which student learning outcomes are assessed for this course. Students' research proposals are rated by two external reviewers. External reviewers are AAS faculty and/or researchers in a related discipline. Two external reviewer conduct a blind review of a single research proposal. Each reviewer critiques the proposal on its strengths and weaknesses in seven areas relevant to research methodology: The abstract, introduction, literature review, theory/concept, significance, methodology and human subjects. Each proposal also receives an overall impact rating. All ratings range of 1 to 9, where 1=exceptional and 9=poor (see Table 1). The goal of this assignment is to give students constructive feedback on the primary components of the research proposal and its merit in advancing the body of knowledge in the field of African American Studies. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, CO4 and SLO2, SLO3, SLO5. Students are assessed on their ability to communicate and analyze research concepts. These learning outcomes are linked to the following components of the proposal: Communication /Literature Review and Analytic /Theory and Concepts.

Table 1. AAS 6010 Mock Review Rating Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional (A+/100)</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good (B+/ 89)</td>
<td>Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair (C+/ 79)</td>
<td>Some strengths but with at least one major weakness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Eight-one (81%) of students scored ‘6’ or better on this outcome with an overall average of 5.0. In sum, 9 out of 11 students were able to explain and appropriately apply a theory/concept to their proposed research, state its relevance to topic, and discuss potential contributions to the discipline of African American Studies.

Target for O2: Communication
AAS 6010: Eighty percent (80%) of the students will score 6 or better in their ability to communicate clearly on the literature review section of the research proposal.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

AAS 6010 Research Methods 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 Africentric 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 (C01) SLO2: Critique the appropriateness of methodological approaches relevant to research design, sample selection, measurement, data collection, measurement validation and reliability (C02) SLO3: Use SPSS to interpret level of measurement, measures of central tendency, measures of dispersion, properties of normal distributions, reliability and validity, hypothesis testing, measures of association, correlation, and prediction, and statistical significance (C03) SLO4: Operationalize Africentric theories and concepts in research design to promote cultural relevance, empowerment, and social justice (C01, C04) SLO5: Construct a research proposal (C02) There are four assignments in this course: 1) Annotated Bibliography (aka - The Matrix); 2) The Concept Paper (1st Draft); 3) the Mock Review (2nd Draft); and 4) the Final Research Proposal (3rd and Final draft). The Annotated Bibliography (The Matrix) The student will submit 3 sets of empirical research citations, totaling no less than 50 empirical articles on their research topic (recommended distribution per set: 10, 15 and 25 citations). Each annotation must include a paragraph summarizing the key words used in the search, the number of hits, and list of journals identified (see Attachment A). Each citation will include the authors' names, title of the article, journal, and year published. The annotation should describe the purpose of the research, the research question or...
Introduction to Anthropology. The course elucidates the comparative study of humanity across time and space by offering (1) a holistic understanding of human diversity that requires the study of biological, archaeological, social/cultural, and linguistic anthropology; (2) a cross-cultural and comparative study of humanity; and (3) a consideration of human problems within historical, environmental, political-economic, and sociocultural contexts. Students are given an overview of anthropological research strategies, the study results/findings as they pertain to the research question/hypothesis. The final aspect of the annotation is to state how the findings inform (support or negate) the students’ proposed research (33 points for each set). The goal of this assignment is to teach students how to systematically collect and critique empirical research and apply Africentric theories and concepts in social science research in order to formulate researchable research topics. This output is related to the following course objectives (CO) and student learning outcomes (SLO): CO1, CO3, SLO1, and SLO2. The Concept Paper (1st Draft) The Concept Paper is a critical synthesis of the Annotated Bibliography assignment. Students are asked to critique the literature for analysis (see Attachment B) (25 points). The goal of this assignment is to teach students how to critique empirical research for its construct

capabilities, generalizability, reliability, and cultural relevance. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, SLO3, and SLO4. The Mock Research Proposal (2nd Draft) This assignment is a mock review of the research proposal. It is designed to give students preliminary feedback on their proposal prior to submitting the final paper. Two external reviewers will be assigned to read each proposal and give feedback on the merits, strengths, and weaknesses of the proposal. Each mock review will last between 15 to 30 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 merit 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, SLO3, SLO5. The Mock Research Proposal (3rd and Final Draft) 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 critically analyze, synthesize, and deconstruct empirical literature to communicate the importance of a research problem/opportunity as it pertains to a social issue and theoretical perspective affecting the African American community. 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.

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? Analysis of Assessment Findings: The significance of the findings from the Mock Review process allowed the instructor to (1) ascertain how well the students were able to translate and assess the discipline specific theories and concepts in their proposed research study. Based on findings from previous years (2) have been able to identify and isolate the specific challenges to operationalization that students face. In sum, students struggled in moving from abstract Africentric theories to concrete measures of these theories. By adding the recent change (3) of creating an in-class operationalization assignment the instructor has developed lesson plans around operationalizing theory and students have been able to engage in small group assignments to develop Africentric measurement instruments. What did you learn from the assessment: The strengths (1) of this in-class process include, but are not limited to skill building in measurement, students learning through peer-interaction, and the ability to acquire and apply theoretical knowledge to social science inquiry. The primary weakness to this process is the time restriction. Based on informal group discussion, the impact (2) of the assignment is increased understanding how to contextualize and assessment Africentric theories in social science research. The quality of the findings will be determined by the output from the Mock Review and the Final Research Proposal

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 not shared with faculty, but rather used as internal evaluation feedback to improve the course.

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 in-class operationalization assignment may become a graded assignment pending the outcome of the Mock Review, scheduled for Thursday, November 19, 2015 and the submission of the Final Research Proposal, due December 5th, 2015. All previous action plans have been terminated. Re-assessment will following the all aforementioned outcomes.
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**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Natural selection inventory (O: 1)**

Students respond to a standardized inventory on natural selection. See attached document.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Ranking Number of Students Percentage 4/4 – Excellent 82 52% 3/4 – Very Good 61 38.6% 2/4 – Good 13 8.1% 1/4 – Fair 2 1.3% 0/4 – Poor 0 0%

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Ranking Number of Students Percentage 4/4 – Excellent 82 52% 3/4 – Very Good 52 33% 2/4 – Good 19 12% 1/4 – Fair 5 3% 0/4 – Poor 0 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

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

Departmental communication and learning outcomes monitoring
Results from this cycle’s assessment were presented to the faculty during a faculty meeting and feedback was sought on a) goals and targets and b) assessment method. The faculty sees the need for continuing to assess learning in these two areas as key foundations of the discipline and will periodically be updated on learning outcomes, and given opportunities to select possible other areas for assessment. Instead of creating a standardized test bank for, the department will continue monitoring a sample of ANTH 1102 classes.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

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

Departmental communication and learning outcomes monitoring
Results from this cycle’s assessment were presented to the faculty during the first faculty meeting of the new cycle and feedback was sought on a) goals and targets and b) assessment method. The faculty sees the need for continuing to assess learning in these two areas as key foundations of the discipline. Assessment of core results will be presented to the faculty at the start of each academic year and the faculty will discuss possible other areas for assessment.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Natural selection inventory | Outcome/Objective: Natural Selection

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 are consistent with last cycle and further the department’s goals, though the department sees the need to establish a longer-term record of learning outcomes, to see possible trends. There have been no significant changes in the educational program or assessment process for this cycle but we feel that our assessment process has been refined over the last few cycles and is now appropriately robust, so such a record can begin to be gathered. The feedback we received on the assessment process has been critical in shaping a stronger practice and we look forward to the opportunities this opens for tracking and improving upon 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.

There is one key element in the assessment process that is now being implemented and we believe will have a positive impact. In the past the faculty discussed the possibility of creating a unified test bank to assess all ANTH 1102 sections but instead, we will continue monitoring a sample of classes, and present and discuss the results in a faculty meeting annually. We will also annually revisit the assessment topical foci.
### 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)**
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**
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.

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Archaeological Methods - Garbology project (O: 1, 2, 3)

Students apply fundamental archaeological concepts and methods by conducting a mini archaeological investigation of garbage. Students describe, classify and analyze material evidence, through which to reconstruct a profile of daily practice and its agents. 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

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 30. 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 30 and 40. 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 40 and 45. 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 45 and 50.

(max) Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating competency in data collection and analysis.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

N = 18. 1. Unsatisfactory: 0. 2. Fair: 3. 3. Good: 3. 4. Excellent: 12. 2 students did not complete the assignment.

Target for O2: Content knowledge

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 30. 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 30 and 40. 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 40 and 45. 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 45 and 50.

(max) Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior critical analysis and interpretation of material remains, to reconstruct lived experience.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

N = 18. 1. Unsatisfactory: 0. 2. Fair: 3. 3. Good: 3. 4. Excellent: 12. 2 students did not complete the assignment.

Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

N = 18. 1. Unsatisfactory: 0. 2. Fair: 3. 3. Good: 3. 4. Excellent: 12. 2 students did not complete the assignment.

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

Students in ANTH 2020 - Introduction to Cultural Anthropology formulate and conduct a short ethnographic project, in which they a. Demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture and its study b. Identify, design and conduct one instance of ethnographic data collection c. Produce an ethnographic narrative The work is holistically evaluated in terms of the following criteria. These axes are unequally weighted and are listed in order of decreasing significance. A. Topic: The student identifies an appropriate topic and formulates a research question, contextualizing it in the culture concept B. Methodology: The student correctly utilizes ethnographic methods C. Approach and Development: The student includes evidence through ethnographic detail and effectively addresses the initial topic or question D. Writing: The student writes in correct English prose. The narrative is clear, organized and grammatically correct. See attached document for details.

Ranking: 1. Unsatisfactory: major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project. Scores below 25. 2. Fair: acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication. Scores between 25 and 30. 3. Good: competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication. Scores between 30 and 32. 4. Excellent: superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication. Scores between 33 and 35.

(max) Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating ethnographic ability.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
**Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication</td>
<td>33-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traget: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior ability to construct an ethnographic narrative in proper English prose.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 12 Excellent (4) = 12 Good (3) = 0 Fair (2) = 0 Poor (1) = 0 Students demonstrate the ability to communicate in competent 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 reflexive 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 11 Approximately 83% of students who turned in the assignment scored a 4 or 5; 27% scored a 4; 9% had a 3; 0% scored a 1. ANTH4970: 5: 7 students: 4 students: 3 students: 1 students: 0 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

N = 11 Approximately 64% of students who turned in the assignment scored a 4 or 5; 27% scored a 4; 9% had a 3; 0% scored a 1. ANTH4970: 5: 7 students: 4 students: 3 students: 1 students: 0 students: 1 student did not complete the assignment.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 11 Approximately 83% of students who turned in the assignment scored a 4 or 5; 27% scored a 4; 9% had a 3; 0% scored a 1. ANTH4970: 5: 7 students: 4 students: 3 students: 1 students: 0 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 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication</td>
<td>12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication</td>
<td>&gt;16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traget: - Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior ability to construct an ethnographic narrative in proper English prose.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 24 Scores 19.9+/0.2 Excellent = 24 Good = 0 Fair = 0 Poor = 0.

**Target for O2: Content knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Major flaws in conception, execution and/or communication of project</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Acceptable conception and execution of project, moderate stylistic problems in communication</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Competent conception and execution of project, minor style or mechanics problems in communication</td>
<td>12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Superior conception and execution of project, fully competent communication</td>
<td>&gt;16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traget: - Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating superior ability to construct an ethnographic narrative in proper English prose.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 24 Scores 19.9+/0.2 Excellent = 24 Good = 0 Fair = 0 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) Target: - 0 unsatisfactory submissions - 80% score Good or Excellent, demonstrating competent use of discipline-appropriate English prose.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

N = 24 Scores 19.9 +/- 0.2 Excellent = 24 Good = 0 Fair = 0 Poor = 0

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
  - Measure: Capstone Seminar Paper | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication
- 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 communication
- Implementation Description: Students will be given access to the handout presenting the most common grammatical errors GSU students make. They will be encouraged to seek assistance over drafts of their work.
- Responsible Person/Group: Instructor
- Additional Resources: n/a
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Advisement
The instructor will monitor performance and individually advise students to address specific areas of concern
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

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

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

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

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
- **Outcome/Objective**: 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

**Coaching**
This assignment continues to be a good indicator of learning outcomes and is helpful both to allow students to experiment with a different writing style and to consider what they have learned not only in the class but as anthropology majors. The instructor will continue coaching and monitoring students closely to achieve the 75% Excellent or Outstanding target.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
coaching and monitoring

This assignment will continue to be used as it is a good indicator of how well students understand, apply and communicate fundamental ethnographic approaches.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

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 indicates that we are mostly achieving the desired results of the BA program, and that there is consistency over time though the faculty sees the need to continue monitoring and working toward fully meeting all goals. Programmatic changes that have taken effect in this cycle include Intro to Linguistic Anthropology not becoming part of the major requirements but an elective. Therefore, it is not assessed in this 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.

Assessment results and the assessment process will be presented to the faculty annually, during the first faculty meeting of the new academic year, to allow for discussion on achievements, areas of improvement, or assessment process and topical foci changes. We are on track with last year’s action plans: Linguistic Anthropology did not become part of the major requirements, therefore it is not assessed here.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improving comprehensive examination outcomes

Faculty, and particularly faculty advisers are discussing mechanisms to enhance student assessment throughout the course of study, in order to further student success. A newly created professionalization seminar course will serve as a hands-on, practical forum in which students will be introduced to, discuss and share experiences regarding the rationale, requirements and strategies of the

M 2: MA thesis or practicum paper (O: 2)
In their theses and practicum papers, students demonstrate the ability to design and conduct original research, along with an in-depth understanding of the field of inquiry, theory and methods pertaining to the research, and proficiency in the writing conventions and formats of the discipline. Students' theses and practicum papers are evaluated by a committee consisting of three regular university faculty members, at least two of whom must be Department faculty members. Students must orally defend the thesis or practicum paper before their committee. The advisor, in consultation with the committee, rates the thesis or practicum paper as a pass, contingent pass or fail. Data recorded included (1) the number of students who wrote and defended a thesis or practicum paper, (2) the number of students who successfully passed the thesis or practicum defense on the first attempt, (3) the number of students who encountered problems with passing the defense, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the defense and graduated. 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. Scale: 1. Poor: Fail the comprehensive exam 2. Good: Successful rewrite 3. Excellent: Pass at first try Target: 1: 0%, 2: >20%, 3: >80%

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
N= 20 1: 0 students (0%) 2: 0 student (0%) 3: 20 students (100%)

M 1: MA comprehensive exam (O: 1)
The graduate students are assessed individually by their committees, which consist of three regular university faculty members, two of whom must be Department faculty members. The comprehensive exam is tailored to each graduate student's interest and is written by the student's major advisor. The three questions include (1) the field of inquiry, (2) theory pertaining to the research, and (3) method to be employed in the research. The graduate students are asked to write 7-10 pages for each question, and to return the completed exam to each committee member within two weeks. The exam is then evaluated; the advisor, in consultation with the committee, rates the exam as a pass, contingent pass or fail. The Anthropology Graduate Program Director was consulted to obtain data on the number students who took the comprehensive exam. Data recorded included (1) the number of students who took the comprehensive exam, (2) the number of students who successfully passed the exam on the first attempt, (3) the number of students who encountered problems with passing the exam, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the comprehensive exam. 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. Scale: 1. Poor: Fail the comprehensive exam 2. Good: Successful rewrite 3. Excellent: Pass at first try Target: 1: 0%, 2: >20%, 3: >80%

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
N= 15 1 = 0 students 2 = 2 students (13.3%) 3 = 13 students (86.7%)

O2: Producing Original Research

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

Strategic Plan Associations

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

Standard Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

Excellent: Succeed at first try

Target for O1: Synthesizing knowledge
Students in their third semester of graduate study at the Department of Anthropology will successfully synthesize, analyze and critically apply anthropological knowledge relevant to their graduate research through a comprehensive examination, which consists of a topical, a theoretical and a methodological segment. The comprehensive examination is evaluated by the faculty members forming the students' committee. Measure: 1. Poor: Fail the comprehensive exam 2. Good: Successful rewrite 3. Excellent: Pass at first try Target: 1: 0%, 2: >20%, 3: >80%

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
N= 15 1 = 0 students 2 = 2 students (13.3%) 3 = 13 students (86.7%)

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. Measure: 1. Poor: Fail thesis or practicum defense 2. Good: Succeed at second try 3. Excellent: Succeed at first try Target: 1: 0%, 2: >10%, 3: >90%

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
N = 20 1: 0 students (0%) 2: 0 student (0%) 3: 20 students (100%)
Refining learning outcome assessment of comprehensive exam
Anthropology is a highly diverse discipline, encompassing biology and culture in the past and present. This precludes a homogenous approach to learning outcomes assessment. While the format of the comprehensive exam is the same for all students, the nature of the questions and the particular foci they address are highly particular to the subdiscipline (biological, archaeological, cultural or linguistic anthropology), and to the research interests of each student. In order to render student learning assessment in more detail, therefore, the faculty will discuss other potential reporting options in this cycle.

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

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

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

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

Assessment process
The assistance of the graduate director will be sought to explore ways to construct a department-wide ranking and reporting rubric for graduate student comprehensive exams and theses/practicum for the upcoming cycle.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

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 for this cycle indicate that the department's goals are being met consistently. No major changes have been made in the program. However we will explore options for creating a rubric for the department to assist with reporting. A unified assessment model of student learning is particularly challenging for anthropology, given the nature of the discipline and the diversity of the department. Student projects in biological, archaeological, cultural and linguistic anthropology cannot be assessed using common standard measures. The help of the graduate director will be sought to explore potential alternatives to the assessment process for the upcoming 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.

A ranking system detailing the outcomes of the two measures being reported was used for this cycle. For the next cycle, the faculty will discuss possible alternative forms of assessment tracking to better illuminate student learning.
**Mission / Purpose**
The BA in Applied Linguistics provides a thorough grounding in the study of language structure, use, and acquisition to prepare students for a variety of options for employment or further study in fields in which the scientific study of language is significant, e.g.: language teaching (including English as a second/foreign language), anthropology, speech and hearing science, psychology, cognitive science, 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Core Areas of Linguistics (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of the core areas within linguistic study: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and semantics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Awareness of Bias (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate awareness that different theoretical and cultural perspectives, their own included, are value-laden and prejudicial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Analysis of Linguistic Structure (G: 1) (M: 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students acquire the skills to analyze language and/or interlanguage structures (e.g., sound structure, word structure, sentence structure, and discourse structure).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Reporting on Primary Research (G: 2, 3) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate competency in making credible claims about data they have collected and analyzed themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Written Communication and Editing Skills (G: 3) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students develop effective written communication and editing skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Final examinations in foundational course, AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics (O: 1)**
The final examination in AL 3021 is comprehensive and assesses student understanding of core areas of linguistics through analyzing language data and answering open-ended or selected response questions.

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

**Target for O1: Core Areas of Linguistics**
80% of students will exhibit mastery of the core areas of linguistic study by achieving a passing score of at least 70% on the final exam in AL 3021.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In five offerings of the course AL 3021 during three terms, 89 out of 97 students, or 91.75%, exhibited mastery of the core areas of linguistic study by achieving a passing score of at least 70% on the final exam. The target of 80% on this measure was MET.

**M 2: Final Papers in CTW courses, Rubric Rows 1 & 2 (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 and AL 4241 rubrics for CTW papers include 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In AL 3031 Language in Society, the rubric for the final paper assesses students in the criteria of "Identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives" and "Shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem". In AL 4151 Communication across Cultures and AL 4241 Senior Seminar, the rubric assesses the criteria "Demonstrates an honest awareness of one’s feelings/thoughts about cultural difference" and "Shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being". Across 3 terms, 3 sections of AL 3031 were offered, 2 sections of AL 4151 were offered, and 1 section of AL 4241 was offered. The total percentage of students in all sections who were judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on the relevant criteria of the rubrics was 80.53%, or 91 out of 113 students. The target was met across all criteria in this measure.

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

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

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

26 out of 30 students answered at least 70% of language analysis problems correctly on the final exam in AL 4011. 21 out of 25 students answered at least 70% of language analysis problems correctly on the final exam in AL 4012. Because the number of students demonstrating competence in linguistic analysis on these exams exceeded 80% (86.67% in AL 4011 and 84% in AL 4012), this target has been met.

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

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

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

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

80% of students will demonstrate competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on interlanguage papers in AL 3041.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Across two sections of AL 3041 Second Language Acquisition offered across fall and spring semesters, 60 of 64 students, or 93.75%, demonstrated competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on interlanguage analysis papers. This target was MET.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

AL 4111 Semantics & Pragmatics was not offered during this cycle. We will collect data with this measure in the coming year (there is a course offering in Spring 2016).

**M 6: Final Papers in CTW courses, Rubric Rows 3 & 4 (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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In 6 CTW offerings of AL 3031, 4151 and 4241 across three terms, for the rubric item "Presents convincing arguments based on data", 81.42% (92 out of 113 students) scored either "competent" or "sophisticated", and 85.84% (97 out of 113 students)
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

### CTW Course Student Retention

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

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Instructors of CTW courses now take care to structure the course calendar so that major assignments with feedback are due before the midterm, so that students have a better basis for deciding whether or not to withdraw. Furthermore, the director of undergraduate students now always sends a reminder to all majors about the withdrawal deadline.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

### Add an AL Course to the Core

The department of Applied Linguistics does not currently have a lower level course that counts in areas A-E of the university core curriculum, despite the applicability of several of our introductory courses to these areas. Our goal is to propose to the faculty senate the addition of AL 2102 Languages of the World or another of our 2000 level courses to the university core, in order to better serve the undergraduate student body (by offering a variety of electives to meet core requirements) and to recruit more students to study languages and Applied Linguistics (in support of the Strategic initiative to globalize the university and our department goal of an increased local footprint). Update 2015: We proposed the addition of AL 2102 to the core in area E, but met with resistance from another department that offers competing courses in that area. After consulting with our colleagues at Georgia Perimeter College who might eventually be teaching our 2000 level courses at that site, we decided to change tactics. Now we are interested in proposing the addition of AL 2101 Introduction to Language to the core in area C.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** The undergraduate curriculum committee is working on the proposal for this core change in the fall semester of 2014 and will submit it for review by the college, faculty senate, etc. before December, 2014. Update 2015: As the consolidation between Georgia State and Georgia Perimeter moves forward, we will pursue adding AL 2101 into the core by making a proposal to the faculty senate in the spring of 2016.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

### Scaffolding for Linguistic Analysis Courses

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

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** The exam and prerequisite have been in place for 3 terms now. Passing rates in 3021 have definitely increased, but there is still concern that the two courses are not well-aligned (there may be too much overlap, as well as some disjointed approaches/terminology between the two). We will continue to measure and monitor the relationship between these two courses. See implementation for more details.

**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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The director of undergraduate studies will gather information from the faculty and put together a training session for GTAs.

Curriculum Mapping

We feel that we have a good assessment plan with measures and targets that fit our BA and TEFL certificate programs well. However, our curriculum as a whole is not explicitly linked to the student learning outcomes in our assessment cycle.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Over the next year, we will be standardizing all undergraduate syllabuses so that they include the SLOs relevant to that particular course. In addition, the undergraduate director will use these updated syllabuses to create a curriculum map that documents how each course in the BA and TEFL certificate programs introduces, reinforces, or teaches mastery of the associated skills for each SLO.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

This is one of our action plans for this year - to create a curriculum map for both our BA and TEFL certificate programs linking them to our 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?

Data on six of the seven measures were collected and analyzed this year - the course where the seventh measure is administered was not offered during this cycle. Targets were met for all six measures. Therefore, all five student learning outcomes for the BA program in Applied Linguistics that are associated with these measures can be considered achieved for this assessment cycle. Our BA program is still relatively young (it was previously a BIS program). We only have 4 years of data previous to the current cycle. BA targets were at the outset established based on common-sense reasoning that four of five students should be reaching skill mastery in our courses, and should be able to demonstrate that mastery at a level of 70% or higher on direct measures. Over the past five years of assessment this logic seems to have provided us with reasonable, challenging yet reachable targets. Some years we don't meet or only partially meet some targets, but overall our trajectory has been satisfactory. Not meeting targets has provided us with ideas for improvements at the programmatic level, for example adding new courses to scaffold information in difficult courses and implementing strategies for student retention in CTW courses. The fact that all our targets were met in the current assessment cycle is encouraging, but also makes us question whether some of the targets are now set a bit too low. This may be especially true for the target for M1 (O1), the final exam in AL 3021. A new prerequisite for that course has recently been added to our BA program in order to introduce difficult concepts and skills for students before they enter this course. It may be that the addition of this prerequisite class that important background knowledge before they enter AL 3021 may mean that our students are now achieving beyond our previous expectations in that course. A committee of faculty will be examining the textbooks for both AL 3021 and its prerequisite, AL 2021, as well as the exemption exam by which students can avoid taking AL 2021, to ensure that the courses are well-aligned and not too repetitive. One of the issues that has come to light in the current assessment cycle is that, while we have a deep understanding of how effectively our measured courses are contributing to our program SLOs, we don't necessarily know or cannot always readily articulate how each course in our program is connected to other courses and to learning outcomes. We know that curriculum mapping can be an important tool in understanding the relationship between a curriculum and its assessment program, so we are engaging in an action plan to develop a thorough curriculum map for our undergraduate courses this year. It is our hope that having this big picture understanding will allow us to better analyze results of our assessment cycles in the future and make effective program changes informed by those findings.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Findings for all BA Program Outcomes, Measures and Targets were shared by the Director of Undergraduate Studies with the full department faculty in a meeting on October 7, 2015. Implications of the findings were discussed, as well as potential action plans that would address potential program issues revealed by 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.

This year we are implementing no major program changes. The fall catalog this year starts several significant changes that we put in place the year before, including changes in required courses for the major and the minor in Applied Linguistics. We are eager to see to what extent these changes will impact our assessment findings.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
resolved and no longer poses a threat to graduation for our majors. Another plan, adding more research to our courses, was also
deemed ready to close because of the significant course revisions that have happened over the past 4 years. One plan that will
remain open, adding a course to the core, has seen progress - we submitted a proposal to add AL 2102 Languages of the World to
area E but met with resistance from competing departments in that area. With the support of colleagues at Georgia Perimeter, we will
instead be moving ahead with trying to add AL 2101 Introduction to Language to area C of the core. Also, we have implemented
several strategies to support PhD student GTAs teaching undergraduate courses, including assigning faculty course coordinators to
undergraduate courses and providing information on logistical procedures for registration adjustment, early alert reports, academic
dishonesty, etc. Finally, we have opened a new plan that will result in curriculum mapping of our undergraduate program,
documenting the links between all coursework offered at the undergraduate level and our assessment program SLOs.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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.
Target for **O5: Communication**
90% of students will score "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.

**Target for O5: Communication**
90% of students will meet or exceed 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".

**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".

**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".

**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".

**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".

**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".

**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".

**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).

**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).

**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.
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.

**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:** 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
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 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 over the most recent three-year period will score “Meets expectations or “Exceed expectations” for theory and content knowledge.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
92% of students in the last three years (including all five students in the current cycle) scored at least “Meets expectations”; 31% (including one student in the current cycle) scored “Exceeds 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 clearly explained 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 over the most recent three-year period will score “Meets expectations or “Exceed expectations” for research methodology competence.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met
85% of students in the last three years (including four of the five students in the current cycle) scored at least “Meets expectations”; 23% (including one student in the current cycle) scored “Exceeds 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), or “Exceeds expectations” (The paper is well written and organized; in terms of writing it could be...
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. 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.

Target for O1: Theory and content knowledge

Examples of the three examination questions: “How is the student's research related to the field of language teaching and language teacher development?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?”

Target for O2: Research methodology competence

Examples of the three examination questions: “How does the student's research contribute to the field of language teaching and language teacher development?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?”

Target for O3: Communication skills

Examples of the three examination questions: “How does the student's research contribute to the field of language teaching and language teacher development?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?”

Target for O4: Career planning and development

Examples of the three examination questions: “How does the student's research contribute to the field of language teaching and language teacher development?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?” “What are the key issues in the field of language teaching and language teacher development that the student needs to be aware of?”

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

For writing, 85% of students in the last three years (including four of the five students in the current cycle) scored at least "Meets expectations"; 38% (including two students in the current cycle) scored "Exceeds expectations". For speaking, 92% of students in the last three years (including all five students in the current cycle) scored at least "Meets expectations"; 31% (including one student in the current cycle) scored "Exceeds expectations".

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

92% of students in the last three years (including all five students in the current cycle) scored at least "Meets expectations"; 31% (including one student in the current cycle) scored "Exceeds expectations".

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

One of the six students who took the comprehensive exam in 2014-2015 did not pass. That student scored "Meets expectations" on just one of the three questions. The remaining 83% of students scored at least "Meets expectations" on all questions of their exam and "Exceeds expectations" on at least one question.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

One of the six students who took the comprehensive exam in 2014-2015 did not pass. That student did not meet expectations on any of the three questions. The remaining 83% of students scored at least "Meets expectations" on all questions of their exam and "Exceeds expectations" on at least one question.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

One of the six students who took the comprehensive exam in 2014-2015 did not pass. That student did not meet expectations on any of the three questions. The remaining 83% of students scored at least "Meets expectations" on all questions of their exam and "Exceeds expectations" on at least one question.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

One of the six students who took the comprehensive exam in 2014-2015 did not pass. That student scored "Meets expectations" on just one of the three questions. The remaining 83% of students scored at least "Meets expectations" on all questions of their exam and "Exceeds expectations" on one question.

M 3: Conference presentations (O: 4)

Graduate students are expected to begin presenting regularly at conferences.
Target for O4: Career planning and development

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

At least 80% of graduate students beyond their second year presented at least one paper at a conference, with most of those presenting multiple papers (at least half of 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.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

80% (of five) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication; at least three of them had published multiple papers.

Target for O2: Research methodology competence

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

80% (of five) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication; at least three of them had published multiple papers.

Target for O3: Communication skills

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

80% (of five) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication; at least three of them had published multiple papers.

Target for O4: Career planning and development

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

80% (of five) students who graduated during the year had at least one refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication; at least three of them had published multiple papers.

M 5: Teaching experience (O: 5)

Students will graduate with substantial teaching experience in the Intensive English Program and in undergraduate courses in Applied Linguistics.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

100% of students who graduated had taught at least 4 semesters at GSU. 60% of these had taught at least one undergraduate applied linguistics course at GSU.

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Publications | Outcome/Objective: Career planning and development
  | Communication skills | Research methodology competence | Theory and content knowledge

Responsible Person/Group: PhD committee chair, PhD advisors, all faculty

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Qualifying exams | Outcome/Objective: Career planning and development
  | Communication skills | Research methodology competence | Theory and content knowledge

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Conference presentations | Outcome/Objective: Career planning and development
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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.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Nine students were assessed for 2014-15. The average score for this outcome was 3.67, which exceeds our target of 3.5. On the whole, our MFA graduates exceed our targets (with one exception, see objective 4). We feel that this success indicates that our current mode of instruction is providing a quality education in which students are given the tools and training needed to achieve our desired outcomes. We currently see no need to radically alter our approach but will continue to monitor student responses and will adjust as necessary.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Nine students were assessed for 2014-15. The average score for this outcome was 3.67, which exceeds our target of 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Nine students were assessed for 2014-15. The average score for this outcome was 3.55, which meets our target of 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

Nine students were assessed for 2014-15. The average score for this outcome was 3.22, which falls below our target of 3.5. We did not meet our target because of the lower than expected performance of two students who struggled toward the end of their studies. On the whole, the other 7 students were at or above our minimum target of 3. We have recently instituted a Professional Practices course for our MFA students and are hopeful that this course will help prevent any future drops in student performance.

**M 3: MFA Solo Exhibition with Statement and Resume (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

A solo exhibition of work done in last two semesters of graduate study accompanied by an artist statement and resume.

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

**Target for O1: Theoretical and critical thinking**

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

**Target for O2: Contemporary contextual knowledge**

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

**Target for O3: Advanced research skills**

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

**Target for O4: Professional practice**

With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Theoretical and critical thinking

Implementation Description: Ceramics and Sculpture faculty are in the process of refining the details of a 3-D program yet are moving forward by joining the two disciplines in one Directed Study course this semester. By Fall 2010 all details should be resolved and in full operation.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Mark Burleson, Christina West, Ruth Stanford, George Beasley

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Theoretical and critical thinking

Implementation Description: The review of the Graduate Program will take place throughout this academic year with the intent of implementing any changes in Fall 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine

Professional Practice in Higher Education
The graduate studio faculty is going to consider whether making Professional Practice in Higher Education (AE 6100) mandatory for all students (it is currently only required of graduate assistants who are teaching) will improve student achievement in the area of Professional Practice.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition with Statement and Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional practice
  Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional practice

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

Seminar Reorganization
In order to improve the performance of our students in regard to Theoretical and Critical Thinking and Contemporary Contextual Knowledge, we are planning to restructure the way MFA seminars are taught and rotated, including involving the art history faculty to a greater degree.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition with Statement and Resume | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary contextual knowledge
  Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary contextual knowledge
  | Theoretical and critical thinking

Responsible Person/Group: Stan Anderson

Graduate Program Review
As the needs and expectations of students and the university change, it is clear that our MFA graduate program needs to change to meet new demands. We have begun this process by streamlining internal processes and are working toward a redesign of the graduate program. The School of Art is scheduled for a faculty retreat Spring 2014 in which we will discuss seminar structures, new classes (e.g. professional practices, thesis writing).

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Redesign class structures and offerings to bolster student outcomes.
Responsible Person/Group: Research Faculty/Graduate Director/Director
Additional Resources: Unknown at this time.

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.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional practice

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).

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional practice

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.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced research skills

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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 Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design educates future artists and scholars. As part of that process, we have created new learning opportunities designed to strengthen our artists and designers. Specifically, we have instituted two new courses required of all MFA candidates: Professional Practices and Thesis Writing. Professional Practices introduces students to the realities of working in the art and design fields at the MFA level. Thesis writing not only helps MFA candidates prepare their theses, it also provides them with opportunities to learn professional-level writing skills and polish them as part of becoming MFA-level practitioners. This is the first year we have required the courses from our students. As a result, we do not have firm data. We are also trying to establish how we might assess these courses but will not have a firm idea until we have worked through at least two cycles.

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 we have recently instituted the Professional Practice and Thesis Writing courses, we do not yet have data to analyze.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

As we have only recently instituted the courses in question, we do not have data to analyze.

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 we have only recently instituted the courses in question, we have not data to assess at this point.
**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical thinking**

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critical thinking in core (G: 1)**

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

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

**Critical thinking in Core Action Plan**

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

*Established in Cycle:* 2008-2009  
*Implementation Status:* In-Progress  
*Priority:* Low  
*Responsible Person/Group:* AH faculty

**CT in Art History Core**

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 "all of the above" and "none of the above" answers).

*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* Medium  
*Projected Completion Date:* 01/2015  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Art History faculty  
*Additional Resources:* n/a

---

**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**
Measure, Targets, and Findings

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 understands 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
| Instructional Resources | Learning Environment | Professionalism

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
| Instructional Resources | Learning Environment | Professionalism

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
| Instructional Resources | Learning Environment
**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 + Instruction
- Outcome/Objective: Instructional Resources | Learning Environment | Professionalism

**Mission / Purpose**

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

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research skills in gathering evidence (M: 1)**

Thesis evaluation: Ability to gather evidence to support thesis statement

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

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

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

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Low Residency with Online Course Offerings

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning in the fall semester 2009.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

#### Summer triad of courses

In order to engender greater cross disciplinary activity in our students classrooms, we are focusing on integrating the three required summer courses that address contemporary issues in art education, postmodern art history and a studio mixed media course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Summer session 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

#### Survey of cohort program

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The survey will be conducted at the conclusion of the academic year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

#### Develop extended support network

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

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

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

- **Measure:** Thesis
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research skills in critically analyzing evidence

- **Implementation Description:** Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012

#### Greater structure in curriculum

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

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

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

- **Measure:** Thesis
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication Skills

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

#### New cohort formation evaluation

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

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

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

- **Measure:** Thesis
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research skills in gathering evidence
**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.

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

**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.

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

**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.

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

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

---

**Goals**

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

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

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

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of Content (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**
Student is able to recall pertinent art historical facts (i.e., artist, title, date), can identify artworks as belonging to specific cultures, periods, and places, and can define art historical vocabulary.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
- 8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

### Strategic Plan Associations

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

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
Student is able to apply a range of art historical methods (i.e., formal analysis, semiotics, criticism, etc.), to apply appropriate methods to the analysis of particular works of art, and to make reasoned judgements about the validity of rival claims about art.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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

Students are evaluated on the basis of a graduation portfolio assembled by graduating seniors in connection with AH 4990: Art History Capstone or in consultation with their principal advisers in the course of their final semester (or last 15 credit hours of study). This year, the portfolio consisted of a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, an advanced writing project involving art historical research, a research response paper, a critical analysis paper, an art analysis paper, and an art history experience paper. The portfolio requires students to submit a paper from the beginning of their Art History studies and one from the end, and this “book-ending” approach provides us with a solid grasp of each student's improvement, or lack thereof, across time. Knowledge of Content is evaluated based on analysis of performance in 1000-level art-history survey classes, and a review of the content-based sections of tests submitted with the graduation portfolio. Critical Thinking Skills are evaluated based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. Written Communication Skills are evaluated based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project(s) submitted with the graduation portfolio. The degree of student mastery of each Learning Objective is evaluated according to the following scheme: 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very Good, 5-Excellent, not evaluated

**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 evaluate are meeting our goals in both those areas, and we see no need for changes in our program with respect to these particular goals. One concern that we do have is that these scores may be somewhat inflated, since they are based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, and -- since submission of the graduation portfolio is still essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted may not be a representative sample. This problem should be solved in coming years, as more and more of our graduating majors will be required to pass through the new capstone course (AH 4990), and thus be required to submit a graduation portfolio. As we get a more truly representative sample of work, however, we may find that our average scores go down.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation portfolio</td>
<td>Research Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 their scores for the Research Skills objective. In addition, our students now have the opportunity for instruction in library research skills under the guidance of Nedda Ahmed, the new library instructor in the fine arts area. We plan to take more advantage of this opportunity in the future, with the expectation that it will further improve our students' research skills.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation portfolio</td>
<td>Knowledge of Content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Glenn Gunhouse, Maria Gindhart, Melinda Hartwig, Kimberly Cleveland, John Decker, Susan Richmond, Akela Reason

#### AH 3000 and AH 4990 as CTW courses

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation portfolio</td>
<td>Research Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Terminated
- **Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation portfolio</td>
<td>Research Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Projected Completion Date:**
- **Responsible Person/Group:**

#### 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.

- **Established in Cycle:**
- **Implementation Status:**
- **Priority:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation portfolio</td>
<td>Research Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the US. Our concern last year was the somewhat inflated scores based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, which -- since submission of the graduation portfolio was essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted were not a representative sample. This year we solved the problem by offering graduating majors a new capstone course (AH 4990), and required all to submit a graduation portfolio. This resulted in a more representative sample of work that included a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, and an advanced writing project involving art-historical research, a research response paper, a critical analysis paper, and an art history experience paper. We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breadth of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

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

Undergraduate Seminars
We would like to see all undergraduate majors take at least one seminar class. For this, we would need to make 4900-level classes “undergraduate seminars,” with a lower cap on class size to ensure greater one-on-one instruction. Such a seminar would better prepare our students for the rigors of graduate school and would offer them an opportunity to perform more focused research and writing. We need, however, to consider how this will affect such things as RPG and credit-hour generation.

Establishment of Course and Program Priorities

---

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Content

**CTW Alignment**

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

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

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

**Research Plan**

The scores for Objective 3 (Research Skills) were quite a bit lower than we'd like to see. The average of 3.75 was considerably below our goal of 4.5, and lower than the results for the other three objectives. We recognize that this is a continuing area of focus for the faculty. We have already added a new course to our program (AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology), which we hope will improve the research skills of our majors by giving them training in art-historical methods early in their course of study. As more and more of our graduates are required to take this course as part of their program, we hope to see improvement in the scores for the Research Skills objective. In addition, our students now have the opportunity for instruction in library research skills under the guidance of Nedda Ahmed, the new library instructor in the fine arts area. We plan to take more advantage of this opportunity in the future, with the expectation that it will further improve our students' research skills.

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

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

**3000-Level Courses**

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

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

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

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

**Establishing BA in Art History**

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

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

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

**Undergraduate Seminars**

We would like to see all undergraduate majors take at least one seminar class. For this, we would need to make 4900-level classes “undergraduate seminars,” with a lower cap on class size to ensure greater one-on-one instruction. Such a seminar would better prepare our students for the rigors of graduate school and would offer them an opportunity to perform more focused research and writing. We need, however, to consider how this will affect such things as RPG and credit-hour generation.

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

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

Responsible Person/Group: Art History area

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
- Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills
- Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: 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
2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
4.2 Highlight the arts and media.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

SLO 2: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence) (M: 4)
Ability to read, process and critique high-level scholarly aricles 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)
SLO 3: Written Communication skills (M: 3)

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

SLO 4: 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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met
The average score for students for the 2014-15 cycle was 3.5, which falls short of our stated goal of 4.5. The numbers for this goal were skewed by one student who failed to meet the minimum score across all goals (5 out of the 6 students assessed met the minimum goal of 3). The relatively small sample size under assessment amplifies the negative effects one student can have. We have stronger students coming through the program this year and expect the numbers to reflect their abilities. In keeping with the 2011 NASAD review of the School of Art & Design, we will continue to offer graduate-only seminars, which we hope will yield improvement in the overall averages. Previously, our graduate students have taken only mixed classes and this may have negatively impacted their performances. We are hopeful that the seminars will have continued positive effects on our students.

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met
The average score for this outcome was 3.5, which falls short of our stated goal of 4.5. The numbers for this outcome were largely skewed by a single student who failed to meet the minimum targets for each area. The students accepted to the program for this year are stronger than those from previous years and we expect that their evaluations will reflect this. As with the research goal, we are turing to our focus on graduate-only seminars as the mainstay for educating our students. It is our hope that the greater rigor and closer attention that the seminar environment fosters will have positive benefits on student performance.
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 more reflective of the quality of graduate students graduating from the Art History program. Scores for objectives 1 and 2 exceeded our stated targets; the score for objective 3 came close to meeting our desired level. One potential reason for the rise in outcomes may be that each of the students assessed benefited from the institution of Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH8010). 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 AH8010 and graduate only seminars will have continued positive effects on our students.

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

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 (AH8010) every fall. This course, which introduces graduate students to graduate-level methodology and provides them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research, should ideally be taken by graduate students in their first semester. Also, in keeping with our recent NASAD review, we plan to offer at least one graduate-only seminar every semester, but meeting the College’s minimum enrollment requirement is proving problematic.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Analysis of Evidence | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence)
Measure: Gathering of Evidence | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence)
Measure: Written Communication Skills | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication skills

Responsible Person/Group: Art History Faculty

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

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Area meeting to assess needed program changes and implement as necessary.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2014
**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Studio Art BFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive, and

---

**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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Thesis  
- Outcome/Objective: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence)

---

**Introduce non-thesis track**

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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Thesis  
- Outcome/Objective: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence)

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 training of Art History students requires a greater emphasis on graduate-only courses. We have responded by increasing the number of graduate-only courses our students take. The key learning opportunity for students pursuing graduate education in Art History is the Methodology course. Given current enrollment requirements (e.g. the 12 student minimum for MA courses), we are only able to teach this course every other year. Until recently, the SLO section has been optional and we have opted not to gather data from this course. Moving forward, we will use this course to help assess SLOs for the program but currently do not have anything to report.

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 gathering of data has been optional (and still is for 2014-15). As a result, we have no findings to report.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 gathering of data has been optional (and still is for 2014-15). As a result, we have no findings to 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.

   The gathering of data has been optional (and still is for 2014-15). As a result, we have no findings to report.
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.

**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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2014-2015 Astronomy PhD**
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
Coming Soon

**Goals**
G 1: Coming Soon
Coming Soon

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

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

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

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

**O/O 5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Astronomy Ph.D. students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge. Areas of required knowledge are: i. at least two of the core physics areas, classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. ii. fundamental astrophysics and astronomical instrumentation and techniques. iii. stellar atmospheres, stellar structure and evolution, the interstellar medium, extragalactic astronomy, and relativistic astrophysics and cosmology. All Ph.D. students shall be able to demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and 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 degree progress, and for Ph.D. students, on their preparedness for independent research. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are available in the Qualifying Exam 2 Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

**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
### 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 program. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in the PhD in Astronomy program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- Measure: Motivations and Implications of Research | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication

**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

---

### 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; approximately 40 of them completed the program.
44 of them completed the certification program.

**Goals**

**G 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**G 2: Understands student development regarding learning.**
Understands student development regarding learning.

**G 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.**
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

**G 4: Can Effectively plan and assess instruction.**
Can Effectively plan for and assess instruction.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

**SLO 2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn. (G: 2) (M: 2)**
The teacher demonstrates understanding of how children learn and develop over a period of time, and provides learning opportunities that demonstrate a child's intellectual, social, and/or behavioral development/growth.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**SLO 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of children. (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher demonstrates understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and uses effective communication and professional behavior while differentiating instruction based on student need.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**SLO 4: Effectively plan and assess instruction. (G: 4) (M: 4)**
The teacher plans for and uses assessment in instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student needs, the community and curriculum goals.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Teaching Sequence (O: 1)**
EXC 7190 Teaching Sequence using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include: Rationale and design, lesson plans and continuous assessments and post-assessments and discussion of findings.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the EXC 7190 Teaching Sequence Rubric.

**M 2: Pupil change project. (O: 2)**
P-12 change project using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include a description of the behavior to be changed, a treatment for change, baseline and treatment data, and analysis and discussion of the results.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.**
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric.

**M 3: Performance Evaluation (O: 3)**
Performance Evaluation Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include indicators based on the Georgia Framework.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of children.**
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric.

**M 4: Lesson Plan (O: 4)**
Lesson Plan Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include lesson title and description, primary learning outcomes, procedures, technology, assessment, modifications, extension, and reflection.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
**Target for O4: Effectively plan and assess instruction.**

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

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

### Action Plan for All indicators

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Lesson Plan
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Effectively plan and assess instruction.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BLD Coordinator and BLD faculty

### Explore reliability of teaching sequence rubric

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Teaching Sequence
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
- **Implementation Description:** The current instructors using the teaching sequence rubric will meet with any new instructors in order to train new instructors on the use of the rubric. They will determine if further training is warranted.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BLD Coordinator and faculty

### Revise rubric

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

- **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**

**2014-2015 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd**

*(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST)*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

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

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

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

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

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

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

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Performance Evaluation (O: 1)**
Final 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
EXC 7941 A B F W Mean Grade 2014-2015 18 1 A

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
EXC 7130 A B C I Mean Grade 2014-2015 10 4 1 A

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
EXC 7130 A B C I Mean Grade 2014-2015 10 4 1 A

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

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Regarding the comprehensive examination data, a total of 13 students too comps. 12 of these students scored at or above a 3. The score range of students was 2.0- 4.0 with a mean score of 3.5.

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

#### Monitoring Student Progress

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

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

#### New Program Status Requires Changes in 2015-16

In the 2014-15 year the Board of Regents approved revisions to all Special Education Programs based on reporting requirements of the Professional Standards Commission. Thus, all our programs have been changed as of Fall 2015 from MEd to a differentiation between MEd and MAT. We will need to make changes to the entire reporting structure based on these changes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We are in the process of making these changes and hope to have them implemented in pilot fashion by the end of this academic year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director of Special Education (Easterbrooks through 2015, then Jolivette with assistance from Special Education Assessment Coordinator, Emerson)
- **Additional Resources:** Time

#### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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.

A curriculum matrix is available in Live Text on the program website.

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 used this system for several years now and are seeing the desired results based on student achievement. With the exception of one student who consistently received incompletes for acceptable reasons, we are seeing anticipated results. Strengths of this approach are that the questions students must answer and the activities they must participate in are solidly grounded in evidence-based practices. A weakness is that our programs now must differentiate between MAT and MEd and so we will need to make a differentiation within the assessment as well. At present we cannot respond to "What impact have recent program changes had on student learning" because we have no students yet in the MAT. We may be able to answer this next time around.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 Special Education Faculty meets annually to share results. Minutes of this meeting will be available in November associated with
the PAAR report in Live Text.

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.

Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: In 2014-15 the Georgia Professional Standards required all special education
programs to differentiate into MAT and MEd options. We did not receive permission to proceed on this from the Board of Regents
until the very end of Summer 2015 and so we are in the process of engaging in discussions and making decisions about how this will
influence assessment. We will be able to described this differentiation in the 2015-16 report. We have met all our action plans and will
be creating new plans based on the work we do this year.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

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

Our major accomplishment is that we met our target objectives in all areas.

**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 a special challenge this year that has been described elsewhere based on new expectations from the Georgia Professional
Standards Commission’s requirement to differentiate between the MAT and MEd. Our challenge will be to differentiate between these
groups in the areas of assessment. We anticipate that there will be two new reporting areas: Special Education MAT and Special
Education MEd. We use the same key assessments across the 5 disability categories, and so we should be able to collapse all of
special ed by degree into one report.

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

We did not make any changes this past year.

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

no modifications

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

Our faculty members are highly active across the university. Please see information reported in Digital Measures.

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

Our faculty members are very active in publishing and presenting. Please see information reported in GSU’s Digital Measures.

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

See Digital Measures Reports

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

Our graduation and retention rates are consistent with data from around the nation.

**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).

See Digital Measures

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Biology Assessment of Core**

(As of 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST)

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

---

**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

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

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**  
75%

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**  
66 of 80 (82%) of students answered the question correctly

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

**Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method**  
75%

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**  
92% answered correctly

**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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**  
87% answered 6 of 12

**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**  
85% MATCH CORRECT SCIENTIST

**M 6: Cell structure identification (O: 1)**  
Students were asked to match labels to their respective cellular parts on a diagram
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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: Content in Biology - Most lecture courses have opportunities to learn, practice and master this SLO since it essentially deals with the basic content in biology. SLO: Communication - This deals with written and oral communication skills. BIO3810 (Cell and Molecular Biology lab) teaches students how to both write and present scientific data professionally. SLO: Application of the Scientific Method - Most of the lab courses, Anatomy and Physiology lab, Cell and Molecular Biology lab and Animal Biology lab all have data based critical thinking of scientific problems. There are also topic seminars and most of the 4000 level courses are designed to analyze data and trouble shoot problems that represent applicable situations that occur in real life scenarios. SLO: Analysis - Most of the lab courses mentioned above have this component but a deeper analysis of data is delivered in: Theme based biology laboratory, Immunology and Infectious disease, Natural environment of Georgia, and Advanced Human Physiology. SLO: Basic lab/field techniques - All of the major lab courses offers opportunities to learn, practice and master this SLO.

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) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? The main issue that stands out is how much variability there is in collecting data for the same course with different sections. The data varies depending upon the time of day the course is offered and what semester is being assessed. In general, summer assesses better than Fall and Spring and mornings have better data than afternoon sections. In the future data will be collected to control for these variables. (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? The Biology department is growing in student population and in administrative structure so it is hard to tell what is affecting student learning. This coming year should offer clearer answers to this question but it's difficult to both grow and assess the effects of policy at the same time. (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings? The quality of the findings are definitely improving. More faculty are assessing in awareness of the SLOs and with the formation of the assessment committee the process of assessing has become more routine.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 structure for analyzing assessment data was agreed upon during the NTT faculty retreat in August of 2015 so the Biology Dept. has not yet systematically used the new structure for an entire academic year. The Biology Dept has Academic Professionals who oversee the major labs required to obtain a BS in Biology. The major labs are also connected to major lectures and the APs work to assure consistency in content as various instructors take turns teaching the major lectures. The APs are all on the assessment committee and collect data from the lectures they are associated with and report their findings to the committee. The committee then analyzes the data and assesses how to improve weak areas in relations to satisfying the SLOs expected for their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
<th>Target for O1: Content in Biology</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Content in Biology</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method</th>
<th>85% would get 75% correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</td>
<td>87% met goal of 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Analysis</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</td>
<td>87% met goal of 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 assessment process described in the previous analysis question is being executed starting during the Fall 2015 semester. After the Fall semester the committee will meet to discuss the data and determine how well the assessment process is going.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Biology BS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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, 17)
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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
87% of students answered correctly

Target for O4: Analysis
90% of students were able to participate in an analytical discussion of the in class assignment

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target for O4: Analysis</th>
<th>Target for O5: Basic field/lab techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>Lab Technique in Cell Biology (O: 4, 5)</td>
<td>Students were expected to determine, using molecular tools, if a sample contained protein or DNA</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12</td>
<td>Historical Changes over time content (O: 1)</td>
<td>Question: Matching the following people to their contribution toward the advancement of microbiology</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>Merging knowledge from many disciplines to biological theory (O: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>Content of questions: Apply knowledge from other scientific disciplines (ie. General biology, immunology, and human anatomy/physiology) to the understanding of fundamental biological principles</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14</td>
<td>Creating molecular bonds (O: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15</td>
<td>Oral presentation of scientific findings (O: 2, 4)</td>
<td>Students were asked to orally present data of experiments performed in BIO3810</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O4: Analysis**
75%

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
80% of students were able to analyze their laboratory data and present the analysis to the class

**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%

**Target for **O5: Basic field/lab techniques**
75%

**M 17: Question about cell parts (O: 1)**
Students were asked to match the names of organelles to their respective location on a labeled diagram
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for **O1: Content in Biology**
80% of students were expected to match 80% of the organelles to their location on a diagram

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
85% matched the labels 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

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Cell and Mol Bio in class activity | **Outcome/Objective:** Application of the Scientific Method

- **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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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: Content in Biology - Most lecture courses have opportunities to learn, practice and master this SLO since it essentially deals with the basic content in biology SLO: Communication -This deals with written and oral communication skills. BIO3810 (Cell and Molecular Biology lab) teaches students how to both write and present scientific data professionally. SLO: Application of the Scientific Method -Most of the lab courses, Anatomy and Physiology lab, Cell and Molecular Biology lab and Animal Biology lab all have data based critical thinking of scientific problems. There are also topic seminars and most of the 4000 level courses are designed to analyze data and troubleshoot problems that represent applicable situations that occur in real life scenarios. SLO: Analysis - Most of the lab courses mentioned above have this component but a deeper analysis of data is delivered in: Theme based biology laboratory, Immunology and Infectious disease, Natural environment of Georgia, and Advanced Human Physiology. SLO: Basic lab/field techniques -All of the major lab courses offers opportunities to learn, practice and master this SLO

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) What strengths and weaknesses do the findings reveal about the program and/or the assessment process? The main issue that stands out is how much variability there is in collecting data for the same course with different sections. The data varies depending upon the time of day the course is offered and what semester is being assessed. In general, summer assesses better than Fall and Spring and mornings have better data than afternoon sections. In the future data will be collected to control for these variables. (2) What impact have recent program changes had on student learning (indicate those program changes that resulted from previous assessment findings)? The Biology department is growing in student population and in administrative structure so it is hard to tell what is affecting student learning. This coming year should offer clearer answers to this question but it's difficult to both grow and assess the effects of policy at the same time. (3) What impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings? The quality of the findings are definitely improving. More faculty are assessing in awareness of the SLOs and with the formation of the assessment committee the process of assessing has become more routine.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 structure for analyzing assessment data was agreed upon during the NTT faculty retreat in August of 2015 so the Biology Dept. has not yet systematically used the new structure for an entire academic year. The Biology Dept has Academic Professionals who oversee the major labs required to obtain a BS in Biology. The major labs are also connected to major lectures and the APs work to assure consistency in content as various instructors take turns teaching the major lectures. The APs are all on the assessment committee and collect data from the lectures they are associated with and report their findings to the committee. The committee then analyzes the data and assesses how to improve weak areas in relations to satisfying the SLOs expected for their courses.

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 assessment process described in the previous analysis question is being executed starting during the Fall 2015 semester. After the Fall semester the committee will meet to discuss the data and determine how well the assessment process is going.

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

Goals

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

G 2: Critical Thinkers
Students will be able to reason and think critically.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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

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

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.2 Establish University-Level Research Centers.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
4.1 Expand the number of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Conduct Research (G: 1) (M: 1)
Demonstrating skills of scientific professionals, students will be able to apply scientific principles via performance of a laboratory or literary based paper.

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

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.2 Establish University-Level Research Centers.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Thesis (O: 1, 2)

The thesis is the capstone assignment. These capstone provides a measure of the accomplishments of thesis students in scientific content, inquiry, and communication. Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend the current scientific literature; form hypotheses, design experiments, collect data, and evaluate results; place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and develop an understanding of the impact of these discoveries on science and society. Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Scientific Literacy

90% of the thesis proposals are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.

Target for O2: Conduct Research

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

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

Target for O1: Scientific Literacy

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

---
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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**

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Measure:** 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. 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: 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. 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.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Goals

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 run 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 where 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Business Analysis MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (O: 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.

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 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 i 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. 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

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
The chemistry department is certified by the American Chemical Society (ACS). This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual assessment. Members of our academic areas are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and student learning outcomes.

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 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 assessment.
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 assessment process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with development of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level. Since critical thinking is so important to the discipline, this is the measure that we will be addressing in the core.

### Goals

#### G 1: Critical Thinking Assessment in the Core

Area D Critical Thinking Assessment for Chemistry Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. 1) The American Chemical Society provides national-level exit exams for all the area D courses within the chemistry program. A representative faculty committee for area D was formed in 2004 and 8 questions from each test were chosen as questions that would require critical thinking. The faculty voted that a 2/8 would demonstrate appropriate critical thinking skills. The expected outcomes were based on the Department of Chemistry Learning Outcome rubric submitted to the Provost's office prior to Fall 2004. 2) A rubric was developed to assess critical thinking skills demonstrated in the laboratory reports required for these courses. 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 American Chemical Society (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 American Chemical Society (ACS) exit examination for each course were chosen by the faculty. The national mean and median for these questions is known and the department uses this as an indicator of students' critical thinking skills. The national mean for all exams is between 2.5 and 3.1 questions correct. (Nationally for this subset of questions the average student answers 2.5 - 3.1 of the 8 questions correct) The departmental goal is 4 out of the 8 questions correct.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: ACS exam questions for 1151 (G: 1)

These questions are copyrighted and can not be placed in report.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry
Target goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 6.2 out of 8.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 6.3 out of 8

**M 2: ACS exam in 1152 (O: 1)**
ACS results of 8 critical thinking questions off of Chem 1152 exam
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**
Goal was 4/8

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 5.4 out of 8

**M 3: ACS Exit exam in 1211 (O: 1)**
Students got 4/8 on 1211 ACS exit exam on critical thinking problems
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**
Goal was 4/8.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.1 out of 8

**M 4: ACS result in 1212 (O: 1)**
Students should receive at least a 4/8 on critical thinking questions on the ACS exam
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 5.6 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
85% of students who completed course received an adequate or better.

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

**Pre-lab lecture**
Improve the understanding of in laboratory exercises with clearer theory discussions 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 mathmatical skills.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: More practical math problems on worksheets and pre test materials.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
The Department graduated 63 students with a BSc degree in 2014-2015. This is the highest amount of undergraduate students that
the department has graduated in the past 10 years. Additionally, we had our largest number of majors in 2014-2015 at 537 students. We have established a LinkedIn page for our undergraduate alumni students. Through LinkedIn, we are able to track our graduates. It also allows us to create connections with our former students and their organizations so that we can assist our current students with possible internships and networking opportunities.

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

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate), Faculty Senate Committees (e.g., Finance Committee), and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the Pennsylvania State University (Penn State). This provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the undergraduate and graduate levels. The principles of liberal arts education are adhered to in the chemistry department, 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 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 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.

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


**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Chemistry BS**

As of 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 postgraduate study 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 affords 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
Measures, Targets, and Findings

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking

Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. Upon Graduation students will be able to take and analyze real world data to develop a knowledge base and the ability to draw conclusions from this knowledge base. Thought processes should be rational, logical and consequent. 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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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.

American Chemical Society

American Chemical Society

American Chemical Society

American Chemical Society
### 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 2014-2015 - Target:** Met

Average was a 4 out of 8

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target:** Met

Average was a 4 out of 8

### M 2: laboratory reports (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The senior level analytical courses (4000, 4010 and 4190) use laboratory reports to assess different outcomes.

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

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

Average of "Adequate" on Rubric

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target:** Met

80% scored adequate or better on final paper

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

Adequate or better under critical thinking on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target:** Met

80% scored adequate or better

**Target for O3: Technology**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target:** Met

90% of students met goals

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**

90% of students should be able to use quantitative skills from laboratory measurements.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target:** Partially Met

90% of students met goals

### 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 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 class. We have also received feedback that students are actively engaging in the discussions, and feel that they are improving their problem solving skills 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 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 most confusing or misunderstood, as well as what other persons teaching upper level courses were thinking. This approach has been very successful 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 DFW rates for our core courses over the last ten years, we have still been working hard to maintain and improve student retention and satisfaction. Success for students through foundation courses is still a fundamental priority of our department. We are always looking for new methods that will enhance our students’ performance and progression through our lower level course. It is important now more than ever because of 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 our organic division has been evaluating the various available online homework systems available for students. These evaluations have been conducted by arranging free trials of these systems for entire classes, so that the students could use the homework course of the entire class only who thought that topics shared by the major online systems were not only what they thought 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 material. Course online homework systems were then chosen based on student feedback as well as instructor perspectives. Our faculty have been working with support from the chosen homework systems to help tailor these 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, 3411) we have also successfully implemented Peer Led Team Learning. 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 then given online by the instructor of record. The key concepts of these online lectures were further re-emphasized during lectures. The PLTL model: students were divided into groups of approximately 16-17 students/group (a total of 12 groups for a class of 194 students), to work on workshop problems with an undergraduate peer leader. Each group met 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 course restructuring and expansion over the last ten years. The focus 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 6,654 undergraduate credit hours for a total of 12,920 undergraduate credit hours during the 2003-2004 school year. In 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, 6 sections of 1202 for 407 students, and 5 sections 1203 for 407 students. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 27 % to 13 % during the 1211 course. The ACS scores are slightly higher. A ten year analysis of the 3410 course shows an increase from 355 students in 2003 to 519 students in 2013 which is an increase of 77 %. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 36 % to 21 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same. During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 36 % to 17 % during the 3411 course. A ten year analysis of the 3411 course shows an increase from 355 students in 2003 to 519 students in 2013 which is an increase of 17 % during the 3411 course. The ACS scores are statistically the same. A ten year analysis of the 4600 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 %. There was a slight drop in DFW rates for the 3410 course which is an increase of 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 change the current course content without the input of all course instructors. As partial of the plan to accommodate the 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. Upper Division Courses for Majors As we have seen the demand for our core courses grow, the number of majors we are teaching has grown as well. Most of this 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 342 Chemistry Majors; and during the 2013-2014 school year the department had 498 Chemistry Majors. This is a 85 % 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 of the demand on our major is done by evaluating the demand for our CHEM 4000 class. This class is a prerequisite 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. Since that time we have seen the demand for our other upper division courses following a trend similar to our CHEM 4000 course. 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 trying to approximate our headcounts and space requirements for the next 8 years.

Finding methods for meeting increased class demand
With the class size growing in almost every course; new methods of meeting student demand will need to be evaluated. Limited lab space is becoming a large factor for our department, however we have recently had issues with lecture rooms as well. We will need to find creative ways to work with our heavy course demands at the freshman and sophomore instructional levels.

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 largest challenge our department has faced is keeping our desired student performance despite a dramatic increase in the number of credit hours that our department is teaching. We have implemented tutorial sections to our high risk courses, we have had added support from the Office of Supplemental Instruction, and we have added Faculty lead breakout sessions. All of this has been done to help improve student performance and student progression. The result of this preparation has meant that our student performance has remained relatively stable over the last five years despite the dramatic increase in the number of students that are being taught. We are teaching nearly 8,000 more credit hours than we were 5 years ago, and yet our student performance base on our SLO's has been fairly stable. We see this as a sign that our focus outside of lecture support is allowing our student to succeed and to maintain a level of performance that is consistent with programs standards.

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.

With our continuous struggle with growing class sizes our department is having to constantly innovate our teaching and student development. Our organic division has been looking into the advantages and drawbacks of Peer Lead Team Learning classroom formats as well as working to provide free tutoring for students in these high risk courses. One major advantage that our department has is that our learning objectives and desired student outcomes are based on American Chemical Society (ACS) standards. Having and external accreditation on our program has provided us with a set of current and relevant standards on which to base our SLO's. Our concern moving forward will be to continue to meet and exceed these standards while dealing with a rapidly growing major, dealing with a rapidly growing population in our core and high demand courses.

Annual Report Section Responses

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

The Department graduated 63 students with a BSc degree in 2014-2015. This is the highest amount of undergraduate students that the department has graduated in the past 10 years. Additionally, we had our largest number of majors in 2014-2015 at 537 students. We have established a Linkedin page for our undergraduate alumni students. Through Linkedin, we are able to track our graduates. The result of this preparation has meant that our student performance has remained relatively stable over the last five years despite the dramatic increase in the number of students that are being taught. We are teaching nearly 8,000 more credit hours than we were 5 years ago, and yet our student performance base on our SLO's has been fairly stable. We see this as a sign that our focus outside of lecture support is allowing our student to succeed and to maintain a level of performance that is consistent with programs standards.

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

- University Senate
- Faculty Senators
- Jun Yin
- Kathryn Grant
- Dabney Dixon
- Ainim Liu
- Rayvo Ivanov
- Senate Sustainability Committee
- Dabney Dixon (Chair)
- Jun Yin
- Senate Admissions and Standards Committee
- Rayvo Ivanov
- Senate Academic Programs
- Ainim Liu
- Kathryn Grant
- Senate Information Systems & Technology Committee
- Ainim Liu
- Kathryn Grant
- Senate
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) with a bioinformatics option 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 and faculty over the last decade.

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


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

Dr. Comar and Dr. Pascoe In Summer 2015, Dr. Joan Mutanyatta-Comar, Dr. Angela Narvavro-Eisenstein and Dr. Keith Pascoe were invited to participate in the 2015 University Immersion Program (IUP) organized by the International Office of Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, UPI, initiated in the year 2012, is a two-week summer program that convenes professors from world-class universities worldwide to give short courses and lectures to both domestic and international students at both undergraduate and graduate levels. IUP courses cover a wide range of topics including natural sciences, medicine, art, law, business, and literature. Drs. Mutanyatta-Comar and Pascoe taught organic chemistry I & II, respectively, whereas Dr. Narvavro-Eisenstein taught biochemistry. The three faculty were accompanied by three Georgia State University senior students: two chemistry majors and one biology major. The students participated in the 2015 summer "International Exchange Camp" which covered topics such as water quality analysis and metal etching. They also attended short chemistry lectures delivered by distinguished scholars both domestic and international. Bin Xu Study Abroad The study abroad program initiated in 2012, Learning the Pharmaceutical Globalization Trend through a Culture and Language Prism, is sponsored by Department of Chemistry and Confucius Institute at GSU. It is designed to offer students opportunities to learn about the global trends in pharmaceutical development through a culture and language prism in an exemplary emerging market-China. During the 2-week program (Maymester) in Beijing, China, formal lectures discussing general topics about pharmaceutical sciences and biotechnology including history and development trends will be offered. Other activities are including guest lectures and site visits to research institutes/universities and pharmaceutical CRO companies. Formal lectures about Chinese culture and language will also be arranged as well as the excursion trips for culture and history experience. Since the start of this program in 2012, more than 20 students have participated this program (2012- 2014) and excellent feedback has since been received. The trip did not go in 2015, but it is resumed in 2016.
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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) with a bioinformatics option 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 is 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 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 and productively 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. 4. Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry. 5. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter. 6. Effectively perform laboratory operations to collect appropriate experimental evidence in conjunction with 2.1 - 2.5. 7. Students will be able to apply theory learned in lecture courses to original research performed under the supervision of a faculty member.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14-SUM 14), 25 students were eligible to defend a thesis, and 25 successfully defended. 3 students were eligible to graduate with a non-thesis masters and 3 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14-SUM 14), 25 students were eligible to defend a thesis, and 25 successfully defended. 3 students were eligible to graduate with a non-thesis masters and 3 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14-SU 15), 25 students were eligible to defend a thesis, and 25 successfully defended. 3 students were eligible to graduate with a non-thesis masters and 3 students graduated.
**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) with a bioinformatics option 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. 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 is 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 the training of students to conduct independent research in the chemical sciences.

**Goals**

**G1: 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. Additionally, students are required to submit an end of semester report on their research which requires the student to formally go through the critical thinking process by providing a detail analysis of their research (each semester) using the ACS research format. All Ph.D. students are required to submit a dissertation proposal where they provide background and significance of their research, present preliminary data, and propose and develop future experiments to test several hypothesis they propose in.
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 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
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
By June 2015, 17 students took the qualifying exam – 100% or all 17 students passed the exam.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
By June 2015, 17 students took the qualifying exam – 100% or all 17 students passed the exam.

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
By June 2015, 17 students took the qualifying exam – 100% or all 17 students passed the exam.
### Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
By June 2015, 17 students took the qualifying exam – 100% or all 17 students 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 reviews, and writing before the dissertation defense can be scheduled. Each semester, the student is expected to make satisfactory research progress and under the guidance and at the direction of the research advisor, the candidate will write an updated progress report of his/her research for a grade. Additionally, the final portion of a student's academic work is spent in the laboratory where research is conducted and through weekly group meetings the student must communicate to advisor and peers his/her research. The student must also meet with his/her dissertation committee once each academic year to provide an overview of research project and to report and discuss research progress. When the student schedules the dissertation defense, it is only at the approval of the research advisor and dissertation committee.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14, SP 15, SU 15), 15 out of 15 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14, SP 15, SU 15), 15 out of 15 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14, SP 15, SU 15), 15 out of 15 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In 2014-2015 (FA 14, SP 15, SU 15), 15 out of 15 or 100% of those defending successfully defended their dissertation and graduated.

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

**Continued Quality**
Our goal is to continue excellence with our program’s growth.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 12
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

**Continued Quality and Growth**
The department has met all its goals and will continue to grow while keeping the quality of the program.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.
**Action Plan**
The PhD program meets all our objectives. Our plan is to continue this excellence with continued growth.

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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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**

**2014-2015 Communication Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Communication prepares students to collaborate with and enhance local, state, regional, national, and global communities in the media age, utilizing oral, written, and visual communication skills as well as critical thinking and media literacy skills related to communication.

The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University's Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students’ oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication.

**Goals**

**G 1: effective communicators**
Students become effective consumers and producers of communicative acts in various contexts.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: critical thinking (G: 1) (M: 1)**

At the end of the semester, students will be able to...

1. Explain the various components of human communication.
2. Apply major principles of human communication to specific instances.
3. Create and deliver a public speech.
4. Analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions.
5. Consider opposing points of view when appropriate.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 2: oral competency (G: 1) (M: 2, 3)**

Students will be able to:

1. Engage in communication across various settings and context, including: small group discussions, meetings, interpersonal dyads and public speaking.
2. Increase their predisposition toward communication.
3. Reduce their perceived apprehension associated with communication.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
M 1: Cornell Critical Thinking Exam (O: 1)

In order to assess "critical thinking" among students who have taken SPCH1000, we define critical thinking as: "reasonable and reflective thinking on deciding what to believe or do" (Ennis, Millman, & Tomko, 2005). In the past three academic years, we have adopted the Cornell Critical Thinking Exam Z as the means by which to measure critical thinking, as it was designed to test critical thinking among advanced high school students, college students, and graduate students. Exam Z is a general-content critical thinking measure, which uses content from a variety of subject matter familiar to our target group. Exam Z provides both an overall score, and subtest scores for each type of critical thinking skill. For this reason, it promises to provide more detailed data than other similar assessments. As the summer 2015 term was the first time we had assessed SPCH1000 under Area B (critical thinking), our sample was extremely small, and only showed post-test results. In the fall 2013, spring 2014, and summer 2014 semesters, we conducted a full course assessment across all SPCH1000 sections, with a pre-test / post-test format. In fall 2013, we collected pre & post-test data from 1,020 students; in spring 2014, 817 students completed the pre & post-test exams; and in summer 2014, 40 students completed both pre & post-test exams. We were, therefore, successful in attaining our projected goal for SPCH1000 assessment, namely: "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 have continued the exhaustive nature of our data collection and analysis during the 2014-2015 academic cycle, resulting in equally comprehensive assessment of the Speech Core. Based on the meta-summaries collected by Ennis et al., we expect to find the above results among our SPCH1000 students. Earlier findings of the Cornell Critical Thinking Exam Z at various academic institutions show that the mean score for upper division undergraduates is 31.7, the mean score for lower division undergraduates is 26.4, and the mean score for remedial undergraduates is 20.8. In these initial attempts at assessing critical thinking in the Core Curriculum, we predict that the percentage of SPCH1000 students will breakdown as shown in Target Scores. Due to the robust nature of SPCH1000 assessment during the 2014-2015 academic calendar year, we have broken down the data into three categories: (a) the overall mean average for each semester; (b) the overall distribution of scores for each semester; and (c) the mean average for each subset of critical thinking skills.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: critical thinking

Based on the meta-summaries collected by Ennis et al., we expect to find the above results among our SPCH1000 students. Earlier findings of the Cornell Critical Thinking Exam Z at various academic institutions show that the mean score for upper division undergraduates is 31.7, the mean score for lower division undergraduates is 26.4, and the mean score for remedial undergraduates is 20.8. In these initial attempts at assessing critical thinking in the Core Curriculum, we predict that the percentage of SPCH1000 students will breakdown as shown in Target Scores.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

All sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the CT measure, producing: 1258 scores in fall 2014, 760 scores in spring 2015, 69 scores in summer 2015. Due to the robust nature of SPCH1000 assessment during the 2014-2015 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. The overall mean averages indicated an increase in students' critical thinking aptitude: From 23.14 to 24.04 (fall 2014), From 23.37 to 24.32 (spring 2015). From 23.05 to 23.95 (summer 2015). 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 (31.7). 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.

M 2: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (O: 2)

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, used widely in the field of communication studies due to its internal validity and reliability, measures students' perceived apprehension across diverse communication contexts, including: small group discussions, meetings, interpersonal dyads and public speaking. Although the survey generates data regarding apprehension in all areas, the public speaking context remains the most relevant to our current assessment goals.

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

Target for O2: oral competency

We hope to find an overall decrease in students' communication apprehension in the various situations. Logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in SPCH1000 will result in a significant decrease in the public communication score. We also expect to find a decrease in communication apprehension in other situations: group, meeting, and interpersonal.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

All sections of SPCH1000 were selected for data interpretation using the PRCA measure, producing: 1255 scores in fall 2014, 944 scores in spring 2015, 72 scores in summer 2015. The mean scores indicated an overall decrease in students' communication apprehension in the various situations: From 64.75 to 64.50 (fall 2014), From 64.40 to 63.92 (spring 2015), From 64.05 to 63.83 (summer 2015). Logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in SPCH1000 is partly, but not wholly, responsible for the decreases in the public communication score (see corresponding document). All other situations showed a decrease in students' communication apprehension, as indicated by the corresponding document.

M 3: Willingness to Communicate (O: 2)

The Willingness to Communicate Scale, also used universally among Speech Communication departments, indicates students' predisposition to engaging in or avoiding communication contact. Like the PRCA-Z4 survey, WTC measures students' responses in different communication settings and once again the public communication setting is most relevant to assessing oral communication competencies in the Speech 1000 curriculum.

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

Target for O2: oral competency

We hope to find an overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations. Logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in SPCH1000 will result in a significant decrease in the public communication score as well as the communication with a stranger score. We also expect to find an increase in willingness to communicate in other situations: group,
Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All sections of SPCH1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing: 1255 scores in fall 2014, 944 scores in spring 2015, 72 scores in summer 2015. The mean scores indicated an overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in various situations: From 65.27 to 66.23 (fall 2014), From 64.79 to 66.25 (spring 2015), From 62.71 to 63.91 (summer 2015). Logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in SPCH1000 is partly, but not wholly responsible for the increases in both the public communication score and communication with a stranger score (see corresponding documents). All other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate, as indicated by the corresponding documents.

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

Full Pilot of Critical Thinking Assessment
In the 2013-2014 academic calendar year, we plan to engage a full-fledged pilot of the Critical Thinking Assessment across all SPCH1000 sections (approximately 1000-1200 students per semester), compare pre-test & post-test scores, and break the overall critical thinking score into various skill sets.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Davin Grindstaff, SPCH1000 Course Director

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: In-Progress
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: 10/2016
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?

All 3 assessment measures for the Communication Core (PRCA, WTC, CT) have produced consistent and significant results for the 2013-2014 & 2014-2015 academic calendar years, showing a substantial increase in critical thinking skills and reduction in communication apprehension among SPCH1000 students. The move to online data collection and standardization of assessment measures have improved the quality and quantity of the data collected. The data not only demonstrates the success of course standardization for SPCH1000, as student scores remain consistent across multiple sections and a diverse teaching pool for the course, but it also indicates that SPCH1000 has indeed met the goals and student learning objectives set forth in the Core 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.

In the 2013-2014 Assessment Report, we proposed the following: “We plan to begin a larger conversation with instructors and graduate students who teach SPCH1000. 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.” We successfully began this action plan in 2014-2015, and will continue the conversation in 2015-2016, developing more specific teaching methods in SPCH1000 to target the improvement of critical thinking skills in the Communication Core.
**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Scholarly or creative excellence**

Our highly diverse cohort of MA students can nonetheless be divided into two broad categories: those whose work is centered on scholarship and research, and those whose work is centered on the creative production of media work (films, videos, images, etc.). Students in the creative tracks are expected to develop a strong personal aesthetic vision as evidenced in their work, as well as a solid mastery of the technical demands of media production. Students in the research tracks are expected to produce a methodologically sound and theoretically rigorous scholarly exploration of a question central to the sub-field of communication which they are working in.

**G 2: Broad understanding of communications fields**

The MA in Communication trains students in a number of different sub-fields in our discipline, ranging from rhetorical studies to quantitative studies of media messages, from humanistic approaches to film and media to digital moving image production. Nevertheless, all students receiving the MA in Communication are expected to have a broad understanding of the various disciplines and interdisciplinary traditions that comprise the field of communication.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions (G: 2) (M: 1, 5, 6)**

Students should demonstrate a command of the key texts in their area of specialization. These include theoretical and scholarly literature in the area; additionally, for the Film/Video specialization, it includes a breadth of knowledge of the important artistic works, styles, and movements that comprise the film canon.

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

Writing: the student is able to effectively present research in writing, cogently and effectively orchestrating his/her knowledge of the literature and theory to present a well-organized, clearly written, and effective argument. Production students are expected to write proposals that clearly convey the aesthetic qualities of the proposed work, as well as situate the work within larger aesthetic traditions. (film production track) Aesthetic and Technical: Students in the film production track are expected to have a thorough knowledge of the history of cinematic forms of expression; are expected to develop an original artistic voice in which to express themselves; and are expected to produce works that have a solid technical command of the components of filmmaking (cinematography, editing, sound).

**SLO 3: Understanding of research methods (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 5, 6)**

Research and Method: Students are expected to be able to formulate a research problem which poses a significant and original intervention in the field. They are able to select both the appropriate objects of study and the appropriate theoretical tools pertinent to addressing this problem.

**SLO 4: Engagement with New Media (G: 2)**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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

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 for students in the Mass Comm and Human Comm tracks; 6020 Advanced Film Theory for students in the Film, Video, and Digital Imaging Studies track; and 6145 Digital Editing for students in the Film, Video, and Digital Imaging Production track. This strategy of three (3) key points for assessment is 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] action plan included a complete rethinking of the graduate assessment in the department. In the Fall, the graduate director (Restivo) met with Marti Singer to discuss ways to implement a new assessment for a very complex graduate program with many areas of specialization. The grad director then mapped out some preliminary sets of rubrics and measures. Early in the Spring of 2012, the grad director met with each area of the doctoral and MA faculties, and worked with them to devise clear and relevant learning outcomes, rubrics, and measures for each of the tracks of the MA and PhD programs. We decided to designate key core courses in each area of the MA and PhD programs as those in which student performance would be measured. We developed learning outcomes which, while parallel throughout the various tracks, nevertheless are able to measure learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are expected across all the tracks. (See associated appended documents.) "For the Mass Comm and Human Comm MA tracks, the core courses for assessment will be Issues and Perspectives in Communication, and Research Methods in Communication. New rubrics are being designed for both these courses, to more accurately pinpoint student performance across a variety of areas. For the Film-Media Studies area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media History. The rubrics have been developed for Advanced Film Theory and are in the process of being developed for Media History. For the Film Production area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media Expression. These rubrics have been developed."

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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.

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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
## 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.

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

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

- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
- Measure: Quality of creative or research thesis | Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
- Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense | 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>Implementation Status:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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, 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>Implementation Status:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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

**Implementation Description:** BoR signed off on this program in August 2014. Department will accept first applications in March 2015 for
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: Chair; production faculty

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, which faculty will be able to “bookmark” in their browsers, 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: Graduate 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
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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)**  
The student can apply the basic principles of biological science, physical science, and the behavioral/social sciences to communication sciences and disorders.

**SLO 3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)**  
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)**  
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)**  
The student can discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.

**SLO 6: Evaluate Research Relevance (G: 1, 2) (M: 8)**  
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)**  
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**  
100% of students passed the PRAXIS II exam on their first attempt.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**  
95% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average in this area of the PRAXIS exam. Ten students scored above average, 9 students had an average score, and 1 student scored below average.

**M 3: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) (O: 3, 4)**  
Score for Category II Phonological and Language Disorders.  
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state  
**Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Nine scored above, 4 scored below, and 7 scored within the national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Nine scored above, 4 scored below, and 7 scored within the national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Score for Category III Speech Disorders.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Five scored above, 1 scored below, and 14 scored within the national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Five scored above, 1 scored below, and 14 scored within the national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Score for Category IV Neurogenic Disorders.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Nine scored above, 2 scored below, and 9 scored within the national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Nine scored above, 2 scored below, and 9 scored within the national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) (O: 3, 4)**

Score for Category V Audiology, Hearing.

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

**Target for 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall program performance was 74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (4-6), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

**M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemt) (O: 4)**

Score for Category VI Clinical Management.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
**Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
90% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Eleven scored above, 1 scored below, and 8 scored within the national average.

**M 8: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) (O: 5, 6)**
Score for Category VII Professional Issues, Psychometrics, Research.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
90% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Four scored above, 1 scored below, and 15 scored within the national average.

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
90% of the students for which there is data scored at or above the national average. Four scored above, 1 scored below, and 15 scored within the national average.

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

**Monitor student performance**
Two students scored below the national average on the Clinical Management subtest of the Praxis II exam. This was surprising for two reasons; both students performed well in their clinical experiences, and the program graduates have met or exceeded the national average on this subtest every 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 Managemt)
  | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues)
  | Outcome/Objective: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct

Implementation Description: Students’ scores for this subtest will be monitored during the next two years for potential trends in student performance.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
- Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator.
- Additional Resources: None

**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
The Graduate Program in Communication offers its students a multi-disciplinary curriculum leading to the Ph.D. degree. The program is designed to provide students with a solid foundation in communication sciences and disorders while allowing them to specialize in areas of interest. The program also has an At-Risk procedure that is followed for any students not performing in courses as expected. We adjust our curriculum as needed based on needs of the populations we serve and advances in the field.

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. During the 2014-2015 cycle 80% of our students achieved this goal. Although this is a decline from the previous two cycles it is still believed that changes to the curriculum (adding two new language courses) will improve performance on this part of the PRAXIS exam.

We will continue to monitor our students' ability to achieve our stated goal for another two years. We no longer have the portfolio which was one index in this area. During the 2014-2015 cycle 87% of our students achieved this goal demonstrating minimum improvement. We have recently added two new language courses and are predicting that there will continue to be an improvement in scores in this area. During the 2013-2014 cycle 80% of our students achieved this goal. Although this is a decline from the previous two cycles it is still believed that changes to the curriculum (adding two new language courses) will improve performance on this part of the PRAXIS exam.

Overall, our program continues to be successful in meeting our goals and producing qualified speech-language pathologists. Most of our goals have been achieved and students are completing our program with great success. Our employment rate is 100% which reflects the quality of our graduates and program. Over the years we have adjusted our program as needed based on student needs and meeting of our goals. We have added two faculty positions in the last 5 years and have hired faculty members to fill other positions. We adjust our curriculum as needed based on needs of the populations we serve and advances in communication sciences and disorders. During the 2014-15 cycle we underwent reaccreditation and were successful with this process, receiving reaccreditation for another 8 years. The reaccreditation process allowed us another assessment path for our program and very few weaknesses were revealed. We also provide an annual report to our accrediting agency reporting changes, etc... to the program. We survey our students and alumni every two years and review those results together as a faculty. All students complete an exit survey which also provides us with suggestions to improve or maintain the quality of our curriculum. The faculty review the summary of these results too. All students are monitored for progress with their KASFA throughout the program. The program also has an At-Risk procedure that is followed for any students not performing in courses as expected. The WEAVE process is just one of many ways that the CSD faculty evaluate our student progress.

The program also has an At-Risk procedure that is followed for any students not performing in courses as expected. The WEAVE process is just one of many ways that the CSD faculty evaluate our student progress.

Overall, our program continues to be successful in meeting our goals and producing qualified speech-language pathologists. Most of our goals have been achieved and students are completing our program with great success. Our employment rate is 100% which reflects the quality of our graduates and program. Over the years we have adjusted our program as needed based on student needs and meeting of our goals. We have added two faculty positions in the last 5 years and have hired faculty members to fill other positions. We adjust our curriculum as needed based on needs of the populations we serve and advances in communication sciences and disorders. During the 2014-15 cycle we underwent reaccreditation and were successful with this process, receiving reaccreditation for another 8 years. The reaccreditation process allowed us another assessment path for our program and very few weaknesses were revealed. We also provide an annual report to our accrediting agency reporting changes, etc... to the program. We survey our students and alumni every two years and review those results together as a faculty. All students complete an exit survey which also provides us with suggestions to improve or maintain the quality of our curriculum. The faculty review the summary of these results too. All students are monitored for progress with their KASFA throughout the program. The program also has an At-Risk procedure that is followed for any students not performing in courses as expected. The WEAVE process is just one of many ways that the CSD faculty evaluate our student progress.

The use of only the PRAXIS data is used for this assessment process. The faculty have developed a plan as outlined in past reports. Not meeting a goal was typically only a small percentage (typically equaling only one student) or did not represent a trend, so often we decided to wait to evaluate the goal after the next cycle. During the next cycle the goals were usually achieved. We no longer have the portfolio which was one index of student progress. The use of only the PRAXIS data is used for this assessment beginning this cycle.
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is designed to prepare students for research and teaching in one of three primary areas of emphasis: Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Images Studies. The curriculum is designed to provide students with in depth training in communication pedagogy and the professional expectations of the discipline, as well as mentored experiences in both teaching and research.

**Goals**

**G 1: To produce Phds highly skilled in research**
The areas of Rhetoric/Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Image Studies are all highly interdisciplinary, drawing on a broad range of theoretical and intellectual traditions. We would like our Phds to frame research questions with full understanding of their positioning within this broad discursive matrix, while at the same time having highly developed research skills specific to their research questions.

**G 2: To produce excellent undergraduate teachers**
We seek to produce Phds with demonstrated teaching excellence in the undergraduate classroom, both at the level of the introductory or survey course and in higher-level courses related to their research projects.

**G 3: To foster academic professionalism**
We strive to produce Phds with significant professional experience, including presentation at conferences in their area (Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, or Moving Image Studies), professional interaction with leading scholars in their areas of research, publication in journals, and service activities in the graduate student caucuses of the professional organizations in their area.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Knowledge of Literatures (G: 1) (M: 6, 7, 8)**
Because all three of our doctoral tracks are highly interdisciplinary, the students in each track are expected to have solid mastery of the diverse literatures informing their particular area of study. Background: In the academic year 2010-11, we piloted an online system of end-of-course assessment for all graduate courses in the department. While some important information was gathered with this system, the data parsing and analysis proved to be an extreme burden on the limited number of faculty able to do it, and at the same time, we were getting lots of extraneous or irrelevant information. In light of this, last year’s action plan included a complete rethinking of the graduate assessment in the department. In the Fall, the graduate director (Restivo) met with Marti Singer to discuss ways to implement a new assessment for a very complex graduate program with many areas of specialization. The grad director then mapped out some preliminary sets of rubrics and measures. Early in the Spring of 2012, the grad director met with each area of the doctoral and MA faculties, and worked with them to devise clear and relevant learning outcomes, rubrics, and measures for each of the tracks of the MA and PhD programs. We decided to designate key core courses in each area of the MA and PhD programs as those in which student performance would be measured. We developed learning outcomes which, while parallel throughout the various tracks, nevertheless are able to measure learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are expected across all the tracks. (See uploaded documents.) For the doctoral programs, we developed new, and much more nuanced, rubrics for measuring performance on the comprehensive exams, specific to each area. Thus, measurements of outcomes on the comprehensive exams are now directly tied to measurements of learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are measured 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.)

**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 specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are measured in the comprehensive exams, and thus be able to ascertain what kinds of curricular change would be warranted, given the particularities of the area. At the doctoral level, after the comprehensive exam assessment, we will use common forms for assessing dissertation prospectuses and dissertations. These will tie in to the learning outcomes which are common throughout all the tracks of the PhD program. (Assessment forms uploaded in documents.)

### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
**SLO 3: Proficiency in communication theory (G: 1) (M: 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.

**Target for O2: Research and Method**

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.

**Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory**

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.

**M 7: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

In the newly adopted assessment plan put in place in Spring of 2012, we decided to begin assessing doctoral dissertation prospectuses and dissertations, which in the past had not been assessed. Because only a very small number of prospectuses were defended in the period between the development of the measure and the end of the cycle, it is too early to develop targets or report findings here. Prospectuses will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported in next cycle.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures**

We received too few assessments of prospectuses this year to be able to set targets. This is probably due to a misunderstanding
among faculty of the need to assess the prospectus. Action item: develop a "prospectus calendar" that shows all upcoming prospectus defenses and allows grad directors to follow up on assessments.

**M 8: Assessment of Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

In the newly adopted assessment plan put in place in Spring of 2012, we decided to begin assessing doctoral dissertation prospectuses and dissertations, which in the past had not been assessed. Because only a very small number of dissertations were defended in the period between the development of the measure and the end of the cycle, it is too early to develop targets or report findings here. Dissertation assessments will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported in next cycle.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures**

All students should achieve at least a level 3 in assessment of knowledge of literatures. The rubrics are designed so that very few will score at level 5. The average aggregate performance should be 3.5.

**Target for O2: Research and Method**

Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.

**Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory**

Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.

**Target for O4: Proficiency in writing**

Average aggregate performance on dissertations in this area should be 3.5, with the occasional exceptional dissertation receiving a 5.

**M 9: Presentation of work at conferences (O: 4, 7)**

Students are expected regularly to present conference papers at both the international professional organizational conferences in their area, and at smaller, boutique conference related to their specific line of research. In our annual review meetings we now do an annual credential check, requiring CV submission, and those are carefully discussed so that ongoing plans of study are matching actual accomplishment. (Note: we are splitting a current measure, “Conferences and Publications,” into two separate measures, as achievements are significantly different in the two areas.)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Professional development**

All doctoral students are expected to present, minimally, one conference paper per year (after the first year in the program), and to publish at least one article before defending the dissertation.

**M 10: Publication in peer reviewed journals (O: 4, 7)**

While this is an indirect measure, we feel that it is very important that we measure and report the number and types of publications and conference presentations of the doctoral students. Several years ago, we instituted the doctoral writing proseminar expressly to allow students to turn seminar papers into papers ready to send out for journal review. We want to track over time whether or not this results in increased publication among the doctoral students.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O4: Proficiency in writing**

The aggregate number of publications among the doctoral students should increase to reflect a 50% annual publication rate: ie, the number of publications accepted in any given year should rise to 50% of the doctoral cohort.

**Target for O7: Professional development**

We will not adopt a rigid target percentage on this, except that all students should have at least one article accepted in a peer-reviewed journal or collection by the final year of dissertation writing (as they prepare to go on the job market). The reasons for this flexibility are that, first, there is legitimate disagreement among graduate educators whether doctoral students should take time away from dissertation writing to produce journal articles; and second, the time-frames of academic journal publishing (ie, from the time of submission, to 'revise-resubmit,' to final acceptance) vary so widely that one cannot set expectations that are tied to academic years.

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

**Increased opportunity to revise written work**

Currently, slightly over 50% of our doctoral seminars incorporate paper revision into the seminar. We would like to encourage faculty to adopt this practice more widely. One of the systems we would advocate is to have the students present short versions of the final paper orally to the seminar as a conference presentation, and then use the resulting feedback to revise the paper for final submission. This is already done in some seminars; we would like to see it more widely adopted in doctoral syllabi.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Publication in peer reviewed journals | Outcome/Objective: Professional development
Institute prospectus writing workshop

In Fall 2009, we began to offer a prospectus writing workshop for all students who had completed coursework (whether or not they had taken comps yet). We believe that this workshop will not only help doctoral students avoid the post-comprehensive-exams "doldrums," which often 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):
Measure: Presentation of work at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

Revised doctoral proseminar curriculum

At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new prosem format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosem at least twice during their doctoral residence, once before comprehensive exams, and once in the dissertation-writing period. We believe that this shift in focus in the proseminar will help bring the students more quickly up to speed in the theoretical foundations of the field, and in their oral and written proficiency.

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

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

Implementation Description: We have already begun the new proseminar format; we will monitor its effectiveness during the year.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009

Bring top doctoral applicants to department in mid February

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

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

Responsible Person/Group: Restivo; MIS area faculty

Institute earlier application deadlines for graduate application

Because the Grad Committee discovered that we were losing our best applicants to other programs in part because our application deadlines were so late in the cycle, we moved the doctoral application deadlines to Dec 1 (Feb 1 for no GTA consideration); and the MA deadlines to Feb 1/ Mar 15. This is in keeping with other, competitive departments' deadlines.

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

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee, in consultation with Graduate Admissions (Amber Amari, Chad Van Gorden)

Investigate option for non-thesis MA

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

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

Implementation Description: Non-thesis option adopted 2011.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee
Revamp end-of-semester online assessment of doctoral students
Given the described problems in the current set of data generated by the pilot assessment year, the following recommendations have been presented to the Graduate Committee: 1. Aggregate data by student for each semester; 2. Assign semester-in-program numbers to each student and generate data spreads under that variable. 3. Revise the evaluation questionnaire both to a/ eliminate redundancies; and b/ eliminate categories that will not lead to identification of actionable issues; and most important, c/ revise assessment rubrics to produce a wider spread in the results, to be accomplished by adopting standards of the profession and not expectations of a graduate student. 4. Establish coherent methods of reporting and presenting data, as well as a deadline for each semester’s data.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee; Fujioka and Wilkin for statistical design; Restivo, Stuckey, and committee members for assessment questions.

Add writing requirement to Prosem
Beginning Fall 2011, the department is requiring that all students who present papers at proseminar (and they are required to present at minimum two papers during their doctoral studies) distribute beforehand the written version of the paper to the faculty and doctoral students. This is designed not only to produce better discussion in the proseminar after the paper is delivered, but also to serve as another opportunity for doctoral students to revise and polish written work for an audience.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Already implement in Prosem syllabus.
Responsible Person/Group: Cheshier

Annual reports submitted by all grad students
We already track doctoral student publications and conference presentations during the academic year in the course of our year-end meetings with each doctoral student. However, we want to institute a form for them to fill out (as opposed to the current CV), so that we can gather more information on other activities that we want to track, such as extent and types of engagement with New Media, creative work in film production (for the MA students), and other information.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee; graduate directors

Begin new assessment system based on data collected 2010-11
Background: Last year, the department implemented an online evaluation system with six rubrics, for all MA and doctoral students in the program, for every course that they took. The results were aggregated by year-in-program, program of study, and were averaged for each student across all the seminars the student took. The results have been reported throughout this WEAVE report as finding; in addition, the raw data and the interpretation of that data has been deposited in the document repository. The amount of data collected has given us valuable information with which to move forward in assessment (see below); while at the same time, it would be overkill to collect all this data every semester. (For one thing, it required that two tenure-track faculty spend over 50 hours of work during summer research time crunching data; this is clearly not something we can do on a regular basis.) Thus, we plan to redo this assessment in 7 years; in the meantime we plan to use the results to focus on targeted areas for assessment, in order to come up with more concrete revisions of curriculum, assignments, and so on. To this end, a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee will devise a system of rubrics that begins at the dissertation and moves backward through the prospectus and comprehensive exams. Then we will target two courses 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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
Projected Completion Date: 03/2012

Fine tune the new assessment system begun Spr2012
2013: Feedback we received from assessment experts suggested that we were doing too much early assessment in course work; thus we are going to phase out course assessment and assess at important end points: comprehensive exams, prospectus, 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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Ongoing meetings with area faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Angelo Restivo; Mary Stuckey; graduate committee

Department workshops in selection of objects of study
Because a consistently measured weakness was the ability to select appropriate objects of analysis in relation to the larger
arguments the student wants to make, we are going to have a series of proseminar sessions on this subject in Spring 14.

### 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. Students, in response to measured performance on comps, have been asked to re-apply to the field. This year marks the year in which the first cohort under the new core curriculum will be coming and writing prospectuses; thus we will be able to find out how effective the new curriculum in Rhetoric and Politics is.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus  
Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures

### Revise comps film reading list for Moving Image Studies

Our current comps reading list in film studies is not only out of date, but it is too diffuse and thus does not allow us to ask the kinds of questions we need to in order to assess students' overall knowledge of the field. This manifests itself, for example, in sometimes poor performance on prospectus writing/defense, when we should have identified the problem area at an earlier stage. Thus, we plan to revise the film studies reading list in order to organize it around a small number of key ideas in the field that we feel all the students must have complete mastery over.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations  
Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures  
| Proficiency in communication theory

**Responsible Person/Group:** Film Area of Moving Image studies

### Subcommittee on remediation

In the Moving Image Studies area, because of its interdisciplinarity, we admit students with a wide range of backgrounds. Some of the students are not conversant in the fundamentals of film theory and history. Thus we are forming a subcommittee to discuss the possibility of accepting students on condition that the do not-for-credit remediation work in film theory and media history, based on an examination of their transcripts during the admission process.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations  
Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures  
| Proficiency in communication theory

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** MIS area faculty; graduate committee

---

**Mission / Purpose**

In today's highly competitive global environment, the effective deployment of information technology has become the key to organizational success. There is a continuing shortage of individuals with the combination of business and technology skills needed to develop and manage information systems that provide competitive advantage in the global marketplace. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete. In many respects these applications are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The mission of the M.B.A. concentration and major in information systems is to produce graduates able to fill this need. Students will learn how to combine their general business knowledge with contemporary and emerging information systems concepts to enable organizations to compete strongly in the global marketplace. The courses to constitute a concentration (12 semester hours) in information systems are chosen from the 8000-level offerings of the Department of Computer Information Systems or IB 8680. This flexibility enables students to select courses that provide the best foundation for their career advancement. The M.B.A. IS enrollment over the 2008-2009 academic year was used to identify the specific courses for this assessment. Based on highest registration, the selected courses were CIS 8000 IT Project Management, CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation & Organizational Change Management, CIS 8020 Systems Integration, and CIS 8080 Security and Privacy. Indeed, these are logical extensions of the overall MBA program. Businesses need to continually innovate. This typically requires employing IT enabled business process reengineering and careful management of organizational change and of the overall innovation project. Finally, security and privacy are evermore important to maintain integrity and trust in this highly connected business environment.
**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Build and renew business via technology and process (M: 1)**

Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**O/O 2: Manage projects and balance resources (M: 2)**

Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan. Students will be able to work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**O/O 3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls (M: 3)**

Students will be able to articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate controls.

**O/O 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (M: 4)**

The student will be able to employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. This includes: Define the objectives of and issues associated integration of information systems applications. Explain alternative strategies for systems integration. Identify commonly used tools for integrating information systems, describing the benefits of using each. Explain how Web services can aid in systems integration, identifying the underlying tools and technologies that facilitate the creation of such services. Discuss the characteristics of systems integration projects, emphasizing the management issues and practices associated with them. Identify information systems application and organization characteristics that are most likely to cause an organization to employ a systems integration company to carry out the project work.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by IT, and manage the required change (O: 1)**

Students will be able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the required organizational changes.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Build and renew business via technology and process**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the midterm and final exams in CIS 8010. Learning Objective: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were not able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This program is no longer offered. No sufficient number of remaining students in this program to provide meaningful data to assess the program.

**M 2: Manage projects and balance resources (O: 2)**

Manage projects and balance resources

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

**Target for O2: Manage projects and balance resources**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the written assignments in CIS 8000. Learning Objective: translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were not able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This program is no longer offered. No sufficient number of remaining students in this program to provide meaningful data to assess the program.
M 3: Understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. (O: 3)

Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions.

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

**Target for O3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This program is no longer offered. No sufficient number of remaining students in this program to provide meaningful data to assess the program.

M 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (O: 4)

Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals.

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

**Target for O4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8020. Learning Objective: Identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This program is no longer offered. No sufficient number of remaining students in this program to provide meaningful data to assess the program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Computer Information Systems BBA**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

The application of information technology to organizational functions has shifted from supplanting basic operational tasks to the evolution of an intelligent information infrastructure which supports knowledge-workers within the organization as well as customers of the organization. Underlying these changes is an ever more rapidly developing technology with dramatically changing economics, pushing the envelope of what is possible and desirable. In this environment of dynamic and pervasive technology development and diffusion, the mission of the BBA-CIS program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business and technical knowledge with the latest software development tools and techniques to create information systems that will meet the needs of tomorrow's organizations. Number of graduates from this BBA CIS degree program this academic year: Summer 2014 Fall 2014 Spring 2015 The number of students in this program major: Summer 2011 347 Fall 2011 659 Spring 2012 673 Previous academic year graduates: Summer 2010 21 Fall 2010 37 Spring 2011 48 The number of students in this program major during previous academic year: Summer 2010 297 Fall 2010 562 Spring 2011 586 General approach As part of the ongoing assessment of our CIS BBA program, the CIS department has leveraged the CIS 4980 "Capstone" course project. Students in this required course are assigned to real world organizations for the purpose of exercising the full range of topics from the CIS undergraduate core courses. Since these are real world environments, the needs of specific organizations may not cover all topics. See the CIS assessment plan at [http://education.gsu.edu/ct/outcomes/RCB/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm](http://education.gsu.edu/ct/outcomes/RCB/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm). CIS has developed a survey to gain structured and free form feedback from individuals involved with CIS 4980 "Capstone" projects. Use of this survey began in Spring 2005 (although we have project materials from several earlier semesters as well as informal feedback and observations from students and faculty). The form used in this Capstone survey is attached. At the end of each semester, the CIS 4980 teams present their projects to fellow students, faculty, and clients. Each of these viewers (excluding students) is asked to complete a survey for each team's presentation. Students' are asked to complete the survey to comment on their own performance and on their level of preparation to perform within each of the areas on the survey. And, there are areas for "open" comments. Clients may complete the survey based on their observations of the team's work and their presentation at the client's site. The survey's areas cover the full range of primary objectives of the courses within the CIS undergraduate core (and also within most electives). In particular, we can map the areas back to the CIS courses and measure whether scores are increasing (hopefully reflecting continuing improvement in the conduct of the associated courses and the in resulting student learning).

**Goals**
G 1: CIS BBA Program Goals
Students will become better problem-solvers; students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking; students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline; students will be well prepared for positions in the discipline.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 11)
Students will be able to investigate, define, document and analyze an existing information system including the capability to solve complex organizational problems Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze real-world organizational needs will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to analyze real-world organizational needs will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Student will be able to specify the requirements for a replace system. Within the context of a capstone course, the quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by the client organizations. The quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

SLO 2: Students will be proficient in systems design (M: 5, 6, 9)
Students will be able to read a system specification and analyze user data requirements within the context of a three-tier architecture. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design current system architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Student will be able to model and develop a design for a web-based application. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to 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.

Strategic Plan Associations

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

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 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
4.47

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 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
4.43

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 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
<th>4.20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Developed Architecture (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Designed programs (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Designed the programs according to specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: Coded and Developed (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Coded/developed the specified &amp; designed programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 9: Designed user interface (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td>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>
M 10: Appropriately used database concepts (O: 3)
Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
4.32

M 11: Appropriately used business process modeling concepts (O: 1)
Appropriately used Business Process Modeling Concepts
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
4.53

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
4.53

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

Object-Oriented Concept Use
Need to assess whether this miss is a result of programming not being required or the result of projects not requiring Object-Oriented.

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

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

Implementation Description: The CIS UPC will assess whether this miss is a result of programming not being required or the result of projects not requiring Object-Orientation. Student interpretation of questions seems to be an ongoing problem.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC Chair

Use of database concepts
Teams did not use database concepts well enough to meet goal.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Appropriately used database concepts | Outcome/Objective: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency

Implementation Description: Assess change in assessment rating of database concept use. Take appropriate action to correct or to clarify.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC

Recommend self-paced programming course
Students are not able to program are now strongly advised to complete an e-training self-paced Java programming course. The survey will also emphasize that responses to this question should be N/A if no programming is required by the student's project.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: 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
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

Review user interface design in CIS courses
Review the learning objectives of CIS courses including CIS 3300, CIS 3270, and others and propose actions to introduce or to improve the coverage of the concepts of user interface design.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Designed user interface | Outcome/Objective: Students will be proficient in systems design
Implementation Description: Improving user interface design concepts
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC

Transition to required programming course
2014-2015 is the transition period for implementing the mandated programming course requirement (CIS 3260). Some of the students were admitted to the program before the approval of the requirements and they are waived from the requirement. It is expected that the percentage of those students will be significantly reduced after 2015 fall semester.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming | Outcome/Objective: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency
Implementation Description: Complete the transition to mandated OO programming course, CIS 3260
Projected Completion Date: 01/2016
Responsible Person/Group: CIS administration

Transition to required programming course
2014-2015 is the transition period for implementing the mandated programming course requirement (CIS 3260). Some of the students were admitted to the program before the approval of the requirements and they are waived from the requirement. It is expected that the percentage of those students will be significantly reduced after 2015 fall semester.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Coded and Developed | Outcome/Objective: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency
Implementation Description: Mandated programming course, CIS 3260
Projected Completion Date: 01/2016
Responsible Person/Group: CIS administration
**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 2008 Fall 2008 Spring 2008 8 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 2008 10 38 39 Summer 2007 Fall 2007 Spring 2008 16 2 22 Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 31 34 27 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 38 57 46 The 2004-2005 assessment report for this program may be found at http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/CIS_MS_Assessment_Report_9_16_2005.htm. While this document primarily addresses specific course-level assessment of our departmental programs, it is but part of a larger assessment and curricular improvement activities engaging the energy of CIS faculty for two very compelling reasons. The first arises from the core nature of our discipline and the second arises from purely economic realities. 1) The disciplinary core. Our discipline is at the nexus of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Social Organizations. The modern business, governmental and Nonprofit organization is increasingly dependent upon these technologies to compete in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. Both these technologies and the organizational settings in which they are embedded are highly dynamic, and emergent settings. As such our discipline, and our curricula, must necessarily address those principles and skills that are stable over time, but also to anticipate where changing technical and social/political realities may lead. 2) Economic necessity. The triple-whammy of the dot com implosion, the economic downturn of post 9/11 economy and the accelerated global sourcing of digital work have conspired to reverse a 15 year trend of enrollment growth to a period of contraction and rebuilding. The net result of these continuous and dramatic underlying technological and social changes is that the content of virtually all CIS courses and the curriculum itself is in constant flux. Thus, by technical and economic necessity, the CIS faculty are confronted with compelling reasons for constant improvement of our programs, course offerings and course content. We offer 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 means of direct and indirect measures of exams, homework, projects and presentations, adjudicated by the principal instructor, and in many cases, with the participation of other faculty and industry representatives as outside adjudicators. The course level assessment provided herein was arrived at by indirect means; that is, via the evaluation of static artifacts. Those assessments were based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall learning objectives. For each of the core courses the departmental evaluation committee developed a survey instrument (c.f., http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/index.asp). The draft instrument was created from published course documents reviewed by instructional staff to access the efficiency of the instrument and the completeness of the courses learning objectives. At the conclusion of the Fall and Spring term instructional faculty were asked to provide a sampling representing 15% of the student’s work, with the provision that there should be a minimal sub-set of work representing all the stated learning objectives. These materials were made available to the assessment team of faculty, and PhD students. Those evaluating review all documents and the course syllabi and relevant assignment materials then completed the assessment questionnaire. The summary results herein and the full student level 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)

Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with an emerging technology. Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system (O: 1)**

- **Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs.**
- **Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve "level 2" ("meets the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.
Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the change of the MS program to the cohort format and the flexible course offering in each semester, the field study course (CIS 8391) cannot provide sufficient, representative data for the program assessment. The assessment method is to be reviewed by the CIS GPC to decide a new assessment method.

**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:** 1.1: 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.
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: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The CIS GPC will review and renew the course objectives, student artifacts for assessment, and associated rubrics and measures for two CIS MS IS core courses each year for the next three years. This will cover the six courses in the CIS MS IS core. The CIS GPC will also evaluate the best means to utilize the capstone course for including in assessing the overall CIS MS IS degree program.

Responsible Person/Group: The CIS Graduate Program Committee

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Computer Science Assessment of Core

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 as well as learning to build circuits theoretically.

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

SLO 2: Word Processing Application Software (M: 3)
Students will learn the necessary components of word processing that will enable them to write term papers, reports, and research papers along with being able incorporate graphs and tables.

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 by creating charts, etc.

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 as well as internally.

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 as labeling.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**

Proper curves should be generated for charts with appropriate labels

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Most of the students (approximately 90%) were able to do this correctly.

#### M 2: Formatting slides (O: 4)
Students should create slides to demonstrate some functions. This includes labeling the slides appropriately

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Presentation Application Software**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

A majority of students could generate the slides accordingly but imported figures were not always formatted as well as expected.

#### M 3: Generate documents (O: 2, 3)
Students should generate a document that imports charts from a spreadsheet. The document should include comparisons as well as a variation in formats for headers and the text body.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

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

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**

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

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Usually the charts were imported properly. However, the comparisons were not detailed enough. About 85.1% performed well with this.

#### M 4: Comparison shopping for computer systems (O: 1)
Students are asked to shop for computer systems for four different purposes. Each task has different requirements for the hardware and software components. Students should be able to justify why each system they chose meets the demand of the corresponding tasks.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Computer Components -- Hardware and Software**

For each environment described, the students should be able to select the appropriate components that follow:

1) motherboard/cpu; 2) memory/hard disk space/ram; 3) adapter cards; 4) video/sound; 5) application software

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The students did well with this objective. Occasionally, they were not able to justify their choices clearly. This could be tied back to critical thinking or writing objectives.

#### M 5: Website design (O: 5)
Students are to design a website using HTML as the programming language. Their design has certain specifications required, such as linking pages, format, and headers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Web Development (**

Students should be able to directions for a website design. There should be multiple pages linked together including tags. The formats should adhere to specifications and include headers.
**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Most of the students do not have difficulty with the syntax of HTML. Tags were not always included properly. Linking pages tended to cause problems for some students so that the intended flow was not achieved.

---

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

#### Additional examples and quizzes

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Generate documents | *Outcome/Objective:* Spreadsheet Application Software

#### Additional examples and quizzes

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Generate documents | *Outcome/Objective:* Word Processing Application Software

#### Additional examples and quizzes

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Formatting slides | *Outcome/Objective:* Presentation Application Software

#### Additional examples and quizzes

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. 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:* Chart drawing | *Outcome/Objective:* Spreadsheet Application Software

### Coordinate 1010 sections

Establish a coordinator for the CSC 1010 course. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors teaching sections of the CSC 1010 course in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

*Established in Cycle:* 2008-2009  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High  
*Projected Completion Date:* 07/2010  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

---

### 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 have been working towards reducing our DWF rates. I think we were able to decrease it very very slightly. We have changed our program over the last year to start accommodate the merger with Georgia Perimeter, by adding a lab component to some of our 2000 level and 3000 level classes, but it is too early to make an overall conclusion as to whether this is effective or not. I think that the classes are too big in size - ranging from 75 to 125 students in a class. I think we will be able to make a better conclusion after a two year span. The effects of adding Labs will not be seen until another year or so. However, our retention rate seems to be holding steady.
### Mission / Purpose

**MISSION** Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science B.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today's applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

### Goals

**G 1: Computer Science BS goals**

Students will become better problem-solvers; Students will demonstrate clearer critical thinking, Students will gain knowledge of the discipline; Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in the discipline 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/algorithms.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**O/O 3: Algorithm Design and Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 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).

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Alumni Surveys (O: 3)**

We propose to periodically contact our alumni with an online survey with the intention of finding out how much their studies at GSU contributed to their success in their career.

**Source of Evidence:** Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements
### Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis

Unfortunately, our surveys were delayed.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

No results.

### 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics.

### Target for O5: Hardware Systems

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the writing skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

### M 4: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 2, 3, 4)

Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on assignments and projects targeting specific components of the corresponding outcome. Each outcome will be measured via the quality of the students’ answers to selected questions on the assignments and projects in the corresponding courses. Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

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

### Target for O2: Programming Skills

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics.

### Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the programming skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

### Target for O4: 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.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the programming skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

M 5: Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 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.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Students demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics.

Target for O2: Programming Skills
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the programming skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the algorithm design and analysis skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

Target for O4: 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.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the discrete math skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

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

Coordinate lower level classes
Establish a coordinator for each of the lower level classes. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors of the course they are assigned to in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

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

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
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

### Add LAB to 2000 level courses

Our 2010, 2310 and 3410 classes now have Labs whereby it is hoped that programming will be enhanced.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The students will have lab projects which they will turn in for assessment at the end of the Lab and a number of these will be graded which will contribute to their final grade.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The Instructor for the class along with Graduate Students assigned as TA

### 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 have been working towards reducing our DWF rates. I think we were able to decrease it very very slightly. We have changed our program over the last year to start accommodate the merger with Georgia Perimeter, by adding a lab component to some of our 2000 level and 3000 level classes, but it is too early to make an overall conclusion as to whether this is effective or not. I think that the classes are too big in size - ranging from 75 to 125 students in a class. I think we will be able to make a better conclusion after a two year span. The effects of adding Labs will not be seen until another year or so. However, our retention rate seems to be holding steady.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2014-2015 Computer Science MS**  
**As of:** 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST  
*Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*

### Mission / Purpose

**MISSION** Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas:  
- **Research:** To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution.  
- **Educational Programs:** To provide the next generation of leaders and capable lifelong learners in computer science.  
- **Service:** To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines.  

The Department of Computer Science M.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today's applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

### Goals

**G 1: Computer Science MS Goals**

Students will become better solvers of advanced computational problems; Students will improve abilities to develop advanced computational models of real world problems; Students will gain advanced knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career applying advanced computer science methods.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Computer Science Foundations (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students should be able to:  
1. Describe the principles and methods of (a) discrete mathematics, (b) best-practices programming paradigms, (c) algorithm analysis, (d) computer & hardware systems development, and (e) advanced network-oriented software engineering.  
2. Develop models and corresponding optimization problem formulations.  
3. Apply (a) discrete structures for solving problems in computer science, (b) algorithmic techniques to optimization problems, (c) high-level programming languages to implement the programming paradigms, and (d) advanced software engineering and modeling techniques for specification of computer systems and implementing the phases of hardware development.
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 (ongoing).

Source of Evidence: External report

**Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking**

**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 presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**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 Ph.D. students, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Consider Course Only Master’s Degree Option**

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

**Consider Course Only Master’s Degree Option**

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

**Consider foundation courses for graduate program**

We plan to present the results to the computer science curriculum committee and show the areas (discrete mathematics and computer organization) that may need improvement. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Written Assignments and Reports
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations

**Dispatch alumni surveys**

Prepare a survey questionnaire to send out to alumni from the Master's program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ms. Tammie Dudley
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $1,000.00 (recurring)

### 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 using the graduation rate as a measure to evaluate the desired results. The graduation level for spring 2014 and spring 2015 are about the same whereas the graduation rate for fall 2014 is much higher. On average, we graduate 40 M.S. students each year over the past eight years. Issues with our retention, progression and graduation rates are practically nonexistent. Almost all our graduated students receive employment.

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Computer Science PhD**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST)

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

### Mission / Purpose

**MISSION** Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders, educators and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science Ph.D. Program provides students with the underpinnings and advanced topics of computation and computer science for today's applications in industry, science, education, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.
## Goals

**G 1: Computer Science PhD Goals**

Students will become better solvers of open computational problems; Students will improve abilities to develop novel computational models of real world problems; Students will gain advanced knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career as computer scientists.

## Outcomes/Objectives

### O/O 1: Computer Science Foundations (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4)

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 (ongoing).

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 (ongoing).

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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying exam</td>
<td>Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science Foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

### 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 using the graduation rate as a measure to evaluate the desired results. The graduation level for spring 2014 and spring 2015 are about the same whereas the graduation rate for fall 2014 is much higher. On average, we graduate 8 Ph.D. students each year over the past eight years. Our retention rate is 80%. The dropouts are due to reasons such as failure in qualifying exam, difficulties in conducting research, transfer to other Ph.D. programs for personal reasons, and the lucrative job markets where these students earn high salaries. All of the graduated students receive employment.
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.

M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop (O: 1)
Performance on exam questions in 8410.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Financial reporting skills: Develop
Mean score of 80% or above.

M 3: Collaboration Skills (O: 5)
Evaluation by student peers of contributions to team projects in Acct 8030 and Acct 8410

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Collaboration Skills**
Mean score of 85% in Tax 8120

**M 4: Communication Skills (O: 6)**
At least 90% of students exited course with a B level grade.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Communication Skills**
At least 90% of students exited course with a B level grade.

**M 5: Analytical Skills (O: 4)**
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**
Mean of 75% on relevant quiz questions.

**M 6: Assurance Skills (O: 3)**
Performance on assignments in Acct 8610
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**
Exam mean of 80%

**M 7: Apply tax law (O: 7)**
Apply tax law to individuals and entities.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: Technological skills**
Research project mean of 85% or above for class.

**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):
  - Measure: Collaboration Skills | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration Skills

**Apply concepts to financial statements in class teams**
Use financial statements of fortune 500 companies to illustrate, explain, and understand the concepts of analysis.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: 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  
Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills

**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. 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  
**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:** 11/2014  
**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

---
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
Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

**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 understating 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 understating 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 understating 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 understating of why, when and how the technique is applied.

**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 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 4 Rubric Software Skills: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Microsoft Excel Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Well designed spreadsheets. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects Inaccurate spreadsheets, sloppy work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks. ii. SPSS Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks. Inaccurate work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks. iii. SAS Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks. Inaccurate work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks.

**On-Going Improvement**

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

**Established in Cycle: 2008-2009**  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: BA Faculty Members  
Additional Resources: None  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**To Hire New Faculty**

The business analysis area is showing increasing enrollment, and there is unfilled demand for our courses in the PMBA programs as well. The analytics field is growing quickly in industry, and additional courses in this area can be offered to keep up with the demand. However, with the loss of faculty to retirements, new hiring is necessary to grow the area to its potential.

**Established in Cycle: 2010-2011**  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Non-tenure track positions in Business Analysis were announced, and the recruitment process is currently in progress.  
Responsible Person/Group: Recruitment committee chaired by Dr. Subhashish Samaddar
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.

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

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

Develop measure for objective #2
conscious experimentation

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
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 develop critical thinking skills used in analyzing complex financial issues.

G 5: Managerial leadership preparation
Students will become equipped for senior management levels in both financial and non-financial organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Development and application of foundation knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
MBA-Finance concentration students will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macro-financial theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microfinancial theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and management practices outside of the area of finance.

SLO 2: Development and application of technical skills (G: 2, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Technical skills that MBA-Finance concentration students will develop and apply include: (i) Proficiency in capabilities in information technology as they relate to finance. (ii) Technical capabilities for analyzing the financial condition and performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) The necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building. (iv) Computer and technology skills, including (but not limited to) spreadsheet capabilities, familiarity with those software packages employed in analyzing financial issues, and general operating procedure capabilities.

SLO 3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills (G: 3, 5) (M: 1, 2, 3)
MBA-Finance concentration students will: (i) Possess knowledge and capability in various subareas of finance such as corporate finance, investments, financial institutions and markets, and international finance. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)
To examine student performance in select courses from various subareas of finance (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310), the course instructors selectively chose five representative questions from various assessment instruments for their courses during the semester that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on these five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 1-2013:Direct Assessment of Course Performance (Spring 2013)" for findings from Spring 2013. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment Plan and Alignment" (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target for O1: Development and application of foundation knowledge
Median scores shall be at least 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Development and application of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course level questions which examine student learning outcomes should align completely with the program learning outcomes (see &quot;Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment Plan and Alignment&quot; for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310) align with program learning outcomes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Development and application of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course level questions which examine student learning outcomes should align completely with the program learning outcomes (see &quot;Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment Plan and Alignment&quot; for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310) align with program learning outcomes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course level questions which examine student learning outcomes should align completely with the program learning outcomes (see &quot;Exhibit 2-2013: MBA-Finance Assessment Plan and Alignment&quot; for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310) align with program learning outcomes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Development and application of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Curriculum

The Department continues to review its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace. In response, we have most recently added two courses: FI 8350 "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and FI 8260 "Hedge funds and their trading strategies." These two courses have been successfully taught now for 2 cycles and are among our most popular courses. Looking forward to the 2013-2014 academic year, we will continue to review the curriculum and identify potential new courses that will provide students with important skill sets relevant to their professional development.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills
  - Development and application of foundation knowledge | Development and application of technical skills
- **Implementation Description:** continuous
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Gerry Gay

#### Practical Training and Field Study Experience

Our experience in developing and offering the field-study in finance course FI 8391 continues to prove highly useful for providing MBA-Finance students with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). We will continue to identify additional corporate partners for purposes of expanding opportunities for students to participate. Our goal is to eventually have the field study course become an integral part and distinguishing aspect of the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** continuous
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Richard Fendler
### Mission / Purpose
The Master of Business Administration in Human Resource Management program prepares students for general business management careers with an emphasis on using Human Resources practices and procedures to increase workforce efficiency and effectiveness. Students receive detailed knowledge of selected functional areas of Human Resources to aid them in formulating legal, motivational, and cost-effective Human Resources policies or to prepare them for Human Resources generalist practices. This Mission was established in 2006-07. It was not moved forward when the WEAVE version was updated.

### Goals

**G 1: Basic functions of HRM**  
To graduate students from the MBA program in HRM with an understanding of the role of the basic functions of Human Resources Management in a variety of organizations.

**G 2: Ability to solve HR problems**  
To graduate students from the MBA in HRM program with the ability to solve Human Resources Management problems.

**G 3: Linkage of HR actions and corporate strategy**  
To graduate students from the MBA in HRM program with an understanding of the importance of the role and interface of the HR functions with organizational strategies.

**G 4: Understanding of employment legal issues**  
To graduate students from the MBA in HRM program with an understanding of the basic employee-related legal issues in organizations.

**G 5: Workforce Diversity**  
To graduate students from the MBA/HRM program with the ability to identify and react to the issues and challenges of workforce diversity and cross-cultural HR.

**G 6: Global HR Management**  
To graduate students from the MBA/HRM program with the ability to identify issues and react to issues and challenges of global HR.

**G 7: HR in Mergers and Acquisitions**  
To graduate students from the MBA/HRM program with the ability to manage the role of HR in mergers and acquisitions.

**G 8: Unions and employment relations**  
To graduate students from the MBA/HR program with the ability to manage complex relationships with unions and to deal with employee relations issues.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: The Role of HR in Organizations (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**  
The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to understand and effectively apply the appropriate job analysis, job description, job evaluation, performance appraisal, dispute resolution, and HR policy formulation techniques in a variety of settings.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Problem Solving (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12)**  
The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify, evaluate, and effectively react to issues in the areas of employee relations and performance management.

**SLO 3: Links with Business Strategy (G: 2, 3) (M: 5)**  
The MBA-HRM student will be able to define, select, and defend specific business strategies and the appropriate HR policies for each of those strategies.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 4: HR Law (G: 1, 4) (M: 6, 7)**  
The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify and address potential legal issues, relevant laws, and appropriate policies to address.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 5: Workforce Diversity and Cross-Cultural Issues (G: 2, 5) (M: 8, 9)**  
Identify issues and challenges of workforce diversity and cross-cultural HR management.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

**SLO 6: Global Issues in HR (G: 2, 5, 6) (M: 10, 11)**
Identify issues and reactions 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 be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected exam questions in MGS 8300, 8360, and 8390. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and
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

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 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 8386. Adapt to 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 students will meet or exceed 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 12 Rubric to randomly-selected cases in MGS 8300. Identify expectations and actions of HR in mergers and acquisitions 1 = Students can give incomplete or inappropriate identification of 1-2 HR roles 2 = Students can give complete and adequate identification of 3-4 HR roles 3 = Students can give complete and detailed identification of more than 4 HR roles

**M 13: Union and employee relations (O: 8)**

MBA/HRM students will be able to identify cultural, legal, and ethical issues related to union and employee relations

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

**Target for O8: Union and employee relations**

80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 13 Rubric to randomly-selected cases in MGS 8300. Identify issues related to unions and employee relations 1 = Student can identify 1-2 issues 2 = Student can identify 3-4 issues 3 = Student can identify more than 4 issues

**M 14: Address union and employee relations issues (O: 8)**

80% of MBA/HR students will meet or exceed 2.0 on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 14 Rubric to randomly-selected cases in MGS 8300. Identify issues and give reactions to issues in union and employee relations 1 = Students can address 1-2 issues 2 = Students can address 3-4 issues 3 = Students can address more than 4 issues

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
- Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Lecture Changes Integrating Law and Policy**

Review in more detail written assignments in MGS 8320 and MGS 8300 concerning the linkages between HR law and policies. Discuss in class and compare student products, giving feedback and analysis. Reevaluate after next offering.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Understanding and Interpreting case Law | Outcome/Objective: HR Law
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**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
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.

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.

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.

Workplace diversity and cross-cultural issues in HR
Add a case study in MGS 8360 to address workforce diversity and cross-cultural issues.
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 teamwork among the team members.

**SLO 3: Develop an Environmental Sustainability Viewpoint (M: 5)**
The student should become aware of the impact that OM and Supply Chain decisions have on the environment and industrial sustainability. They should be able to select the appropriate solutions to OM problems in the environmental/sustainability framework. Outside speakers are engaged to bring this perspective to life and create a desire to better understand the implications going forward.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: Become a Strong Team Member (M: 6)**
The students should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress on a timely basis. Focus is placed on identifying a specific OM problem, defining the problem, setting criteria for measuring alternatives/solutions, selecting alternatives, measuring the alternatives against the selected criteria, implementation of the alternative, KPIs for measuring the success/failure of each alternative, and risk assessment of the selected alternative.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Reasoned Analysis (O: 1)**
Evaluation of individual MS student's case and/or homework analyses will be completed. Individual readings and the students write-up on the reading will be reviewed and turned back to the student with comments on the relevancy of the write-up.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: A Strategic view of OM**
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2.5 on the Rubric for Measure One Learning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 1: Reasoned Analysis The student is not able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student can determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student exceeds at completing a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student excels at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

**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**  
**Leaning Objective 1:** Strategic View of OM  
**Fail Fails to meet standards**=1  
**Meet Meets standards**=2  
**Exceed Exceeds standards**=3  
Integration of recommendations  
The student is not able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student determines the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student easily integrates recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student easily determines the effects that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic.

### M 3: Performance (O: 1)
This item measures the students’ ability to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment through their ability to identify the critical success factors of an OM application and the assessment of available resources and capabilities.

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

**Target for O1: A Strategic view of OM**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM  
**Fail Fails to meet standards**=1  
**Meet Meets standards**=2  
**Exceed Exceeds standards**=3  
Measure 3 Performance  
The student is not able to identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student is able to identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student excels at identifying critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to easily assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students excel at analyzing or understanding how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment.

### M 4: Critical Thinking (O: 2)
Evaluation of individual MS student's work as completed in the required OM course. The accumulation of this type of knowledge will be received through the application of exam questions that will be measured overtime.

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

**Target for O2: Develop Decision Making Abilities**

An adequate number of written questions are used on each exam among the various course requirements to determine the critical thinking capabilities of the student. Case analysis adds an additional dimension for assessing critical thinking through writing. Students are expected to comprehend and offer alternative solutions that adequately (85%) resolve the problem statement and satisfy the criteria for a reasonable solution.

### M 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation Skills (O: 3)
Will develop a focus and will highlight the effects that OM decisions have on the environmental and aspects of industry.

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

**Target for O3: Develop an Environmental Sustainability Viewpoint**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Leaning Objective 3: Develop a Environmental/Sustainability Viewpoint  
**Fail Fails to meet standards**=1  
**Meet Meets standards**=2  
**Exceed Exceeds standards**=3  
Measure 5 Environmental Impact Evaluation  
The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an excellent understanding of the environment impact of OM or are easily able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.

### 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.
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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Find Four-Perspective Causes of Events /Problems (O: 1)
M1: Students can examine organizational events, issues, and problems and identify structural, human, political, and cultural elements in the cause of situation.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Analyze Organizational Situations
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected case assignment and exam questions.

M 2: Recommend Responses Incorporating Four-Perspective Analysis (O: 2)
M2: Students can recommend organizational responses to problems that are cognizant of structural, human, political, and cultural dimensions to the situation.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Specify Courses of Action
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected case assignments and exam questions.

M 3: Identify Political Dimensions of Decisions (O: 3)
M3: Students can identify political dimensions of organizational decisions.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target for **O3: Analyze Political Realities**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 Rubric to randomly selected exams, cases, and projects.

### 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 area of real estate.

Goals

G 1: Business skills required to lead by pursuing ethical, innovative and value-enhancing strategies in real estate organizations
Graduate students with the business skills required to lead by pursuing ethical, innovative and value-enhancing strategies in real estate organizations in a culturally diverse and technologically advanced world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems (G: 1) (M: 1)
Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems

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.

M 2: Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals (O: 2)
Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals
Criterion 1: Understand the process for estimating workplace demand in an exam question. (RE8100)
Criterion 2: Understand the changing intersection of workers, space, and technology in designing workplaces in an exam question. (RE8100)
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Target for O2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm
MBA students score a minimum average 2.0 on 3.0 scale on measure with 1= fails to meet standard; 2=meets standard; 3=exceeds standard.

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.

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;
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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of students received satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructor.

### M 3: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 2)
Evaluation by practicum supervisor. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all quantitative items to be satisfactory.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

| Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice |
| 90% of students score a 3 or above on practicum evaluation items. |

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of students met target of scoring 3 or above on practicum evaluation items.

### M 4: Performance in ethics course (O: 2)
Performance in Advanced Ethics course (i.e., CPS 8530)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

| Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice |
| 90% of students receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructor. |

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of students received rating of 4 or higher on evaluation by instructor.

### M 5: Comprehensive examination question on ethics (O: 2)
Ethics comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students write a 12-page answer to this question to demonstrate their knowledge of professional ethics and their application. Answers are evaluated by a two-person faculty committee who determine whether the student receives a grade of pass or fail.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

| Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice |
| 80% of students receive passing grade on ethics comprehensive area question. |

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of students received passing grade on ethics comprehensive question.

### M 6: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 3)
Performance in assessment didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

| Target for O3: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession |
| 90% of students receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on a 5 point scale) in courses related to key areas of the profession (e.g., Assessment). |

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% received rating of 4 or higher.

### M 7: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors (O: 3)
Written practicum evaluation from supervisors. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must receive a score of 3 or higher on all quantitative items to be satisfactory.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

| Target for O3: Is proficient in key clinical areas of the profession |
| 90% of students will receive a score of 3 or higher on related practicum evaluation items. |

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of students met target goal of receiving scores of 3 or higher on practicum evaluation items.

### M 8: Performance in theories courses (O: 4)
Performance in theories related courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

| Target for O4: Understands relevant clinical theories |
90% of students will receive satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by instructors of theory related courses.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students received satisfactory evaluations (4 or higher on 5 point scale) in theory related courses.

**M 9: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 4)**

Theory comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students write a 12-page answer to the question to demonstrate their knowledge of counseling theories and applications. Answers are evaluated by a two-person faculty committee who determine whether the students receive 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students receives satisfactory evaluation (4 or higher on 5 point scale) by course instructors in research related courses.

---

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

**Comprehensive Examination Orientation**

Present an orientation the the comprehensive examination to enhance students’ preparation for the theories portion of the comprehensive examination.

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

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

- **Measure:** Comprehensive examination question on theory
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understands relevant clinical theories

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director

**Comprehensive Examination Orientation**

To offer an orientation to the comprehensive examination process so that students can focus their preparation for the examination more effectively.

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

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

- **Measure:** Comprehensive examination question on ethics
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of the program

**Monitor Program Strengths**

All outcome objectives were fully met. Program faculty will work to maintain positive program characteristics, and will continue to monitor and assessment stated learning outcomes.

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

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

- **Measure:** Comprehensive examination question on ethics
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical clinical practice
- **Measure:** Evaluation by practicum supervisor
- **Outcome/Objective:** Clinical effectiveness with diverse groups of clients
- **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
Return Assessment Courses to Dept.  
Offer psychological assessment courses in the department rather than having students take courses in psychology department to allow for tailored instruction to Counseling Psychology students.

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

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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) How impact have recent changes in the assessment process had on the quality of the findings?

All goals were met. Recent annual accreditation report to the American Psychological Association has prompted the faculty to reflect on possible additional/different means of assessment. For instance, we are examining the comprehensive examination.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 and 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 planning a summary evaluation for current students each year.

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 received positive feedback on its annual accreditation report to the American Psychological Association.

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.

No significant challenges are anticipated.

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 modifications to outcomes were adopted.

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, Mexico, and Italy.

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.

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

Mission / Purpose
To prepare 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 knowledgeable and skilled clinical supervisors.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Teaching (M: 1, 2, 3)
1. Students will demonstrate the ability to develop course syllabi. 2. Students will be able to provide formative and summative feedback to their students. 3. Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively teach a course. 4. Students will articulate a personal philosophy of teaching.

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=still 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
assess 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 criteria.

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

**Target for O1: Teaching**

Target is receiving at least a 2 out of 3 points on the teaching section of the portfolio. Students must receive 2 out of 3 points. 1 point equates to does not meet standards; 2 points equates to competent; 3 points equate to exemplary.

---

### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Six (n=6) CEP students completed the teaching internship during this cycle. All six received 3 out of 3 points on their teaching section of their portfolio.

---

### M 2: Teaching (O: 1)

On the question "the instructor was well prepared" of the teaching evaluation form, students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1 is low and 5 is the highest) with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O1: Teaching**

On the question "the instructor was well prepared" of the teaching evaluation form, students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest) with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

---

### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

The range of scores for this assessment was 4.5 to 4.9 with an average of 4.75. 100% (n=6) met this target.

---

### M 3: Teaching (O: 1)

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.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

The range of scores for this assessment was 4.3 to 5.0 with an average of 4.75. 100% (n=6) met this target.

---

### M 4: Research (O: 2)

Students will complete and submit their predissertation project. All students in the CEP program must successfully complete the predissertation study, this is a milestone project and students cannot advance until they have successfully completed the predissertation study. 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.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Research**

Students will complete and submit their predissertation project.

---

### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Two students successfully completed their predissertation study during this past cycle. One has been accepted for publication and the other one has been accepted with revisions.

---

### M 5: Research (O: 2)

Students will receive 2 points 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.

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

**Target for O2: Research**

Students will receive a pass (2 points) on the research portion of their written comprehensive examination.

---

### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Three students (n=3) completed their comprehensive examination during this cycle. All 3 (100%) received 2 points on their research question from all three reviewers.

---

### M 6: Clinical Skills (O: 3)

Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80%
receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds. 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients. 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Clinical Skills**

Students will receive at least 3 out of 5 on the relevant questions on the Supervisee Evaluation Form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (N=5) of the students who took advanced practicum received at least a 3 or higher on the relevant questions for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. 1= needs considerable improvement in this area. 2= needs improvement in this area. 3=demonstrates minimal competency in this area 4= demonstrates competency in this area. 5= demonstrates exceptional ability in this area. NA= not applicable More specifically the means for Fall 2014: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts (mean =4.4). 2: demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds (mean=4.8). 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients (mean=4.6). 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession (mean=5). The means for Spring 2015: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts (mean =5). 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds (mean=5). 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients (mean=5). 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession (mean=5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015</th>
<th>Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please note that the supervision internship was not offered during the 2014-2015 academic year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2014-15):** 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 for the CEP doctoral program are linked to specific courses. For example, the teaching SLOs are linked to CPS 9680: Doctoral Internship and to CPS 9963: Leadership in Counselor Education; Professional and Social Advocacy; the research SLOs are linked to CPS 9920: Research and Publication and to the doctoral comprehensive examination; the supervision SLOs are linked to CPS 9661: Supervision Internship, and the clinical practice SLOs are linked to CPS 8660 and CPS 9660: Applied Practice II and II. All these courses are required as a part of their program of study.

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 have been no curricular changes in the CEP program during the past year. CEP students continue to excel and exceed SLOs.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 CEP program is accredited by the Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) as a part of this accreditation we submit a mid-cycle review and also publicize this mid-cycle review on our website. The report can be found on: http://cps.education.gsu.edu/about/annual-cacrep-report/ In addition to this mid-cycle review, the CEP program publishes an annual program performance update which can be found on our website: http://cps.education.gsu.edu/files/2013/10/CEP-CACREP-Program-Performance-2014-2015.pdf Additional ways in which the CEP program share our findings with program faculty and other stakeholders include: 1. We hold an annual CEP faculty meeting where we discuss each student as well as discuss the program. 2. Annually, we hold a Community Advisory Committee meeting with members from the committee where we share updates about our students as well as the program. During this meeting, we also receive feedback from our Board members as to what we are doing well and what we can do to continue to strengthen 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.

   The CEP program continues to excel and given that our students meet and exceed the SLOs no changes have been made to the program. The CEP program continues to monitor our SLOs and the courses to ensure that our students are meeting the requirements and that the program is meeting our accreditation standards. The CEP program is accredited by CACREP and our courses are designed to meet the CACREP standards.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

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

During the 2014-2015 year, the CEP program had three graduates. All three graduates secured employment at the time of graduation. The following students received regional and national awards: Rafe McCullough SACES Emerging Leader Fellow Jennifer Smith SACES Emerging Leader Fellow Ned Golubovic CSI Leadership Fellow and Intern Tom Murphy CSI Leadership Fellow Cory Viehl NBCC Minority Fellowship Grant
**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 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.

**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.

**M 3: Student Evals (O: 3)**

End of course evaluations will be used to measure undergraduate perceptions of teacher effectiveness based on the item “Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?”

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O3: Teaching Excellence**

100% of students will score a 3.5 or higher (out of 5) on this item. 60% of students will score 4.0 or higher (out of 5) on this item. 20% of students will score a 4.5 or higher (out of 5) on this item.

**M 4: Faculty Evals (O: 3)**

A summary score of the 12 items on the Classroom Observation Form, filled out by faculty will be used to measure the faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness by Ph.D. students in CJ&C.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O3: Teaching Excellence**

100% of students will have an average score of 3 or higher on the 12-item faculty-rated classroom observation form. 50% of students will attain an average score of 4.0 or higher on the 12-item faculty-rated classroom observation form. 25% of students will attain an average score of 4.5 or higher on the classroom observation form.

**M 5: Comps Rubric (O: 5)**

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.

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

**Target for O5: Critical Thinkers**

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.

**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. Consistent with the department’s mission and in support of the department’s role in the core university curriculum, students should be analyzers of the complexity of crime and the criminal justice system considering historical
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)

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 2014 (n=2), Spring 2015 (n=2), and Summer 2015 (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, two taught in the Fall 2014 and one taught in the Spring 2015, all by full-time, tenure-track faculty.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
A total of 309 students (n=72 for Instructor 1; n=120 for Instructor 2; n=117 for Instructor 3) were enrolled in the three CRJU 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions by instructor and section are reported below: Instructor 1: Q1 Pass Rate: 91.2%; Q2 Pass Rate: 93.6%;
Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 1, 92.4% (Overall: Met target goal); Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 91.9%; Q2 Pass Rate: 93.7%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 2, 92.8% (Overall: Met target goal). Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 91.9%; Q2 Pass Rate: 91.9%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 3, 91.9% (Overall: Met target goal).

**Target for Q2: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 309 students (n=72 for Instructor 1; n=120 for Instructor 2; n=117 for Instructor 3) were enrolled in the three CRJU 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions by instructor and section are reported below:

- Instructor 1: Q1 Pass Rate: 91.2%; Q2 Pass Rate: 70.6%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 1, 80.9% (Overall: Met target goal).
- Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 73.2%; Q2 Pass Rate: 86.8%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 2, 80.0% (Overall: Met target goal).
- Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 55.8%; Q2 Pass Rate: 80.0%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 3, 67.9% (Overall: Not Met target goal).

**Target for Q3: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

A total of 309 students (n=72 for Instructor 1; n=120 for Instructor 2; n=117 for Instructor 3) were enrolled in the three CRJU 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions by instructor and section are reported below:

- Instructor 1: Q1 Pass Rate: 57.4%; Q2 Pass Rate: 80.9%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 1, 69.2% (Overall: Not Met target goal).
- Instructor 2: Q1 Pass Rate: 48.7%; Q2 Pass Rate: 47.2%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 2, 48.0% (Overall: Not Met target goal).
- Instructor 3: Q1 Pass Rate: 54.7%; Q2 Pass Rate: 55.0%; Overall Pass Rate for Instructor 3, 54.9% (Overall: Not 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: In-Progress
- Priority: Low
- Implementation Description: Fall 2010
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: Criminal Justice Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Review new core and course requirements**

Review course learning outcomes and measure to ensure that new core outcome is appropriately reflected and assessed and to streamline reporting in the coming year.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: instructors and undergraduate committee
Review new core and course requirements
Review course learning outcomes and measure to ensure that new core outcome is appropriately reflected and assessed and to streamline reporting in the coming year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: instructors and undergraduate committee

Training on assessment for PhD Instructors
With implementation of Ph.D. Program the department has added a number of Teaching Assistants and as a part of this implementation, the department has developed a teaching seminar. As part of this seminar, students will be subjected to assessment issues and questions as a part of this conference. With this implementation, a section of the seminar will be consistently oriented to ensure that curriculum of the department and assessment issues are considered in course development. As well, required data collection elements will be discussed and collected as a part of this course.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues
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 type/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
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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 opportunities to learn, practice, and master each of the SLOs.

CRJU 2200: Social Science and the American Crime Problem is designated in the undergraduate program to meet the SLOs associated with the university core curriculum. The Undergraduate Committee is in the process of developing a curriculum mapping assessment tool to determine whether students learn, practice and/or master each of the SLOs in the program curriculum. Although the mapping tool has yet to be implemented, it is most likely that CRJU 2200 will be evaluated as an opportunity to "learn" each of 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?

Overall, the evidence suggests considerable imbalance in meeting the target achievement goal of 80% across the three different student learning outcomes (SLOs). Specifically, the SLO involving the analysis of contemporary crime and criminal justice issues was met, the SLO involving analysis of contemporary multicultural issues was partially met, and the SLO involving the analysis of contemporary global and international issues was not met. Compared to AY 2013-2014, there was an improvement in the target achievement goals for the first SLO, moving from partially met to met. For the second SLO, the target achievement goals remained steady at only partially being met. For the third SLO, there was a significant decline in target achievement goals, shifting from partially met to not met. During this two-year assessment period, there was no change to the assessment items and the same instructors taught the course. At this juncture, it is unclear as to what contributed to these changes other than differences in student composition and possible changes in the delivery (e.g., readings, lectures) of the course material. Part of our review with the instructors will be to determine what may have contributed to these discrepancies.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

As a first step, the Undergraduate Coordinator will distribute the AY 2014-2014 Weave Report for the University Core Course to the CRJU 2200 instructors for review and feedback. Next, feedback from the instructors will be organized and provided to the Undergraduate Committee for full review. The committee will assess the extent to which changes can or should be made regarding the utility of the assessment method itself and the kinds of assessment items used. Working with the CRJU 2200 instructors, recommendations will be made and presented to the full faculty for discussion. Any recommendations made will also be considered in light of the evidence garnered from the results of the curriculum mapping project.

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 stated in the Action Plan, an evaluation of the assessment tool - multiple choice items from one examination - to ensure applicability of the goals is warranted. Two issues require further consideration. First, it is unclear how the multiple choice examination connects to the goal of promoting critical thinking. Considerable discussion with the CRJU 2200 instructors is needed to determine if an alternative measure can be developed as part of an exam (e.g., an essay question) or as a separate writing
Second, the 80% pass rate as the target achievement goal for each question has not been met consistently across the three student learning outcomes. Assessment is needed to determine why the second and third SLOs fail to meet the target achievement goal (e.g., is the problem associated with the assessment tool itself or the types of questions used to assess the SLOs?). The Undergraduate Coordinator will meet with the CRJU 2200 instructors to discuss the issues raised above and to determine what changes, if any, are needed. One major obstacle is that enrollments for the sections are quite high (e.g., 70-120 students), making it difficult to use a different assessment tool, especially one that might involve essay writing. The review process will begin during Spring, 2016 and to be completed no later than the end of the Summer session, 2016.

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes the development of understanding about issues of crime and justice, particularly within urban environments using multicultural, interdisciplinary perspectives that inform science, policy, and practice. The educational mission of the undergraduate program is to encourage critical analysis of information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant within the fields of criminal justice and criminology. We aim to produce students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for criminal justice positions in public and private agencies through education, training and research experiences.

Goals

G 2: Be critical thinkers
Students should be critical thinkers, specifically concerning crime and justice issues.

G 4: Be effective writers
Students will be effective writers, with a specific focus on communication about issues of crime and justice, necessary to excel in public and private sector criminal justice positions.

G 1: Students should be knowledgeable about the criminal justice system
Students should be knowledgeable about the functions and structures of the criminal justice system and issues related to crime and justice responses.

G 3: Be appliers of ethical frameworks
Students will be effective appliers of ethical frameworks when considering issues in criminal justice decision-making.

G 5: Be effective oral communicators
Students will be effective oral communicators, with a specific focus on their ability to orally communicate about issues in crime and justice, in order to excel in in professional positions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their retention of knowledge about the criminal justice system and salient topical issues in the field in written form. Students will effectively communicate facts about an issue and apply theoretical frameworks to demonstrate the depth of both their knowledge and their ability to critically synthesize relevant information about that specific topic.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
Students will develop and/or enhance skills in applying theoretical frameworks to contemporary issues in criminal justice. Students will be able to not only synthesize and interpret extant information, but also identify patterns within extant information, be able to compare and contrast different sides of a problem, and/or generate new predictions through their presentation in a written form.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 5: Written communication skills (G: 4) (M: 1)
Students will be able to effectively communicate their knowledge and analytical skills in written form (paper). Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively identify issues, develop and organize subtopics, and generate streamlined presentations of information. In addition, students will utilize appropriate grammar and syntax, as well as the ability to adhere to APA style guidelines.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 6: Oral communication skills (G: 5) (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively through oral presentations about criminal justice issues and processes using the spoken word. Students should be able to orally develop and present material that is organized, flows smoothly, and is engaging in a manner that is smooth and uses good grammar.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 7: Identification and evaluation of ethical frameworks (G: 3) (M: 3)**

Students should be able to identify and evaluate ethical issues that arise within the criminal justice system.

**Standard Associations**

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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay (O: 2, 3, 5)**

CRJU 4930: Seminar in Criminal Justice is a key assessment course for the department. It is a capstone and the second of a two bookend courses designated as CTW. The CTW assignment, referenced as the Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay, is designed to test student's ability to critically evaluate an issue in criminology or criminal justice. The assignment, included as an attached document, requires students to identify a single issue from the internship experience, identify a relevant theory (criminological, sociological, psychological, organizational, or legal) that can be utilized to enhance understanding of the issue, and prepare a position paper that addresses policy implications and recommendations. The assessment rubric is attached, and includes the different sections for the separate learning outcomes.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2014 (n=42), two sections in Spring 2015 (n=69), and one section in Summer 2015 (n=31). Data are available and presented for all 42 students in the Fall 2014 section and half or 25 students in one of the Spring 2015 sections. It should be noted that one of the CTW consultants assigned to both sections in Spring 2015 completed the rubric for the draft essay but not the final essay; therefore, we are unable to analyze data for 44 of the students in those sections. The data for Summer 2015 are unavailable due to the retirement of the instructor. The attached files labeled “CRJU 4930 Rubric Data Fall 2014” and “CRJU 4930 Rubric Data Spring 2015 Sec 1” contain data for 67 students. At the end of the year, 76.1% (n=51) of the students scored a 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale on the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric dimension. 37.3 percent (n=25) 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 55.2% (n=37) exhibited an increase in the Comprehend and Synthesis of Knowledge rubric with an additional 9% (n=6) who remained at the highest score (4 of 4) between the first and final submission for a total of 64.2 % (n=43). Only 9.0% (n=6) exhibited a decrease and 25.4% (n=17) showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2014 (n=42), two sections in Spring 2015 (n=69), and one section in Summer 2015 (n=31). Data are available and presented for all 42 students in the Fall 2014 section and half or 25 students in one of the Spring 2015 sections. It should be noted that one of the CTW consultants assigned to both sections in Spring 2015 completed the rubric for the draft essay but not the final essay; therefore, we are unable to analyze data for 44 of the students in those sections. The data for Summer 2015 are unavailable due to the retirement of the instructor. The attached files labeled “CRJU 4930 Rubric Data Fall 2014” and “CRJU 4930 Rubric Data Spring 2015 Sec 1” contain data for 67 students. Overall, 100% (n=67) of the students earned a score of 2, 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. 68.7% (n=46) of students received a score of 3 or 4, and 28.4% (n=19) 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 82.1% (n=55) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 6.0% (n=4) exhibited a decrease and 32.8% (n=22) showed no improvement in the Application & Analysis rubric dimension score where improvement was possible (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point). Finally, 52.2% (n=35) 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2014 (n=42), two sections in Spring 2015 (n=69), and
one section in Summer 2015 (n=31). Data are available and presented for all 42 students in the Fall 2014 section and half or 25 students in one of the Spring 2015 sections. It should be noted that one of the CTW consultants assigned to both sections in Spring 2015 completed the rubric for the draft essay but not the final essay; therefore, we are unable to analyze data for 44 of the students in those sections. The data for Summer 2015 are unavailable due to the retirement of the instructor. The attached files labeled “CRJU 4930 Rubric Data Fall 2014” and “CRJU 4930 Rubric Data Spring 2015 Sec 1” contain data for 67 students. At the end of the year, the first two goals were not met, although the rates were close to the target goals. First, 77.6% (n=52) of the students enrolled earned a score of 3 or 4 on the Writing Quality & Style dimension of the rubric. Second, 43.3% (n=29) of the students earned a score of 4 on this dimension for the final draft of the paper. We did achieve the final goal of 50% on the final dimension, finding that 52.2% (n=35) of the students showed improvement on their scores between the draft and the final draft submissions. It is worth pointing out that 95.5% (n=64) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 11.9% (n=8) exhibited a decrease and 13.4% (n=9) 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 a 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

We did not assess outcomes using this measure this year.

Target for O6: Oral communication skills

80% of student presentations will be score at least an 80% on oral communication skills rubric (with low values representing a poorly developed and organized presentation, without a logical flow, that is not engaging and uses poor grammar and a 100% representing excellence – well organized, logical flow, engaging with excellent grammatical skills). 

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

There was one section of the capstone class (CRJU 4930) during Fall 2014 (n=42), two sections in Spring 2015 (n=69), and one section in Summer 2015 (n=31). Data are available for 111 students from all sections during the Fall and Spring semesters. The data for Summer 2015 are unavailable due to the retirement of the instructor. The target goal was easily met with 98.2% (n=109) of the students scoring 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 3060: 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. Beginning in AY 2014-2015, the new faculty member developed and implemented a new assignment which meets the CTW requirement (see attached file named "CRJU 3060 Scruples Assignment AY 2014-2015"). A two-part "Scruples" assignment is designed using a "draft and revise" format. In the first assignment, students are expected to write a "Scruples" question that presents a moral or ethical dilemma. The student then describes why the question is in fact a moral or ethical dilemma and then analyzes the situation using at least one of the standard ethical perspectives discussed in the course. Building upon the experience of the first assignment, student develop and analyze a second “Scruples” question that is expected to be more sophisticated than the first. For both “Scruples” assignments, students will submit a draft, receive comments and a critique from the instructor, and then revise and resubmit the assignment for a grade. A grading rubric is applied to the draft and revised versions (see attached grading rubric). This set of assignments measures not only students' ability to assess and apply ethical frameworks, but also their written communication skills. The instructor was given the academic year to assess and redesign the assignment based upon student feedback and an undergraduate committee review. In doing so, no grading rubric was required; instead, the instructor assigned numerical grades to the assignments.

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, across the initial assignment (Scruples 1) and the second assignment (Scruples 2).

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

There was one section of the Ethics class (CRJU 3060) during Fall 2014 (n=16) and two sections in Spring 2015 (n=93). Data are available and presented for all 109 students in three sections (see attached file labeled “CRJU 3060 Grades AY 2014-2015”). The findings indicate that 54.1% (n=59) of the students increased their scores from the initial to the second scruples assignment.
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
- **Implementation Description:** The department has reviewed all syllabi in the undergraduate curriculum with a focus on determining alignment of course learning outcomes with departmental learning outcomes. The next step will be to review the assessment approaches within courses to determine usefulness for departmental assessment across sections.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and CTW teaching faculty

**Objective assessment measures**
The CTW Ambassador will meet with faculty to discuss the need to use objective assessment measures that are independent of grades.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador

**Continued data collection**
As a discipline, we believe that cross sectional data may yield findings that are not accurate, particularly given that contextual factors may enter into any particular course during any particular semester. Because we value examining a greater breadth of data, we will continue to monitor results over the next two years to determine whether our goals are being consistently met before we move on to address another question.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Continued data collection
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** UG committee and program faculty.

**Expanded gathering of data**
We will work to expand collection of data across sections of the capstone seminar next semester to collect a wider range of data relevant to assessment of oral presentation requirements and outcomes in the coming two years.

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

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

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

Reassessment of Student Learning Outcomes
With the adoption of the one-course-required-CTW model and the decision to have CRJU 3060: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice as its sole CTW designated course, the Undergraduate Committee will need to review the department's student learning outcomes (SLOs) and determine how the assignment (or assignments) in the course meet the existing SLOs or it may require changes to the SLOs.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate 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?

Capstone Seminar - Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice Issue Essay: To summarize, the findings indicate that we "partially met" (compared to "met" in AY 2013-2014) the target goals for demonstrating knowledge and the ability to synthesize information, "met" (compared to "met" in AY 2013-2014) the target goals for application and analysis, and "partially met" (compared to "partially met" in AY 2013-2014) the target goals for written communication skills. Capstone Seminar - Oral Presentation Assignment: To summarize, the findings indicate that we "met" (compared to "met" in AY 2013-2014) the target goal for oral communication skills. Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice Assignment: To summarize, the results indicate that we "met" (not reported in AY 2013-2014 cycle) the target goal for the identification and evaluation of ethical frameworks. Overall, this year's results are comparable to those of last year. The Undergraduate Committee, in association with the Internship Coordinator, have or will be instituting two significant changes associated with the CTW requirement. First, in accordance with the Georgia State University Senate motion approved on April 16, 2015, the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology has approved their CTW plan that will deliver critical thinking through writing within a one-course-required-CTW model. The plan designates CRJU 3060: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice as it sole CTW course. In addition to continuing the Scruples assignment in the course, a grading rubric has been designed and implemented beginning in AY 2015-2016. For the AY 2015-2016 assessment cycle, new target goals will be proposed in conjunction with this assignment. Second, CRJU 4930: Internship Seminar in Criminal Justice will no longer be regarded as a CTW designated course. This will result in discontinuing the department's assessment of the capstone seminar as part of the Weave report. The undergraduate committee will need to assess how the change to a one-course-required-CTW model involving CRJU 3060 will affect the department's assessment of its student learning outcomes. Additional and varied assignments in CRJU 3060 will be required.
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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 0: Critical thinking
Students will be critical thinkers with regards to issues of crime and criminal justice.

G 1: Develop knowledge
Students will be knowledgeable about crime and criminal justice systems and processes.

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.

Strategic Plan Associations

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

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the four items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the four items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the four items.

#### M 2: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)

The Thesis knowledge assessment survey is a 21-item faculty-rated questionnaire that measures the degree to which students who defended their thesis successfully have met the student learning outcomes. The questionnaire is completed by the student’s thesis supervisor. Items are based on a 4 point scale 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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Apply research and statistical skills
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Understand how systems & processes interact

- **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 weaker on this 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.
**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

---
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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: · 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 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 1: Accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources.

**M 4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems (O: 4)**

Students will identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.

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

**Target for O4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the student work in HA 8670 Health Information Systems. Learning Objective: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 1: Accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.
Mission / Purpose

The mission and purpose of the Master of Arts in Teaching in Early Childhood Education program is to develop a cadre of teachers who will become change agents who will positively affect their classrooms, their schools, their communities, and their school districts as well as the national conversation about educational issues and change. Specifically, the program is designed for teachers in urban school settings who will remain in and be informed by their classrooms while assuming leadership roles in their schools, their communities, and within the larger context of the political structures that shape educative opportunities for all children.

Mission in Action-

Both experience in urban schools and urban research studies suggest that urban communities face unique challenges that must be addressed by teachers in those schools. In order to accomplish this mission, the program is designed to support beginning teachers of record who have not completed a traditional teacher preparation baccalaureate but who are working in their own classrooms. Coursework has been carefully constructed in order to support them as they work in urban high needs schools in the metro Atlanta area. This will help ensure that those teachers working in high needs schools without previous coursework in education are adequately prepared to meet both the needs of their students and the challenges of teaching in urban schools.

Goals

G 1: G1: Content Knowledge
The teacher candidate will have the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum he or she teaches.

G 2: G2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills
The teacher candidate will possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be able to effectively plan for and teach learners in grades PK-5.

G 3: G3: Student Learning
The teacher candidate will use varied instructional strategies, assessment techniques and critical reflection to document children’s development and learning.

G 4: G4: Diversity
The teacher candidate will work collaboratively with diverse professionals to meet the cultural, linguistic, learning, and behavioral needs of all learners.

G 5: G5: Clinical Teaching Practice
Candidates will demonstrate the application and critical use of pedagogical and content knowledge in the context of classroom evidenced to university coaches observing in their PK-5th grade classrooms.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: SLO1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Teacher candidates understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content and curricula he or she teaches. 1. Candidates are made aware that they must take and pass the GACE Early Childhood Education I and II before being recommendation for certification. 2. Candidates’ content knowledge will be evaluated through their scores on the GACE Early Childhood Education I and II exam taken at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.
8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

Strategic Plan Associations

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
**SLO 2: SLO2: Plans effectively for instruction (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Teacher candidates plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations:

**The Assessment- Directions for the Responsive Planning Project**

This project will demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in your classroom context. Through this project, you will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student's interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Specifically you will utilize planning and instructional artifacts to demonstrate your development as an increasingly responsive educator across your two years of engagement in the MAT.

Specifically, you will need to attend to the following questions:

- How has your planning and instruction changed as you have gained a more complex understanding of your students, the community, and the subject matter?
- Looking back at the first unit that you planned for your class/students, how would you characterize those plans in relation to your current understandings and practices related to curriculum design and implementation?

These questions will be the basis of your self-analysis and narration of your growth in your planning and instructional practices over your two years of teaching. Through the examination of the instructional plans you have created and the type of engagements and learning opportunities you have crafted with/for students throughout the years you will use various media to demonstrate your increasing understanding and incorporation of the following key components of responsive planning and instruction:

(a) holding high expectations for excellence;

(b) valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum;

(c) recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners;

(d) enacting broader curriculum to develop a reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors;

(e) informing planning and instruction through knowledge of students, content, curriculum, learning environments, assessment, and self reflexive processes;

(f) facilitating productive learning tasks;

(g) engaging in self reflexive practice informing planning and pedagogy.

*Please see evaluative rubric for more information about each of these categories.

**Description of how it is used in the program:**

*Planning (pedagogical knowledge and skills)* will be assessed through the *RESPONSIVE PLANNING PROJECT, *which will be submitted by candidates for evaluation at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition. This project will serve to demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in classroom contexts. Through this project, candidates will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student’s interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. At the Clinical Practice/Program Exit transitions, candidates will analyze and evaluate their instructional practices over the two years of teaching, examining the first unit plans they created and the type of engagements and learning opportunities crafted with/for students throughout the years. Specifically, candidates will attend to the following questions: How has your planning and instruction changed as you have gained a more complex understanding of your students, the community, and the subject matter? Looking back at the first unit that you planned for your class/students, how would you characterize those plans in relation to your current understandings and practices related to curriculum design and implementation?

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.
SLO 3: SLO3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 3)

Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. For example, candidates may provide evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formal and informal, formative and summative assessments (such as the Developmental Reading Assessment-DRA- or other literacy assessment tools, math assessments based on the common core curriculum, or benchmark/anchor papers for writing assessment). Through this project, candidates will describe the gains made by their students and demonstrate such claims by including specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

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

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

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

Strategic Plan Associations

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

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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.

3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

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

SLO 4: SLO 4: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 4)

Teacher candidates are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals and stakeholders in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally. They know and use ethical and professional guidelines related to educational practice. Teacher candidates foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

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

Institutional Priority Associations

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

Strategic Plan Associations

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.

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

SLO 5: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice (G: 5) (M: 5)

Teacher candidates use their knowledge of academic disciplines, child development, and their understanding of how children learn, develop, and differ in their approaches to learning to create, implement, and evaluate instructional opportunities that are meaningful to and supportive of all students. They use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and evidence of deep understandings performed idiosyncratically and meaningfully. Teacher candidates use their understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create learning environments that encourage positive social interactions, active engagement in learning, and self motivation. They use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom. They are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other stakeholders and professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally. Teacher candidates foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

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

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

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: M1: GACE I and II Exam scores (O: 1)**

Licensure exam scores will be analyzed for progress toward content knowledge development of MAT candidates.

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

**Target for O1: SLO1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

Target: 95% of our students will obtain a passing score on the GACE I and II as determined by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. A passing score on these tests is required for teacher certification/licensure in Early Childhood Education.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates completing our program in Spring 2015 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 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded expectation on the Responsive Planning Project demonstrating their ability in planning and instruction. 100% of students exceeded expectations in three components of this rubric indicating that the Responsive Planning Project was beneficial to students’ growth and development, especially in regards to holding high expectations, enacting a broader curriculum, and facilitating productive learning tasks. More detailed analysis of the data from the endpoint evaluation of the Responsive Planning Project demonstrates that across candidates, the lowest area of this planning and instruction assessment was “knowledge of assessment” (50% of the students scored within the Level 4 range; 50% of the students scored within the Level 3 range). This subcategory states: Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment...GA-GSTEP-4.C, GA-GSTEP-5.D, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3, INTASC-3, INTASC-4, INTASC-8

**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; 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 include specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth. Reflection demonstrating the development and improvement of instructional practice through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. Description of how it is used in the program: Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. For example, candidates may provide evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of 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 student growth through the documentation and analysis of formal and informal, formative and summative assessments. Through this project, candidates will describe the gains made by their students and demonstrate such claims by including specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth. The rubric used across this project is aligned with the PSC domains, the PECE 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 recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0=5%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of 2015 completers met or exceeded expectations on the Impact on Student Learning Project demonstrating their ability to positively effect student learning.

**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: SLO4: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions**

As beginning teachers of record in urban schools, MAT candidates must demonstrate dispositions toward diversity and professional ethics that will serve students in historically underserved contexts. Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "acceptable," or 4, "exemplary," on the 1-4 point Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (an "acceptable" rating). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric:
Teacher candidates in the ECE MAT program are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performances and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all student in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in university coursework. Teacher candidates in the ECE MAT have supported field based coursework throughout two academic years in the program and are full time teachers of record throughout that time. The Clinical teaching Practice Project completed at the midpoint and endpoint of the program is completed by the university coach at the end of each academic year. The evaluation is a comprehensive review of the candidate's competencies and the rubric is aligned to the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure as well as the Georgia Framework for Teaching, the PSC Rules for Early Childhood Education. The rubric used to assess this project is also aligned with PSC domains, the PCE rules for ECE 505-3-.16 and the Conceptual Framework Standards of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) of Georgia State University. The university coach (supervisor) rates the candidate based on his/her teaching performance, assignments, and 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 7585 and to be recommended for certification. If a teacher candidate receives a rating lower than 3, the university supervisor works with the candidate to develop an action plan and an additional opportunity to demonstrate competency. A grade of "B" or better is required to pass all field based courses and to continue with the program in good standing. This rubric is used at the midpoint and endpoint of the program to ensure candidate progress and success. If a candidate does not meet the minimum target for clinical teaching performance, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4=70%; Level 3=25%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for OS: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "standard met," or 4, "standard exceeded," on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (a rating of "standard met"). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Levels 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

100% of completers in Spring 2015 met or exceeded on aspects of dispositions evaluated in rows incorporated in the Clinical Practice Unit Rubric Endpoint: the Intern Keys, the assessment utilized by the GSU PEF unit.

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

GACE Scores

In 2013-14 we will begin having candidates who are not provisionally certified and therefore have not taken and passed both the GACE I and GACE II before program entry. Each semester of the program, coaches and program coordinators will discuss this Key Assessment and offer support where needed.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: 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

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 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 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 evidence, candidates 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.

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: Authentic; 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 midyear 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 midyear candidates, who also seem to grapple more with a 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 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. (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 as practicing teachers in our metropolitan community. (c) Individual coaching support Midyear 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 areas for growth. This is a practice that has been effective during the 2013-14 year and will be continued. Additionally, the midyear 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 6785, Integrative and Iterative Curriculum Design taken during the third semester of the program (immediately after the midyear key assessment). Candidates at the midyear had not yet enrolled in this critical course. Particular attention to the subscales midyear 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 also collaborating during Fall 2014 to revise this commentary framework and to ensure that, it also with the CLASS Subscales of "Concept Development" and "Instructional Learning Formats" are significant emphases of our field based coaching collaborations in ECE 6765, 6866, 7576, and 7585.

Clinical Practice Support Action Plan

100% of candidates completing in 2015 met or exceeded on the Clinical Practice Endpoint. While all completers met or exceeded requirements, careful analysis indicated that students scored lowest in instructional planning (100% of the 7 students scored within the Level 3 range out of a possible 4). Instructional Planning on this rubric is defined in the following way: The teacher plans using objectives and standards to differentiation and assessment strategies. It also requires that students revisit the lesson plan and provide with interventions, action plans, and specific steps for improvement, along with additional support across time as they focus on areas for growth. This is a practice that has been effective during the 2013-14 year and will be continued. Additionally, students who are struggling 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. (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 also collaborating during Fall 2014 to revise this commentary framework and to ensure that, it also with the CLASS Subscales of "Concept Development" and "Instructional Learning Formats" are significant emphases of our field based coaching collaborations in ECE 6765, 6866, 7576, and 7585.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: see above description
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator and faculty coaches
Impact on Student Learning and edTPA Task 3 Action Plan

100% of 2015 completers met or exceeded expectations on the Impact on Student Learning Project demonstrating their ability to positively effect student learning. More detailed analysis of the data from the endpoint evaluation of the Impact on Student Learning Key Assessment demonstrates that across candidates, the lowest area of these effects on student learning assessment was within their description of longitudinal impact on individual learners (GA Step 2: E, B, A, C, 4, H, G, SU-CF-1.3, INTASC 3, 4, 7, 8). While 42% of completers exceeded expectations within this rubric level, 57% of the students met expectations. Additionally, as we have been analyzing our initial data from externally evaluated edTPA, we have developed specific insights into assessment and determining impact on student learners that is a continued area of focus for our program. Specific rubrics from edTPA Task 3 provide additionally nuanced recommendations for our next steps related to the development of candidates and their ability to narrate and demonstrate effects on student learning. Within the context of edTPA it is discussed below, but it bears including here as it directly relates to our next steps and action plans moving forward with our candidates. Action Plan for Assessment One critical change we have implemented during this year was to include EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment within our program of study. Previously, candidates were only able to take Action Research to meet that requirement. However, as of Summer 2015 we have recommended that all of our candidates enroll in EPRS 7920 so as to gain more complex understandings of these constructs. The group that will be taking edTPA in Spring 2015 as a consequential need for their certification will all have enrolled in this course. The program change was approved in Spring 2015. Rubric 11 - Analysis of Student Learning: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will focus on analysis of student learning, specifically using work samples as evidence and considering the qualitative and quantitative patterns of individuals and groups in their class. They will work to note learning trends for specific individuals as well as for groups of students and for the full class. Rubric 12 - Providing feedback to guide further learning & Rubric 13 - Student Use of Feedback: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will support learners as they use feedback (from teacher, peer, and self-evaluation) to evaluate their own strengths and needs. Candidates will focus on conferring specifically through a book club on Anderson's How's It Going? in their ECE 7585 course thinking about ways to provide and foster increasingly meaningful and enacted feedback for learners. We will focus on ways that this process of conferring moves beyond feedback for a specific work sample and rather works to support the development of the writer/mathematician across time and contexts, impacting future work rather than merely influencing the writing of one single piece. Connecting this reading and the processes within to candidate thinking about feedback and the way individuals and groups will be meaningful and intentional as we support candidates in these two rubrics which were our two most low scoring rubrics as a program. 14 Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will focus on analysis of student learning, specifically collecting, analyzing, and explaining the language function, vocabulary, and additional language demands that students utilized in the development of their content understandings. This will be considered both in the instructional case study for literacy and math and also in the lesson planning template utilized through the planning courses across the program (ECE 6575, 6585, 7575, 7585). Candidates will not only explain and provide evidence for this language use and content learning for their entire class or for one individual student, but also will consider three students from their class with varied needs and analyze language usage across student and time.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Analysis of Student Learning: The data shared within the Clinical Practice Midpoint demonstrate that across candidates, 75% of the students scored within the Level 2 range; 25% of the students scored within the Level 1 range), academically challenging environment (12% of the students scored within the Level 3 range; 50% of the students scored within the Level 2 range; 37% of the students scored within the Level 1 range). These rubrics emphasize the following:

- 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.

- 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. (INTASC-2011-3) + 10. Communication: The teacher communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning. (GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3, INTASC-2011-10) Action Plan: Taken together, these three components represent the lowest scores within the clinical practice midpoint evaluation of candidates still in our program. To support all students in improving in each of these areas, during the following academic year students will be provided with multiple opportunities throughout the semester across courses to bring their young students' work samples to class for direct support via analysis, feedback, and reflection activities within ECE 6586: Advocating for Students through the Descriptive Review of the Child. The structure of this course will be altered so that students will meet weekly and work on campus within small groups to practice the DRC process and implementation. This process requires that teachers collect and analyze students' work in the classroom as well as dispositions and potential events and scenarios outside of the school setting. Providing more teacher-directed support from the course instructor will alert students to nuances and opportunities that may have been missed when meeting in peer-only groups outside of class. Additionally, the instructor can prompt students' thinking by requiring connections to texts be made and aligned to pedagogical thinking. This particular project requires that teachers consider assessment methods, impact of the environment (home and school), and communication tactics with students and families, all of which were the lowest areas within the midpoint assessment.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Objective/Outcome):
- Measure: M 5: Clinical Teaching Practice | Objective/Outcome: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Implementation Description: see above

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator, faculty, and coaches

Planning and Instruction Action Plan

Detailed analysis of the data from the endpoint evaluation of the Responsive Planning Project demonstrates that across candidates, the lowest area of this planning and instruction assessment was “knowledge of assessment” (50% of the 6 students scored within the Level 4 range; 50% of the students scored within the Level 3 range). This subcategory states: Informing planning and instruction
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 its processes? (2) What impact have assessment 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?

ECE MAT Program 2014-2015 Assessment Report Key Assessment Transition: It is important to note that during the 2015-2016 transition year as edTPA becomes consequential, we will no longer utilize the Responsive Planning Project and the Impact on Student Learning Project as key assessments. Instead, in alignment with the procedures and processes of the PEF Unit at GSU, we will use the edTPA as our key assessment. For this 2015-2016 year we found it important to analyze and consider the implications of both sets of data as we plan and move forward for our current candidates. General Overview Based on assessment reports, ECE MAT Program students need more direct instruction and support with the edTPA. Beginning in the fall 2015 semester all coaching courses (ECE 6586, ECE 6585, ECE 7575, ECE 7585) will meet every other week (in lieu of monthly) and incorporate direct instruction of edTPA components. For example, students will intentionally and thoroughly explore academic language and language functions by bringing in copies of their own self-created lesson plans and self-assessing and peer-assessing how language is depicted in their written plans. Additionally, students will confer with their coaches about how language is articulated during implementation. Sharing and revising these materials and teaching students how to use and align language theory with practice as well as build foundational knowledge of key edTPA expectations. Integration of the text Pathways to the Common Core: Accelerating Achievement (2012) by Lucy Calkins, Mary Ehrenworth, and Christopher Lehman will occur a semester earlier as a book club in the context of the coaching courses. This will enable students to return to it more consistently throughout the program as they write reflections about their readings and discuss, address questions, and make connections between classroom practices and edTPA expectations. Clinical Practice - Midpoint: 100% of candidates completing in 2015 met or exceeded on the Clinical Practice Endpoint. While all completers met or exceeded requirements, careful analysis indicated that students scored lowest in instructional planning (100% of the 7 students scored within the Level 3 range out of a possible 4). Instructional Planning on this rubric is defined in the following way: 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. (GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2, INTASC-2011-2, INTASC-2011-7, INTASC-2011-8) Action Plan: Students will explore instructional planning in more intentional ways. The ECE MAT Program is adopting the lesson plan template used within the ECE BSEd Program that directly links to edTPA. This lesson plan template requires more specific details throughout the student's planning, implementation, and reflection. The format scaffolds students with the multiple components involved within a lesson plan from objectives and standards to differentiation and assessment strategies. It also requires that students revisit the lesson plan and add a reflection after conferring with his/her coach. This component invites the student to think not only about the strengths and areas needing improvement within his/her implementation but also to think about how the written plan could be improved to better support instructional delivery. Additionally, such a template will use a more structured format that aligns with the edTPA in a way that is more accessible for students in their current educational experiences. The rubric will serve as a self-assessment tool and guide for instructional choices. For example, when brainstorming what type of "hook" or initial engagement to use to spark young students' interest in the lesson as well as alert them to what topic/skill will be explored, the teacher has an opportunity to review the rubric descriptions for various types of hooks and respective levels (i.e., 4, 3, 2, 1). Clinical Practice - Midpoint The data shared within the Clinical Practice Midpoint demonstrate that students scored lowest in assessment uses (75% of the 8 students scored within the Level 2 range; 25% of the 8 students scored within the Level 1 range), academically challenging environment (12% of the 8 students scored within the Level 3 range; 50% of the students scored within the Level 2 range; 37% of the students scored within the Level 1 range): These rubrics emphasize the following: ● G. Assessment Use: 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. (INTASC-2011-6) ● 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. (INTASC-2011-3) ● 10. Communication: The teacher communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning. (GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3, INTASC-2011-10) Action Plan: Taken together, these three components represent the lowest scores within the clinical practice midpoint evaluation of candidates still in our program. To support all students in improving in each of these areas, during the following academic year students will be provided with multiple opportunities throughout the semester across courses to bring their young students' work samples to class for direct support via analysis, feedback, and reflection activities within ECE 6586: Advocating for Students through the Descriptive Review of the Child. The
structure of this course will be altered so that students will meet weekly and work on campus within small groups to practice the DRC process and implementation. This process requires that teachers collect and analyze students' work in the classroom as well as dispositions and potential events and scenarios outside of the school setting. Providing more teacher-directed support from the course instructor will alert students to nuances and opportunities that may have been missed when meeting in peer-only groups outside of class. Additionally, the instructor can prompt students' thinking by requiring connections to texts be made and aligned to peer feedback. This particular task demonstrates the impact of the course (i.e., planning, teaching, and school), and communication tactics with students and families, all of which were the lowest areas within the midpoint assessment.

Planning and Instruction: Responsive Planning Project 100% of students met or exceeded expectation on the Responsive Planning Project demonstrating their ability in planning and instruction. 100% of students exceeded expectations in three components of this rubric indicating that the Responsive Planning Project was beneficial to students' growth and development, especially in regards to holding high expectations, enacting a broader curriculum, and facilitating productive learning tasks. More detailed analysis of the data from the endpoint evaluation of the project demonstrates that a Plan of Action was implemented. This plan of action during this planning and instruction assessment was "knowledge of assessment" (50% of the 6 students scored within the Level 4 range; 50% of the students scored within the Level 3 range). This subcategory states: Informing planning and instruction through knowledge of assessment...GA-GSTEP-4.C, GA-GSTEP-5.D, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3, INTASC-3, INTASC-4, INTASC-8 Action Plan: To bolster support of candidates knowledge of assessment (a need identified by 50% of candidates who could continue to develop in their use of formal instructional strategies in practice into our curriculum) we are implementing the following opportunities: (1) a moderated submission upload with faculty from ECE. (2) A significant health concern raised by a student experienced very significant health concerns around the time of submission which we feel significantly impacted her certification for our candidates. (3) To target for additional support throughout the 2015-16 academic year as this assessment becomes consequential and linked to students' growth and development.

Rubric 11 - Analysis of Student Learning: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will focus on analysis of student learning, specifically using work samples as evidence and considering the qualitative and quantitative patterns of individuals and groups in their classroom. They will work to note learning trends for specific individuals as well as for groups of students and for the full class. Rubric 12 - Providing feedback to guide further learning & Rubric 13 - Student Use of Feedback: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will support learners as they use feedback (from teacher, peer, and self-evaluation) to evaluate their own strengths and needs and focus on continuous improvement (Hub on Anderson "the Rub"
"Specifically think about the process of thinking about ways to provide and foster increasingly meaningful and enacted feedback for learners. We focus on ways that this process of moving frames beyond feedback for a specific work sample and rather works to support the development of the writer/mathematician across time and contexts, impacting future work rather than merely influencing the writing of one single piece. Connecting this reading and the processes within to candidate thinking about feedback and the support and guidance of individual learners will be meaningful and intentional as we support candidates in these two rubrics which were our two most low scoring rubrics as a program. 14 Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will focus on analysis of student learning, specifically collecting, analyzing, and explaining the language function, vocabulary, and additional language demands that students utilized in the development of their content understandings. This will be considered both in the instructional case study for literacy and math and also in the lesson planning template utilized through the coaching courses across the program (ECE 6575, 6585, 7575, 7585). Candidates will develop plans for this language learning for their entire class or for one individual student, but also will consider three students from their class with varied needs and analyze language usage across student and time. In Spring 2015 all ECE MAT students completed and submitted the edTPA for official scoring, though the assessment at that point was not consequential. From that initial data we have been able to identify areas to target for additional support throughout the 2015-16 academic year as this assessment becomes consequential and linked to certification for candidates. Broadly speaking a large spread between candidates indicates that there were 100% of students who scored at least as high as a 68 and one as low as a 25. It should be noted that each of those candidates were outliers. The second highest score was a full 10 points lower than the highest score and the second lowest score was 9 points higher than our low outlier. The lowest scoring student experienced very significant health concerns around the time of submission which we feel significantly impacted her performance on the assessment. Additionally, two candidates had condition codes (one for three different rubrics), meaning that their rubrics were unscorable and they were awarded no points. While we cannot view the condition codes, it is likely due to the video or the rating saved in the checklist that was not accessible to the scorers, therefore the scorers were not able to provide scores for appropriate data file types, and a moderated submission upload with faculty from ECE. It is notable that when the scores are consequential, candidates will very likely attend with more care to the details of data file types. Action Items As the edTPA becomes consequential, we will be implementing several opportunities for candidates to compress and upload both videos and work samples in the file types that are compatible with edTPA scoring. Additionally, we will have workshops before the upload dates in the spring to formalize peer review of data file types and to ensure that all files are correctly labeled and uploaded before the submission process. Specific analysis by edTPA rubric of areas for continued focus: More detailed analysis of the external evaluation scores for edTPA means revealed particular areas of focus for program development moving forward in 2015-16. As program faculty we ran the means twice, first noting the means overall, then considering the means without the lowest scoring student who was suffering from significant illness and was an outlier by significant deviations. In our second analysis, it became very clear for an additional focus, Task 3. Overall, candidate means for tasks 1 (planning), Task 2 (Instruction) and Task 4 (Mathematics Assessment) were

higher than 2.5 for each task. Rubrics which were scored most highly for our candidates were in Task 1 (planning) and Task 2 (instruction). Planning Rubrics: ● 1-Planning for literacy learning ● 2-Planning to support varied student learning needs ● 3-Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning Additional rubrics which were scored most highly for our candidates were in Task 2 (Instruction): Instruction Rubrics ● 6-Learning environment ● 7-Engaging student in learning ● 9-Subject specific pedagogy - elementary literacy Each of these rubrics, when the lowest outlier was removed, was a mean of 3 or higher. Action Plan: As we continue to plan for and support candidates in preparation for edTPA, we are implementing a number of changes based on our data from previous years. Specifically, we will provide increased opportunities for candidates to analyze their teaching effectiveness and to demonstrate ways that they alter their teaching based on research and theory and in response to the learning needs of their students. Candidates will have opportunities to narrate their practice and decisions for field-based coaches and for peers through a monthly theory-into-practice reflection process, video recordings of their practice which they narrate and theorize for others, and in class engagements which foster and support synthesis and increased connections between course readings and theories and their practice and pedagogy in their classroom contexts. They will have continued opportunities to narrate their practice both orally and in writing and to narrate connections to, support from, and ways that their practice may diverge from theory and research on responsive pedagogy. They will have multiple experiences which support them in their endeavors to provide rationales for and narrate explanations for their own practice through courses and field work. Area of need: Task 3 - Assessment Careful analysis of our data indicates that the specific focus area for our program will be Task 3, Assessment. Initial scores from the non-consequential 2015 graduates indicate that this is the area where candidates scored significantly lower, ranging from 1.85 on Rubric 13 - Student Use of Feedback, to 2.4 on Rubric 11 - Analysis of Student Learning. We will be addressing these specific areas in 2015-2016 as we prepare candidates. Action Plan for Assessment One critical change we have implemented during this year was to include EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment within our program of study. Previously, candidates were only able to take Action Research to meet that requirement. However, as of Summer 2015 we have recommended that all of our candidates enroll in EPRS 7920 so as to gain more complex understandings of these constructs. The group that will be taking edTPA in Spring 2015 as a consequential need for their certification will all have enrolled in this course. The program change was approved in Spring 2015. Rubric 11 - Analysis of Student Learning: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will focus on analysis of student learning, specifically using work samples as evidence and considering the qualitative and quantitative patterns of individuals and groups in their class. They will work to note learning trends for specific individuals as well as for groups of students and for the full class. Rubric 12 - Providing feedback to guide further learning & Rubric 13 - Student Use of Feedback: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will support learners as they use feedback (from teacher, peer, and self-evaluation) to evaluate their own strengths and needs. Candidates will focus on conferring specifically through a book club on Anderson’s How’s It Going? in their ECE 7585 course thinking about ways to provide and foster increasingly meaningful and enacted feedback for learners. We will focus on ways that this process of conferring moves beyond feedback for a specific work sample and rather works to support the development of the writer/ mathematician across time and contexts, impacting future work rather than merely influencing the writing of one single piece.

Connecting this reading and the processes within to candidate thinking about feedback and the support and guidance of individual learners will be meaningful and intentional as we support candidates in these two rubrics which were our two most low scoring rubrics as a program. 14 Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Literacy Learning: In literacy and mathematics courses candidates will focus on analysis of student learning, specifically collecting, analyzing, and explaining the language function, vocabulary, and additional language demands that students utilized in the development of their content understandings. This will be considered both in the instructional case study for literacy and math and also in the lesson planning template utilized through the coaching courses across the program (ECE 6575, 6585, 7575, 7585). Candidates will not only explain and provide evidence for this language use and content learning for their entire class or for one individual student, but also will consider three students from their class with varied needs and analyze language usage across student and 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 Action Plans for 2013-14 and 2014-15 have been accomplished and completed. They have been indicated as such on the Action Plan Tracking System. For additional information about specific goals and implementations for the 2015-16 year, please see analysis question 2.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Early Childhood Education BSED
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science in Education Program in Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University is to prepare teacher candidates who will be qualified to direct the education of young children in diverse settings from pre-school through elementary grades, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and special education. The theme of this program is to develop teachers as facilitators of learning. Coursework, extensive field experiences, and collaboration among school-based and university faculty combine to develop a program that supports the professional growth of the novice educator.

Goals
G 1: Content Knowledge
The teacher candidate is an educator who will have the content knowledge necessary to understand the curriculum he or she teaches.

G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills
The teacher candidate is an educator who will have the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be able to plan and implement effective instruction.

G 3: 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.

SLO 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 3, 5)

Teacher candidates value and display professional and ethical dispositions to meet the needs of all learners. They are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally. They know and use ethical and professional guidelines related to educational practice. Teacher candidates foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 2: Intern Keys: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (O: 3)

M 1: edTPA Portfolio Rubric (O: 4)

In the ECE BSED Program, teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, 100% of candidates, 100%, will achieve at level 3 National scoring level 3 = Local scoring level 2 National scoring levels 1 and 2 = Local scoring level 1. A national scoring level 5 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. edTPA portfolio scores reported using the five point scale have been collapsed to the three point local evaluation rubric described above.

Target for O4: Uses assessment methods to impact student learning

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

The edTPA – Elementary Education (Literacy & Mathematics) national performance assessment was implemented in the ECE BSED Program in 2014-2015. Of the candidates in the program sample, the edTPA portfolios were randomly selected. Although 13/17 or 76% of the candidates had an overall passing score, based upon the Georgia cut score of 42 set for fall 2015 completers, we identified edTPA Tasks 3 and 4, the assessment components, to assess our candidates' effects on student learning. Clearly, according to the assessment components, much improvement is needed in our candidates' assessment of both literacy and mathematics for student learning. The aggregate pass rate for the Literacy component, TASK 3, was 24%, while the aggregate pass rate in Mathematics, at 55%, was much higher. We believe this is the case, because candidates are required in TASK 3 to give pupils appropriate feedback to guide their learning (rubric 12 – mean 2.6), ensure that they apply the feedback (rubric 13 – mean 2.2), and support their academic language use (rubric 14 – mean 2.4). These are three areas that the program faculty have identified for program improvement. An action plan has been developed in the form of signature assignments that are embedded across the program in the following courses: ECE 3360: Assessment of Classroom Learning in Early Childhood Education; EXC 4560: Educational Evaluation of Students with Disabilities; ECE 3400: Reading Methods in Elementary Education; and ECE 3604: Mathematics Methods in Elementary Education: Upper Grades. All teacher candidates will submit edTPA portfolios for national scoring 2015-2016. Program faculty will reevaluate TASKS 3 and 4. See data tables in the repository.

M 2: Intern Keys: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (O: 3)

Teacher candidates in the ECE BSE Traditional and Dual Certification Programs are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills, performance and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all students in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in the university coursework. Teacher candidates have one practicum and field experiences prior to the 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. 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.
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 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Intern Keys Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2014-2015 reveal the following: Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates combined show a 98% or 100/102 aggregate pass rate. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate 97% and 100% of the candidates from each program, respectively, passed the key assessment. The two teacher candidates who were below target have Action Plans for Improvement. One of these candidates will repeat the Student Teaching (clinical practice) and student teaching (clinical practice) and student teaching (clinical practice). The following targets have been set for candidates at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 75%; Level 3 = 100%; Level 2 = 0%, Level 1 = 0%.

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 = 25%; Level 3 = 75%; Level 2 = 0%, Level 1 = 0%.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Intern Keys Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2014-2015 reveal the following: Disposition standards 7 and 9, Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates combined show 84% or 86/102 aggregate pass rate. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate 85% and 84% of the candidates from each program, respectively, met or exceeded the target. Fifteen candidates need development in certain areas and recommendations were identified in the teacher candidates Action Plans. Indicator 7.6 – (Actively listens and pays attention to students needs and responses) was identified as an area for improvement for most of the candidates denoted in the level 2 range. This area will be addressed in ECE 3360 and EXC 4560 – assessment courses in the program. One candidate did not display effective dispositions, overall, and she will repeat Student Teaching. See data tables uploaded in the repository.

M 4: GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood & Special Education (Q: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

GACE Scores for 2014-2015 were not disaggregated by program; however, the average reported for ECE candidates in initial teacher preparation programs at GSU were ahead of state averages in all content areas. Additionally, scores in science are up in comparison to prior reports. See the score report loaded in the document repository.

M 5: Observation Field Performance Assessment Rubric (Q: 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)

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2014-2015 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 97% or 101/104 total program candidates meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Field Performance Assessment based upon the final observation in field during the Student Teaching experience. In review of subcategories on this assessment, teacher candidates' overall pass rates for planning, instruction, and professionalism were 97%, 98%, and 99% respectively. Following a deeper review of the sub-indicators on the assessment rubric, program faculty have noted four areas for improvement. These areas are noted in Domain 2: Implementation of Instruction & Assessment: Instruction: (a) Real World & Interdisciplinary Connections... Instruction: (d) Higher Order Questioning... Differentiation: (c) Student Collaboration... Assessment: (c) Student Self-assessment...Program faculty will monitor these areas going forward by targeting these areas in action plans for improvement.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2014-2015 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 97% or 101/104 total program candidates meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Field Performance Assessment based upon the final observation in field during the Student Teaching experience. In review of subcategories on this assessment, teacher candidates' overall pass rates for planning, instruction, and professionalism were 97%, 98%, and 99% respectively. Following a deeper review of the sub-indicators on the assessment rubric, program faculty have noted four areas for improvement. These areas are noted in Domain 2: Implementation of Instruction & Assessment: Instruction: (a) Real World & Interdisciplinary Connections... Instruction: (d) Higher Order Questioning... Differentiation: (c) Student Collaboration... Assessment: (c) Student Self-assessment...Program faculty will monitor these areas going forward by targeting these areas in action plans for improvement.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2014-2015 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 97% or 101/104 total program candidates meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 or higher on the Field Performance Assessment based upon the final observation in field during the Student Teaching experience. In review of subcategories on this assessment, teacher candidates' overall pass rates for planning, instruction, and professionalism were 97%, 98%, and 99% respectively. Following a deeper review of the sub-indicators on the assessment rubric, program faculty have noted four areas for improvement. These areas are noted in Domain 2: Implementation of Instruction & Assessment: Instruction: (a) Real World & Interdisciplinary Connections... Instruction: (d) Higher Order Questioning... Differentiation: (c) Student Collaboration... Assessment: (c) Student Self-assessment...Program faculty will monitor these areas going forward by targeting these areas in action plans for improvement.

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

**GUMS & Writing Mentor Program & ISCI 2001 Course Changes**

Analysis of our 2010-2011 GACE Content Assessment sub-indicator percentages show that our scores are equal or above the state in all areas, except the lowest area on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics was equivalent with the state score. In response to this outcome the program will implement supplemental instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics, including structure (GUMS) beginning, fall 2012 for candidates who have been identified as needing further instruction in this area. Additionally, the Writing Mentor BSED Program has been developed to help students improve creative and professional writing skills. Finally, our scores on test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. We expect to see improvement in this area due to course changes in
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Please see attached a key assessment chart that identifies the specific courses and key assessments.

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 – Effects on Student Learning. Results from this assessment reveal that targets were partially met. Action plans have been provided to target TASK 3 – the assessment component of this assessment. Content knowledge: Teacher candidates met targets on the Field Performance Rubric for demonstration of content knowledge. GACE content scores have improved in science. We will continue our collaborations 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. We will continue to monitor this area by continuing to offer a signature assignment embedded in ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education.

Field Performance Rubric; GUMS - Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style Writing Program.

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 included 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.

Implementation of Assessment Strategies and Evidence of Feedback – This plan, embedded in ECE 3360: Assessment in Early Childhood Education, will continue with a refined focus: Based upon edTPA Portfolio data from this year, our candidates’ need improvement in giving feedback to students on their strengths and needs in order to improve student learning and to assess students’ academic language use (edTPA Rubrics 12, 13, and 14).

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: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment course instructor & Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: None

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
This target was met. 100% of candidates (14) received ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" demonstrating content knowledge during clinical practice (student teaching). 85% of candidates exceeded standards, and an equal number were rated as meeting the standard. The mean overall rating on 19 indicators was 2.5 out of 3.0, which is a fraction higher than last year's performance. Upon closer inspection of the global measure's indicators that specifically focus on "content knowledge," candidates perform very well. 64% of candidates were rated as "exceeds standard" for the following indicators: 5a. Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines: language and literacy, the arts, mathematics, science, P.E, health and social studies... 5b. Knowing and using the central concepts, inquiry tools, and structures of content areas or academic disciplines... and 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
This assessment target was met over two semesters. During the fall semester, 2014, nine out of 11 (81%) students received ratings of at least "Developing" on all eight indicators of planning for a young child under age three with special educational needs (Individual Family Services Plan). Three students demonstrated the highest level of planning ("Mastery") and six (6) students received the next highest rating ("Accomplished"). Two students did not meet the target of "Developing" and received the lowest rating of "Beginning." During the spring semester, 2015, sixteen students were assessed on their Individualized Education Plan (IEP) project for a child age 3-5. 13/16 (81%) met the target rating of at least "Developing." Three students' ratings fell below the target. However, B-5 students have two semesters of field work with young children with disabilities and two opportunities to create effective plans for development and learning of exceptional children. Students who don't meet the target in one course are closely followed by the instructor to support their mastery of the target rating in the second course.

Planning competencies are also critically assessed in the final student teaching internship.

M 3: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) (O: 3)
This measure rates the teacher candidate's performance against national standards through a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes artifacts and reflective narratives. Examples of artifacts are lesson plans, child case studies, research reviews, and photo documentation of children's learning. Candidates organize the portfolio based on the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC). Candidates submit assigned artifacts and rationales each semester for progress monitoring. The final portfolio evaluation is completed at the end of student teaching.

This 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. 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: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
This assessment target was met with 92% of candidates (9/14) receiving overall scores in the 93-100 range ("Proficiently Met") on this two week planning, teaching, assessment and reflection assignment. Four (4) candidates received a rating of "Adequately Met" with scores in the 72-90 range. One candidate received an overall rating of "Partially Met" due to components of the assignment that were missing or inadequate (curriculum standards not cited nor integrated across
**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Fall semester 2014 was the final semester that the College of Education administered the unit-wide assessment of professional and ethical dispositions for its teacher candidates, named Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals. These five dispositions include: empathy, positive view of others, positive view of self, authenticity and meaningful purpose and vision. 100% of the 13 B-5 program completers were rated as "Exceptional" or "Acceptable" in displaying these key dispositions, thus the target was readily met. One candidate did receive a rating of "Marginal" in the area of long term vision and reflection; however, her other ratings did meet the target (see Fall 2014 Dispositions Rubric attachment) Beginning spring semester 2015, the College of Education and Human Development (new name) administered a new unit-wide assessment called Intern Keys, which includes several embedded indicators of professional and ethical dispositions.(see Spring 2015 Dispositions Rubric attachment). These include: 7.3- Dispositions: Models caring, fairness, respect, and enthusiasm for learning... 7.4- Dispositions: Promotes a climate of trust and teamwork within the classroom.... 7.5 Dispositions: Promotes respect for and understanding of studentsâ€™ diversity, including â€“ but not limited to â€“ race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or disability.... 7.6 Dispositions: Actively listens and pays attention to studentsâ€™ needs and responses.... 7.7 Dispositions: Creates a warm, attractive, inviting, and supportive classroom environment.... The one completer in Spring 2015 was rated on the new measure and received all ratings of "Level IV-Exemplary."

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

**Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards**

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating professional and ethical practices in this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium
**Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards**

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in family and community relations this assessment cycle. This measure is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium
**Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
**Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
**Additional Resources:** none
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards**

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in supporting candidate’s use of assessment methods to document student learning. [Please note, an error appears on the LiveText rubric report showing only 13 overall ratings, rather than 14, due to a scorer not entering the overall rating for 1 candidate.]

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
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 of 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 of the assessment measures that will continue to require close monitoring is the IEP/IFSP project. This is a very relevant assessment to determine a candidate's ability to plan for development and learning, particularly for a child with a disability or other special educational need. However, in prior years, the evaluation rubric and instructions for this assessment were not clear to students, which hampered the monitoring of performance and continuity of support for candidates' performance across two semesters.

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 all teacher education programs, such as the Birth Through Five, are in the midst of significant program changes due to new Georgia certification requirements, there are no changes in the program nor assessment process that are planned specifically in response to this year's assessment findings. There may be assessment changes in the future, such as the new professional and ethical disposition assessment implemented at the unit level (College of Education and Human Development) this spring 2015. For now, each B-5 program assessment appears to be effective in measuring student learning outcomes and our candidates are...
performing well above targets. Previous years' action plans have been addressed through the modification of assessment cycles (reporting on program completers only) and also through improvements to assessments/rubrics that were previously unclear to students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Collaborative Master's Program (CMP) provides a unique approach to educational graduate studies, unparalleled in the nation. Educational equity and student-focused teaching are guiding tenets of the program. We believe students from all backgrounds should have equal access to quality instruction, resources, and other educational opportunities. Each year we invite teachers from the metropolitan Atlanta area to explore the practices, ideas, and beliefs which guide and direct their teaching. In line with our focus on educational equity, teachers consider questions such as, How do my lived experiences impact how I view my students, how my students learn, and their families? What does teaching for educational equity look like? Why is there an achievement gap? Are the interests of my students reflected in my instruction? Our focus on student-centered teaching asks teachers to consider questions such as, Why do I teach the way that I do? When are my students engaged in learning? Does my instruction meet the needs of all of my students? During the year-long program, teachers engage in rigorous study, debate, and research focused on improving their teaching and their students' learning. The teachers' classrooms are the contexts for their work. Their classrooms are their laboratories. The teachers are guided by faculty who are educators and researchers.

Goals
G 1: Students will become empowered
Students will become empowered as instructional decision makers.

G 2: Students will advocate for their classroom students' instructional needs
Students will advocate for instruction that addresses the needs of their classroom students.

G 3: Students will advocate for educational justice
Students will advocate for educational justice for all their classroom students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Educators manage and monitor student learning. (M: 3)
The Teacher Development Rubric assesses the students content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, planning, and effects on student learning through their performance on two program activities that focus directly on the teacher's in-classroom practice: faculty classroom visits and teacher video clubs.
Relevant Associations: This objective is from National Board Performance Teaching Standard

SLO 2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge. (M: 2, 3, 4)
Educators have mastery over the subject(s) they teach and the skill and experience in teaching the subject(s).
Relevant Associations: This outcome is from National Board Teaching Performance Standards

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 3: Educators reflect on their practice. (M: 1, 2)
Educators critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice.
Relevant Associations: This objective is from NBPTS

O/O 4: Educator will collaborate with peers and others. (M: 2, 4)
Educators collaborate with others to improve student learning and they know how to work collaboratively with parents.
Relevant Associations: This objective is from NBPTS

O/O 5: Educator will show commitment to student learning. (M: 2)
Educators are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn and they understand how students develop and learn. They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.
Relevant Associations: This objective is from NBPTS

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Benchmark (O: 3)

The "Impact of Program Rubric" assesses the candidate's perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment of candidate's occurs twice during the program—end of Spring semester, via Benchmark assignment, and then at the end of the second summer semester, via a Capstone assignment. The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework and the NBPTS graduate teaching standards. Specifically, the rubric assesses the candidate's: (a) knowledge of child-centered pedagogy (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 1, 2, 3) (b) knowledge of the content (Conceptual Framework standard: CF.1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 2, 4) (c) ability to monitor and manage student learning; (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2; NBPTS Standard: 3) (d) to think systematically about their practice and learn from performance (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.2, 1.3, 2.3 and NBPTS Standard: 4) (e) participation in a learning community (Conceptual Framework standard: 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and NBPTS Standard: 5).

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

**Target for O3: Educators reflect on their practice.**

The 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: 1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 1, 2, 3) (b) knowledge of the content (Conceptual Framework standard: CF.1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 2, 4) (c) ability to monitor and manage student learning; (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2; NBPTS Standard: 3) (d) to think systematically about their practice and learn from performance (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.2, 1.3, 2.3 and NBPTS Standard: 4) (e) participation in a learning community (Conceptual Framework standard: 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and NBPTS Standard: 5).

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

**Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.**

The Capstone is similar to a Showcase Portfolio in that it includes written reflections, samples of educator's work while in the program as well as 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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Students will read a variety of texts and hold classroom discussions.</td>
<td>The two program directors will be responsible for selecting readings and for leading the discussions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Plans

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas 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. 

#### Examine literature on achievement gap between majority and minority students.

**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)

#### 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.

**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). End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

**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).
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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Early Childhood Education PhD**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Ph.D. major in Early Childhood and Elementary Education (ECEE) 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: NAECY 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.
3.4 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: Ethical researcher (M: 1, 3)
Candidates will conduct quality, valid, and socially responsible inquiry related to early childhood and/or elementary education.

Relevant Associations: NAECY graduate standards

Standard Associations

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

SLO 4: Knowledgeable teachers (M: 2)
Candidates will be knowledgeable teachers who are capable of challenging their students’ thinking and constructing knowledge relative to early childhood and elementary education.

Relevant Associations: NAECY 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 and/or research questions (3) clarity of writing and speaking; (4) convergence of theoretical and methodological approaches; and (5) social responsibility and/or critique. The rubric uses four levels of achievement ranging from “surpassed” to “not met”. Based upon the ratings of the comprehensive exam committee, each of the five items combine to provide a holistic evaluation of the comprehensive examinations and result in a pass/fail decision. Students must meet expectations in all areas of the rubric to pass comprehensive exams. In other words, a student who writes clearly but does not fulfill the other areas will fail the exams. The rubric is completed by the major adviser and the student’s PhD advisory committee at the end of her/his comprehensive exams. In other words, a student who writes clearly but does not fulfill the other areas will fail the exams. The rubric is completed by the major adviser and the student’s 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/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers
80% will pass their comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt. Outcomes are based upon data from previous student performance.
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. 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. Syllabus is organized for planning and instruction. Readings and assignments are relevant to the course topics. 2. 2. Demonstrates engaging instruction through enthusiasm and by supporting caring teacher/student and peer relationships. Promotes respect for different and diverse perspectives. Promotes collaboration. 3. 3. Adapts instruction for learners by being responsive, offering timely feedback, and presenting materials in different ways, and encouraging various means for students to express what they have learned. Offers content that is relevant to students’ contexts and needs. 4. 4. Uses a variety of high-quality formative and summative assessments to inform teaching. Grades fairly. 5. 5. Course evaluations demonstrate that course goals are met. Instructor is responsive to feedback from students and peers.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge

All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

A total of four (N=4) students were evaluated on the quality of their teaching experiences during the 2014-2015 academic year as part of their residency requirement. According to faculty evaluations of their teaching skills, all students met the overarching goal of being "knowledgeable teachers." A close examination of ratings on each indicator under this goal/objectives demonstrated that two students were rated as surpassing on the criteria: "Demonstrates thorough knowledge..."
Dissertation Presentation

The dissertation presentation is used to evaluate the degree to which PhD candidates are ethical researchers. During the dissertation presentation, PhD candidates present a research project including reviewing the literature, analyzing data, and writing a final report for publication. The rigor of the research presentation is evaluated based on dimensions that evaluate the rigor of the research. The following indicators are evaluated on a 4 point scale ranging from "Surpassed" to "Not Met": 1. Demonstrates 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 engaging instruction through enthusiasm and by supporting caring teacher/student and peer relationships. 3. Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study. 4. Demonstrates academic honesty through original scholarship. 5. Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings). 6. Demonstrates the way in which the study is situated. Is able to articulate clear alignments between the study and his/her paradigm or field. 7. 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. 8. Demonstrates engaging instruction through enthusiasm and by supporting caring teacher/student and peer relationships. 9. Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study. 10. Demonstrates academic honesty through original scholarship. 11. Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings). 12. Demonstrates the way in which the study is situated. Is able to articulate clear alignments between the study and his/her paradigm or field.

Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers

We want 100% of our eligible PhD students to have rigorous dissertations.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Three students completed their dissertations during the 2014-2015 academic years. Evaluations of these PhD candidates' performance on their dissertation presentations, as determined by their faculty advisors and dissertation committee, reveal that all students 'met' expectations as ethical researchers and as thoughtful writers and speakers. A closer examination of individual indicators reveals that one PhD student was rated as having 'surpassed' the criteria on the following indicators: (a) "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.", (b) "Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study.", (c) "Demonstrates thoughtful analysis and is able to craft a textual discussion that links analysis to knowledge production (i.e., findings)", and (d) "Demonstrates the way in which the study is situated. Is able to articulate clear alignments between the study and his/her paradigm or field.". The other two students 'met' each of these indicators. All three students were rated as having 'met' expectations as ethical researchers and as thoughtful writers and speakers.
early childhood and elementary education. Further, strong performance on the indicators “Demonstrates a thoroughness of research synthesis for the defined topic” and “Demonstrates clear understanding of research methods appropriate to the current study” suggest that students are developing as emerging scholars in their respective fields.

**Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge**

One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PhD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Three students successfully defended their dissertations.

---

**Target for O3: Ethical researcher**

One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PhD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

---

**M 4: Residency Research and Service Requirement (O: 2)**

PhD students' residency experiences are designed to assess the degree to which they become and demonstrate that they are active seekers of knowledge. There are multiple residency experiences that are used to determine this indicator. These indicators are completed by the PhD students' comprehensive exam committee before comprehensive exams are completed. The following scholarship and professional service focused indicators are evaluated: 1. Presents scholarly work at a research conference. 2. Submits manuscript to a peer reviewed journal. 3. Provides service to the department, university, and/or profession. 4. Participates in identifying and applying for a grant, scholarship, or fellowship.

A rubric is used to evaluate students' achievement on these four indicators. The student is evaluated by his/her comprehensive exam committee on the degree to which he/she “surpassed”, “met”, “partially met”, or “not met” the criteria. Based upon the ratings of the comprehensive exam committee, each of the five items combine to provide a holistic evaluation of the comprehensive examinations and result in a pass/fail decision. In order to “meet” the residency requirement, students' scores across the 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Three PhD candidates were evaluated on the objective “Candidates are Thoughtful Writers and Speakers” as part of their Comprehensive Exams during the 2014-2015 academic years. Although average ratings across indicators within this objective demonstrate some variability, PhD students, on average ‘met’ program expectations. According to faculty ratings of these students, two students ‘surpassed’ on most indicators, while one student ‘met’ all indicators. The two indicators that students performed the lowest on, but still in the passing range, were the indicators: “Demonstrates a thoroughness of research synthesis for the defined topic” and “Demonstrates fit (e.g., validity, credibility) of research methods to the nature of the problem and/or research questions.” Although the 100% pass rate is encouraging, faculty have recently revised the program to address these two aims and it appears that although students are meeting expectations, they may require additional support with regard to the strength of their literature reviews and research designs.

---

**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  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
  Measure: Teaching apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable teachers  
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Program advisory committee

Summary of research skills form
Continue to research and develop a checklist of communication and research skills to use in evaluating the presentation of the dissertation.  
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Ethical researcher  
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Monitoring of comp exam process
We will continue to monitor "process" for comp. exams. The timeframe could be problematic for students who also work full-time.  
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
  Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers  
  Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator of PHD program

UTA as coursework
Now that the university teaching apprenticeship is a required course, the success rate is higher and the outcomes are more systematic. Continue to monitor.  
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
  Measure: Teaching apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge  
  Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator of PHD Program

UTA assessment
Our first student did not pass her University Teaching Apprenticeship. The good news is because it is now a course, we have ways to monitor and guide students who are not yet competent in university teaching. What we need is a systematic way to give feedback to students that is supportive, useful, and accurately matches requirements of the apprenticeship.  
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Implementation Description: Julie will take this issue to the PHD advisory committee. As they deliberate changes in the PHD program, this can be part of the discussion. Looking at what other universities do might be helpful.

Change WEAVE Measures and Targets to become tiered rubrics
We need to change the WEAVE program assessment measures and targets to comply with recommendations of the assessment committee. Faculty met on October 5, 2012 to begin constructing rubrics for each goal.  
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
ECEE PhD program faculty meet regularly as a full committee and as a PhD advisory board (subcommittee) to discuss, plan, and make changes to the program. All research faculty participate in either the larger committee or in subcommittee work (i.e., we have a very engaged PhD level faculty). We have recently changed our program to ensure that students are better prepared as researchers by changing ECEE 9800 to focus on scholarly reading. This allows students more opportunity to read and discuss research in a variety of Birth to 5th grade settings. We believe that data from the 2014-2015 school year reveal that we are being successful in preparing for the rigors of graduate life in reading and critiquing research. We continue to build our PhD student community (a hallmark of the former Doctoral Seminar) by having special seminars for our PhD students focused on topics they select. These evening seminars occur once a month and are focused on building community among PhD students and a shared understanding of the research 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 from the 2014-2015 academic year suggest in all but one case, students met all indicators on all major assessments. In other words, ECEE PhD students are meeting program requirements with many of them surpassing expectations on key indicators. This is the first 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 2014-2015 school year reveal that we are being successful in obtaining our goals. The one area in which a student did not meet our expectations with 100% accuracy relate to the indicator “Candidates are active seekers of knowledge” related research residency requirements. Although students met our criteria on the total indicator, one student only partially met the indicator in relation to the criterion “Submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals” 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 lead role in the program. However, the student has met the expectations for students completion of key research experiences as they achieve residency requirements.

Although students met our criteria on the total indicator, one student only partially met the indicator in relation to the criterion “Submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals” 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 lead role in the program. However, the student has met the expectations for students completion of key research experiences as they achieve residency requirements.

As part of our PhD program faculty and PhD advisory committee meetings, 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 2013-2014 school year, PhD students performed at a slightly 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 83% of students in 2013-2014 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. In addition, we are pairing faculty up earlier with PhD students to ensure strong scholarly writing opportunities that lead to research presentations at national/international conferences and publications before they sit for comprehensive exams. Based upon both student feedback and faculty discussion, we recently changed our ECEE 9800 course from a Doctoral Seminar to Scholarly Reading course. This change was in response to a perceived need for students to be better prepared for the rigors of graduate life in reading and critiquing research. We continue to build our PhD student community (a hallmark of the former Doctoral Seminar) by having special seminars for our PhD students focused on topics they select. These evening seminars occur once a month and are focused on building community among PhD students and a shared understanding of the research 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 from the 2014-2015 academic year suggest in all but one case, students met all indicators on all major assessments. In other words, ECEE PhD students are meeting program requirements with many of them surpassing expectations on key indicators. This is the first 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 2014-2015 school year reveal that we are being successful in obtaining our goals. The one area in which a student did not meet our expectations with 100% accuracy relate to the indicator “Candidates are active seekers of knowledge” related research residency requirements. Although students met our criteria on the total indicator, one student only partially met the indicator in relation to the criterion “Submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals” 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 lead role in the program. However, the student has met the expectations for students completion of key research experiences as they achieve residency requirements.

Although students met our criteria on the total indicator, one student only partially met the indicator in relation to the criterion “Submission of manuscripts to a peer reviewed journals” 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 lead role in the program. However, the student has met the expectations for students completion of key research experiences as they achieve residency requirements.
**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**

**M 1: Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection (O: 1)**  
The Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection Assessment is graded at the end of each of the four mathematics content/pedagogy courses in the program (ECE 7393, ECE 7394, ECE 7395, and ECE 7396). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: Collection of Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks and Rationales The NCTM Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics (1991) emphasizes the posing of learning activities it calls worthwhile mathematical tasks. These tasks are to be based on—Sound and significant mathematics; Knowledge of students’ understandings, interests, and experiences; Knowledge of the range of ways that diverse students learn mathematics; And these tasks are intended to—Engage students' intellect Develop students’ mathematical understandings and skills; stimulate students to make connections and develop a coherent framework for mathematical ideas; Call for problem formulation, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning; Promote communication about mathematics; Represent mathematics as an ongoing human activity; Display sensitivity to, and draw on, students’ diverse background experiences and dispositions; Promote the development of all students’ dispositions to do mathematics. (p. 25) “In selecting, adapting, or generating mathematical tasks, teachers must base their decisions on three areas of concern: the mathematical content, the students, and the ways in which students learn mathematics” (pp. 25-26) Stein, Smith, Henningsen, and Silver (2000) encourage the analysis of mathematics instructional tasks for “the kind and level of thinking required of students in order to successfully engage with and solve the task” (p. 11). Their analysis of cognitive demands divides mathematics tasks into two general categories, each of which are divided further into two subcategories: Lower-Level Demands (including Memorization Tasks and Procedures Without Connections Tasks) and Higher-Level Demands (including Procedures With Connections Tasks and Doing Mathematics Tasks). “Since the tasks with which students become engaged in the classroom form the basis of their opportunities for learning mathematics, it is important to be clear about one’s goals for student learning. Once learning goals for students have been clearly articulated, tasks can be selected or created to match these goals. Being aware of the cognitive demands of tasks is a central consideration in this matching” (p. 11). The NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics (2000) elaborates on the role of problem solving in learning mathematics by specifying that—Instructional programs from prekindergarten through grade 12 should enable all
The Student Interview Assessments are graded during three of the four mathematics content courses in the program (ECE 7393, ECE 7394, and ECE 7395). These assessments provide a model for student-centered teaching. Instructions to candidates for these assessments follow: Student Interview Assessments (O: 3, 4). The Teaching Principle from the NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics indicates teachers’ must understand children’s thinking to make effective curricular and instructional decisions. Specifically—Effective teaching requires knowing and understanding mathematics, students as learners, and pedagogical strategies. Teachers need several different kinds of mathematical knowledge—knowledge about the whole domain; deep, flexible knowledge about curriculum goals and about the important ideas that are central to their grade level; knowledge about the challenges students are facing in learning the next ten; knowledge about how the ideas can be revealed and taught effectively; and knowledge about how students’ understanding can be assessed. This knowledge helps teachers make curricular judgments, respond to students’ questions, and look ahead to where concepts are leading and plan accordingly. (NCTM, 2000, p. 16) Interviewing individual students provides an opportunity to apply research on children’s thinking and to develop a deep understanding of how children construct conceptual understanding in the context of solving nonroutine problems. Interactions with individual children provide the foundation for developing student-centered instruction attending to each child’s needs. For this assignment during the Number and Operations Course (3 Interviews): Interview #1: Addition and Subtraction (First Grade) a. Prepare a script of 11 potential addition and subtraction word problems to pose to a child in First Grade. Include one of each type of problem identified in the CGI framework (e.g., JRU for Join Result Unknown), describes the child’s response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s response on the basis of the CGI framework for solution strategies. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about solving addition and subtraction word problems. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use in solving the problems. Begin by asking one of the easier problems from your script and record in as much detail as possible what the child does and says in trying to solve the problem. On the basis of the child’s strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the child’s strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child’s success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problem you posed, identifies the problem type from the CGI framework (e.g., JRU for Join Result Unknown), describes the child’s response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s response on the basis of the CGI framework for solution strategies. Repeat this process (problem as posed, CGI problem type, child’s response, and CGI analysis) for each of the problems that you posed. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you have learned about the child’s understanding of addition and subtraction and the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, the range of numbers with which the child was familiar, and the types of strategies the child demonstrated. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one word problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing the student’s understanding of addition and subtraction. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. Interview #2: Multiplication and Division (Second Grade) a. Prepare a script of 10-12 potential word problems to pose to a child in Second Grade. The purpose of this interview should be Grouping and Partitioning problems (multiplication, measurement division, and partitive division) as identified in the CGI framework. Include only one multiplication problem from each of the Rate, Price, and Multiplicative Comparison types at the end of your script. Include at least one partitioning problems with a remainder, considering the four different types of remainders. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The problems must make sense to a child. The goal is for the problems to be engaging yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about solving grouping and partitioning word problems. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use in solving the problems. Begin by asking one of the easier problems from your script and record in as much detail as possible what the child does and says in trying to solve the problem. On the basis of the child’s strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the child’s strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child’s success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problem you posed, identifies the problem type from the CGI framework (e.g., G/P-PD for Grouping/Partitioning-Partitive Division), describes the child’s response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s response on the basis of the CGI framework for solution strategies. Repeat this process (problem as posed, CGI problem type, child’s response, and CGI analysis) for each of the problems that you posed. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you have learned about the child’s understanding of grouping and partitioning, the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, and the types of strategies the child demonstrated. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one word problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing the student’s understanding of multiplication and division. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. Interview #3: Base-Ten Understanding (Third Grade) a. Prepare a script of 10-12 potential word problems to pose to a child in Third Grade with the purpose of determining what the child understands about base ten concepts. Most of the problems for this interview should be grouping and partitioning problems that use groups of ten and addition problems that encourage the use of invented algorithms to deal with carefully selected number combinations. Provide for your selection of alternative number sizes during the interview, depending on the as yet unknown needs of the child. The problems must make sense with all of the alternate number sizes. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be engaging yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about 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 strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child's success in solving the problems you posed. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the child's understanding of base ten concepts, the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, and the types of strategies they demonstrated, and the range of numbers with which the child was familiar. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one word problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing the student's understanding of base ten. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. For this assignment during the Algebra Course (2 Interviews): Interview #2: Children's Understanding of Equality a. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of equality. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Prepare a script of 6-10 problems, including open number sentences (e.g., 8 + 4 = 5 + 5) and True-False number sentences (e.g., 8 + 3 = 7 + 4 True or False?). See Thinking Mathematically, pp. 9-24 for examples. Carefully and deliberately choose numbers and your problem sequence to elicit children's understanding of equality (both the concept and the symbol) and explore the extent of children's understanding. b. Interview a small group of children (or 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, describes the children's responses as completely as possible, and analyzes each child's understanding of equality. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's understanding of equality. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's understanding of equality. Interview #5: Children's Relational Thinking a. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of equality. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Prepare a script of 6-10 problems including open number sentences (e.g., 8 + 4 = 5 – 4) and True-False number sentences (e.g., 37 + 56 = 39 + 54 True or False?). See Thinking Mathematically, pp. 41-43 for examples. Carefully and deliberately choose numbers and your problem sequence to elicit children's relational thinking and explore the extent of children's thinking. b. Interview a small group of children (or an individual child) with the purpose of coming to know each child's relational thinking. Provide appropriate materials for the children to use in solving the problems. Record in as much detail as possible what the children do and say in trying to solve the problems. On the basis of the children's responses, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of children's relational thinking while continuing to encourage and support the children's success with the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problems you posed, describes the children's responses as completely as possible, and analyzes each child's relational thinking. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children's relational thinking. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's relational thinking. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's relational thinking. For this assignment during the Measurement Course (1 Interview): Interview #6: Children's Understanding of Geometry or Measurement a. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of key concepts of geometry or measurement through solving nonroutine problems. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be nonroutine, engaging, and challenging, yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child to assess what that child understands about geometry or measurement as well as the child's ability to use that understanding in nonroutine problem solving consistent with grade-level expectations. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use. On the basis of the child's strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the child's strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child's success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problems you posed, describes the child's response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child's strategy and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child's success in solving the problems you posed. Repeat this process (problem as posed, child's response, and analysis) for each of the problems that you posed. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the child's understanding of geometry or measurement. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's understanding of geometry or measurement. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's learning of geometry or measurement. These assessments are graded using the Student Interview Assessment Grading Rubric.

Target for O3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

M 3: Data Project and Presentation Assessment (O: 1)
The Data Project and Presentation Assessment is graded during the data analysis and probability content/pedagogy course in the program (EC 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 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. Data Project Framework: the data collection the data analysis activities: a. Formulate a data collection plan: determine the data collection plan, tabulate data displays. b. 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%). |

**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 students' mathematical achievement. The portfolio will be evaluated as Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) based on completeness and the quality of included artifacts. Section 1. Content Implementation This section of the portfolio includes artifacts generated from demonstrating implementation of content knowledge in teaching. A minimum of four lesson plans demonstrating implementation of instructional strategies, one from each of the four mathematics content areas in ECE 7393, 7394, 7395, and 7396. These lesson plans must have been taught by you and must include your written lesson reflection and analysis. Observer notes and comments regarding a minimum of two taught mathematics lessons based on a pre-established observation rubric. Section 2. Student Learning The portfolio must include a minimum of two different types of artifacts illustrating evidence of impact on student mathematics learning. A minimum of four lesson plans (which you have taught and include your written reflection and analysis) with collected student work or other assessment evidence demonstrating the impact of the lesson on student learning. At least one of these lesson plans must demonstrate the following: - A lesson developed in response to formative student assessment data. May include recommendations for enrichment or remediation. - A differentiated lesson based on specific student needs or interests. A written response to a lesson-observation rubric completed by an observer, specifying lesson modifications intended to improve the impact of the lesson on student mathematics learning. Section 3. Technology Integration The portfolio must include a minimum of two artifacts demonstrating the integration of available technology into mathematics instruction. A minimum of two lesson plans (which you have taught and include your written reflection and analysis) incorporating available technology into mathematics instruction. A personal statement that could be shared with parents on the effective use of technology in mathematics instruction to support learning mathematics with understanding. Notes: All lesson plans, teaching, and reflections included in the portfolio must originate while enrolled in K-5 Mathematics Endorsement Program courses (ECE 7393, 7394, 7395, 7396, and/or 7740). A minimum of 2 of the 10 lesson plans included in the portfolio must be taught in a grade band (K-2 or 3-5) that is different from your regular classroom assignment. A minimum of 2 of the 10 lesson plans included in the portfolio must provide evidence of working with diverse students as demonstrated by submitting demographics of the classes taught with the lesson plans. The use of electronic-recording media for the purpose of lesson analysis is not considered technology incorporation into mathematics instruction. This portfolio is graded using the Professional Portfolio Project Rubric.

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

| Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge |
|---|---|
| Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / Satisfactory (80%). |

**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. |

| Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge |
|---|---|
| GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses. |

**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
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Economics Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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).
**Goals**

**G1: 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...
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)

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

#### SLO 4: Communication (G: 1) (M: 2)
To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories, concepts, analytical methods, and policy choices.

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

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Tracking Examination (O: 1, 2, 3)
To measure the success of Economics majors in the undergraduate program in learning core economic concepts, the Department of Economics developed two Tracking Exams (TEs), one for Principles of Microeconomics (MicroTE) and one for Principles of Macroeconomics (MacroTE). Each exam is comprised of 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 IEM 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.

**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 before 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 project group in ECON 4999 for that instead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2009-2010</th>
<th>Implementation Status: In-Progress</th>
<th>Priority: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
<td>Measure: Tracking Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 05/2014</td>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate programs committee in consultation with ECON 4999 instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2010-2011</th>
<th>Implementation Status: In-Progress</th>
<th>Priority: Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
<td>Measure: Tracking Examination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits and costs

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
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Mission / Purpose
The Master of Arts in Economics program is designed to train students for careers in local, state, and federal government and in the private sector. The program emphasizes basic analytical skills, micro- and macro-economic theory, and mathematical statistics, at a level necessary for contributing to and assessing policy research. Microeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8100. Macroeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8110. Statistical skills are taught in Economics 8740 and 8840. Students' mastery of these skills is assessed with midterm and final examinations in the respective courses. The program also emphasizes advanced understanding of selected topics. Students must take seven additional economics courses, chosen in consultation with their advisors. They must demonstrate mastery of this course material through midterm exams, final exams, and research papers. A final high-quality research paper chosen by the student must demonstrate that the student has the ability to examine an economic problem at a level consistent with advanced graduate course work.

Goals
G 1: Theoretical and applied background.
To equip the MA program graduates with wide-ranging and in-depth knowledge of theoretical and applied economics. Graduates should be able to perform applied economic analysis based on sound theory and data analysis.

G 2: Professional success and continued education.
To facilitate the continued academic and professional development of the MA program graduates. Graduates should possess the necessary theoretical and analytic background to perform successfully in the job market and to be able to pursue further graduate level education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Analytical Skills. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Applying Economic Models. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 3)
To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

O/O 2: Economic Disciplines. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

O/O 4: Economic Data. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Core exams. (O: 2, 3)
All graduating Master of Arts in Economics students will be assessed on their basic learning of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics (e.g., Master of Arts in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The assessment will be based on the performances of their final examinations in macroeconomics, microeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
In microeconomics, there was an increase from last year's overall score of 4.0 to this year's 4.9. Similarly, econometrics experienced an increase from last year's 4.2 to this year's 4.38. This is encouraging as students are improving performance and goals are being met.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In microeconomics, there was an increase from last year's overall score of 4.0 to this year’s 4.86. Similarly, econometrics experienced an increase from last year’s 4.15 to this year’s 4.2. This is encouraging as students are improving performance and goals are being met.

**M 2: Essay. (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

All students will submit a research paper to demonstrate their learning in a chosen subject of their own and to show their understanding, usage, and analysis of economic data. The Essay will typically be a product of the interaction with at least one faculty member in the Department of Economics, and will be assessed by the faculty member(s) involved. The Essay will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Fifteen essays were submitted in this cycle. Applying economic models were judged by the following two categories: Ability to Convey the Research Question and by Economic Analysis. The average grade for these sections was 4.0, which was higher than last year’s average score of 3.7. It is encouraging that the quality of MA papers is increasing given that it was one of the issues we targeted in last year’s report.

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

This category was measured by Comprehension of the Literature. The average grade was 3.93 which was an increase over last year’s average of 3.73.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

This category was measured by the Theoretical Skills and Overall Contribution rankings. The average score on both of these category’s was 3.68 which was higher than last year’s and meets the target.

**Target for O4: Economic Data.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

This category was evaluated by Data Collection, Measurement and Computation. The average score was 4.36, which was higher than last year and meets targets.

**M 3: Alumni survey. (O: 1)**

All graduates of this program will be asked to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program contributes to their performance in their current job. This survey will be given at one year and three years after graduation.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

This year we received 15 responses to the alumni survey. The responses were generally favorable. On the question if faculty were available and accessible to students to provide guidance, respondents strongly agreed with a 4.4 average (out of possible 5). They strongly agreed (average 4.6) on the question if they would recommend the program to their peers. They also agreed with the question about the degree "expanding their job opportunities." In terms of areas that need improvement, respondents suggested balancing course offering more evenly between Fall vs. Spring and offering the econometrics I and II courses during both semesters since they provide skills for writing the research paper.

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

**Collect timely information**

Execute the newly developed surveys of current and graduating students to track experiences in a timely manner.
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

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.

Create dual degree 4+1
The department is considering creating a dual degree 4+1 BA/BS Economics and MA Economics. Our best undergraduate students will have the opportunity to complete both bachelors and masters degrees in five years.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: The proposal must be approved at the department, school and university levels.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: MA program director and Undergraduate Studies program 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?

The goals of the program are being met. This year we saw an increase in several measurable categories in performance. More importantly, changes in the past five years in expanding the quantitative content of the program by offering more econometrics training has been well received by the students since it deepens their preparation for the job market. And these are the skills in demand by employers who need MA economists to work with data. Furthermore, the creation of a career services office at our school
level has better prepared students for jobs. The department wants to increase the number of students in the program. We have been making several efforts to expand recruiting like information sessions, marketing, etc. Also, the creation of a new dual degree program should help in this regard.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Some students want more guidance from us on two aspects: i) how to take more quantitative courses in addition to the ones required and taught in our department, and ii) on how to prepare to apply to PhD programs in economics. Regarding i), we will provide them with a list of potential courses they can take and also make those courses count for our program of study. Regarding ii), we will continue to present an MA symposium on the PhD program and the admission process as we did last year. The director of the program and the graduate committee will also think about how we are assessing our program and see if changes are needed going forward.
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The Public Finance field exam was given to six students and all six (two on a second attempt) passed the exam with an average grade of 4.15. The Labor Economics field exam was taken by three students who all passed with an average grade of 3.6. Three students took (and two passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam; the average grade was 3.44. Seven students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Four students passed the exam with an average grade 3.22. Nine students took the Health Field Exam and all passed the exam (one student passed in on a second attempt); the average grade was a high 4.11. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 86% (which is above the target of 80% pass rate.)

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The Public Finance field exam was given to six students and all six (two on a second attempt) passed the exam with an average grade of 4.15. The Labor Economics field exam was taken by three students who all passed with an average grade of 3.6. Three students took (and two passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam; the average grade was 3.44. Seven students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Four students passed the exam with an average grade 3.22. Nine students took the Health Field Exam and all passed the exam (one student passed in on a second attempt); the average grade was a high 4.11. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 86% (which is above the target of 80% pass rate.)

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The Public Finance field exam was given to six students and all six (two on a second attempt) passed the exam with an average grade of 4.15. The Labor Economics field exam was taken by three students who all passed with an average grade of 3.6. Three students took (and two passed) the Environmental/Urban Field Exam; the average grade was 3.44. Seven students took the Experimental Economics Field Exam. Four students passed the exam with an average grade 3.22. Nine students took the Health Field Exam and all passed the exam (one student passed in on a second attempt); the average grade was a high 4.11. The 3-year moving average of the pass rate by the second attempt is 86% (which is above the target of 80% pass rate.)

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Eleven Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended in 2015. The range of the average scores across different evaluation categories is 3.57 to 4.57. The dissertation committee judged that in seven (out of the total of 11 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 Journal of Health Economics). The average score for the likelihood of the research in the dissertation being published is 4.29. The 3-year moving average score on “the research is publishable” category is 4.59 (exceeding the target figure of 4).

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one Ph.D. students (four of them Senior students) participated in the online survey this year. The total reported number of working papers is 60. All four senior students had at least two working papers (the range is 2 to 6). Fifteen students have teaching experience with eleven of them having taught at GSU, exceeding the target of 50%. Thirteen students had presented their work in international conferences.

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
In most recent year, nine of our twelve graduates obtained a job with nine landing academic positions as Assistant Professor or Post-Doctoral Researchers; academic/research institutions they placed in include Indiana University (Bloomington), Indiana University (South Bend), California State University (Long Beach), Maryville College, The Dartmouth Institute, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. The good 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 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 three preceding 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

**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%.

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

Re-organization of the summer semester I

We moved ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from the summer of the second year to the spring of the first year. This change eliminated mandatory courses in the summer of the second year. This allows students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This also helps with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course.

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

Re-organization of the summer semester II

We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams.

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

Additional dissertation workshop

Students 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.

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

Econometrics sequence

To help differentiate the Ph.D. level courses from the MA level courses, we have proposed renumbering the courses in the econometrics curriculum. These proposed changes are in line with the policy of using course numbers starting with 9 for PhD level courses. ECON 8730 was re-numbered to Econ 9710. ECON 8750 was re-numbered to Econ 9720. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8760 was re-numbered to Econ 9730. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8790 was re-numbered to Econ 9740. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8770 was re-numbered to Econ 9750. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum.

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

Students' characteristics and success in the program.

We are working on creating a database with students' individual characteristics, their academic performance during the years in the program, placements in the job market and their subsequent research activates. The purpose is to identify determinants of what
students’ characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

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

**Summer support**  
Development of an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support.

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

**Tutoring Experience**  
We continue to rotate all 3rd year students through the tutoring lab. Last year this helped with staffing the tutoring lab and provided graduates with valuable teaching experience.

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

**Coordination of tutoring assignments with research schedules**  
Coordinate rotation of tutoring lab assignments with research schedules. All 3rd year students will continue to be rotated through the tutoring lab. This will continue to help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market. Coordination of the tutoring lab assignments with sponsored research grant support from faculty and students’ own research grants will minimize conflicts between program objectives.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Job Placement | Outcome/Objective: Marketability

**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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Senior Ph.D. Student Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research

**New Course on Casual Inference**  
We added a new course: ECON899/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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
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 information (as reported above) we collected during the assessment process of this year reveals that students performance is strong and reconfirms that the program is well established. All of the targets for our program are met. 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 to be successful in the job market. We added the health economics field to the program in response to a high demand for this field from our previous and current students. 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. The field is at a good start as demonstrated by the high number of students (nine) who took the field exam in summer 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.

Changes our Ph.D. program in economics has made since last year. Based on suggestion and feedback we received from the faculty we improved on Communicating to students and faculty the goals for the program as outlined above. Communicating to students the importance of participating in the surveys and providing feedback (as revealed by a high number of students participating in the survey this year (21; last year we received feedback only from five students.) Expanding recruiting efforts by relying on current students and alumni. Changes and improvements to the program that remain to be considered for implementation Remove “readers” from the graduate catalogue as they are not required any more. The decision to relax the requirement of having readers was based on a general agreement that (i) the quality of the decision of a dissertation committee on the readiness of the written proposal for a final defense would not be affected by it and (ii) our department being the only one in AYSPS that had that requirement. Extend the dissertation proposal deadline from 12 months to 15 months. The current regulation states that the PhD students have to propose within 12 months of passing the field comp, which usually mean by the end of June. Many of our students would benefit from a little extra time to work on their dissertation proposals. A proposal to change the dissertation workshop structure: Have one dissertation workshop that would be required for all students in every semester starting in third year. Each student will have to present at least once a year in front of all student (attendance will be required) with students in the third year splitting the hour and students in fourth and fifth year using the full hour. The preparation for job market and dissertation proposal will be done in a separate format. Other important continuing efforts include: 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.
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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

G1: 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.

G2: Develop expertise in teaching higher education
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will have the knowledge and skills to teach at the university level, including university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.

G3: 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.

G4: Develop content expertise
Students of the Educational of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will develop content expertise in special education.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Students will design and conduct investigations (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will develop expertise in research skills, specifically the ability to design, implement and evaluate their own research studies. They will also prepare their results for publication and submit their findings to refereed journals. Students will also develop skills in grant writing.
Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section

SLO 2: Students will teach at the university level (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students will develop expertise in teaching at the university level through teaching (or assisting in teaching) university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.
Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Teaching Section

SLO 3: Students will participate in presentations (G: 3) (M: 3)
Students will participate in professional development activities, including presentations and participation in professional organizations.
Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development

SLO 4: The student will meet course/program requirements (G: 4) (M: 4)
The student will demonstrate content expertise by earning satisfactory course grades, participating in class, passing the comprehensive exam, and successful defense of the prospectus (as appropriate).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section (O: 1)
Evidence of submitted database articles, number of published articles, number of book chapters, and participation in grant development as compiled from the research activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O1: Students will design and conduct investigations
By candidacy, 100% of students will have submitted a manuscript in which they are senior author to a refereed journal.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
During the 2014-2015 school year (fall 2014, spring 2015, summer 2015) we had a total of 26 doctoral students and all students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Fifty-six (n=56) manuscripts have been submitted by students since the beginning of their programs with a range of zero to six. Sixteen (n=16) manuscripts were submitted during the last year from 14 students thus 10 students did not submit any manuscripts this past year. Seventeen (n=17) of the manuscripts submitted were data-based. Of the articles published by students, only four (n=4) were where the student was the primary author. Nine (n=9) students published at least one book chapter. Only two (n=2) students assisted faculty with grant applications this past year.

M 2: Evidence of teaching college courses (O: 2)
Evidence of teaching college courses as teaching assistant and/or instructor, number of guest lectureres, number of students who supervised practica, as compiled from the teaching activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O2: Students will teach at the university level
By candidacy, 100% of the students will have completed their requirement of assisting or teaching a university course.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
In 2014-2015, all students who had reached candidacy had assisted or taught a university course. Twenty (n=25) out of 26 had taken EXC 9660 with 25 having complete or in the process of completing their teaching internship. All those who had taught received a positive evaluation by their professor. Since the start of their program, students had assisted in 64 courses. Students assisted teaching in 25 classes this past year. Students supervised 72 students during their teaching practicum. Interestingly, supervision was completed by only 6 students with one student supervising 33 students and another student supervising 16 practicum students. It does not appear that there is an equal distribution or need for the vast majority of doctoral students to supervise practicum students.

M 3: Evidence of professional development (O: 3)
Evidence of professional development including presentations and participation in professional organizations as compiled from the professional development section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O3: Students will participate in presentations
100% of the students will have made at least one conference workshop presentation by candidacy.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Ninety (n=90) national presentations have been made by 23 of the students with 3 indicating they have not presented nationally. Eighteen (n=18) students have made 55 state presentations since the beginning of their program. Eight professional organization/association offices have been held by 5 students suggesting there is a potential need for a great number of students who hold professional organization/association membership. Sixteen students have conducted a workshop since the beginning of their program. Interestingly, of those who have presented a workshop, the range is 1 to 45.
**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 exams, 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In 2014-2015, there were a total of 26 doctoral students compared to 24 the previous year. Three graduated during the Fall of 2014, one graduated during the Spring of 2015, and two graduated during the summer of 2015. Thus, at the beginning of the Fall semester the Ph.D. program will have 20 doctoral students plus any new admits. All 26 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. One area to improve is related to exit interviews. The majority of students do not complete an exit evaluation. Of those students where an exit interview is provided, the information is on a global 1 to 5 point scale without any categories (i.e., excellent, good, average, poor, very poor). Questions related to teaching, research, service, mentorship, class experiences, and others might be helpful.

**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

**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 desired results are to prepare PhD students who are capable of stepping into high-level research positions in the field of special education. This involves teaching, research/scholarship, and service to the field. Our students continue to perform at the high levels of productivity that we have come to expect over the years. For example, our 26 students (up from the previous year) have assisted or taught courses successfully, have supervised student interns, have participated in 90 national presentations and 55 state presentations, sit on committees and boards of professional organizations, and have engaged in numerous service activities. A strength of our reporting system is that students enter their programs with clear expectations in hand and are routinely reminded that
they will need to address the assessment system annually. Thus, they know we have high expectations of them and they have high expectations of themselves. Of importance is their impact on the professional literature, with 56 manuscripts submitted to a variety of journals with high impact factors. Students also have contributed to books and chapters. We have received external feedback indicating that employers have come to expect the best from our 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.

Several years ago we streamlined our program in a manner that allowed us to focus on the key aspects of writing for professional publication, development of grant proposals, and mastery of research designs that are appropriate to use with the Exceptional Student population. These were described in previous reports and we are seeing the results of these changes in the high-level research that are students are producing. We would like to target getting students more hands-on experience in proposal writing based on the benefits we have seen to their productivity with the changes in content that we made. It will become a goal in the next several years to get students even more exposure to work on proposal-writing.
Students in the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership will be able to demonstrate their understanding of the practice of school leadership and how it relates to the literature.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: The Comprehensive Exam (O: 3)**

1. The Comprehensive Exam. This assessment is used to gain an understanding of candidate leadership, research and writing skills. It is administered during the first semester of the second year in the program. 2. This assessment has replaced the College of Education Disposition Assessment as the dispositions assessment is no longer being used by the COEHD.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O3: The Comprehensive Exam**

100% of the students taking the exam will "pass" all three sections and move into doctoral candidacy.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

12/12 students taking the exam during this reporting cycle passed all three sections with a score of "met" or "exceeds".

**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 for Chapter 1 of the dissertation project. Submitted papers will be evaluated based on a rubric. Student presentations will be evaluated using an acceptable/unacceptable scale. Additional feedback will be given through peer feedback regarding the topic selection, literature review and the research questions developed.

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

**Target for O1: Literature Review**

100% of students taking the assessment will score an "acceptable" rating

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

12/12 students completed this assessment during the 2014-15 reporting cycle. 100% of those students scored a "meets" or "exceeds" on the assessment, thus meeting the goal of 100% acceptable for this year.

**M 5: The Dissertation (O: 2)**

Dissertation The dissertation and defense are the culminating activities in the students' doctoral program, demonstrating high levels of scholarly and intellectual activity. The dissertation is an original contribution to knowledge in the field of study through disciplined inquiry. Conducting, writing, and defending the dissertation are done in accordance with the highest professional standards. Enrollment for a minimum of three semester hours of credit is required during at least two out of each three-term period following successful completion of the comprehensive examination until graduation. These hours of credit must include a minimum of nine semester hours of dissertation (9990) credit but may also include other coursework. Doctoral students must be enrolled in and successfully complete three semester hours of graduate credit (typically dissertation hours) the term all degree requirements are completed. The students must be enrolled in at least three semester hours of coursework during the academic term in which they defend the dissertation. All doctoral dissertations must comply with the format, style, and procedural instructions established by the College of Education. The guide should be consulted soon after the students complete their comprehensive examination 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. The research manuscript presents the results of the research study. 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 jstockwel@gasu.edu and request the date, time, room, and equipment needs. When the dissertation is completed, a public announcement of the oral defense of the dissertation is disseminated via the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions to the College of Education faculty. The announcement must be submitted to the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions at least ten business days prior to the scheduled defense. Additionally, the dissertation must be defended between the first day of classes and the last day of final examinations; it cannot be defended between academic terms. Students should consult the current deadlines for doctoral candidates to plan the timely announcement of the dissertation defense. At the same time the announcement of the oral defense is
submitted, two typed copies of the completed dissertation are made available for faculty review in the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions. The announcement of the oral defense includes the date and location of the defense and an abstract of the dissertation no more than 350 words. The oral defense is scheduled during regular dates of operation (i.e., between the first day of classes and the last day of final examinations each term, excluding official holidays). The oral defense must be attended by no fewer than three (3) members of the Doctoral Advisory Committee and is open to all College of Education faculty and invited guests. The committee will invite other faculty and guests present to question the candidate and to communicate to the committee their professional reactions. Approval and acceptance of the doctoral dissertation requires a favorable vote of a majority of the Doctoral Advisory Committee. The presentation of the dissertation study shall include an overview of the study, including its rationale, design, data analysis, and results. The presentation should be approximately twenty minutes in length. The presentation will be followed by questions from the committee members. Following the period of questioning the Chairperson of the defense will invite the candidate and all visitors to leave the room while the committee deliberates. Upon returning, he/she learns of the committee's decision. The committee shall decide if the candidate passed or failed and in either case, what revisions, if any, are required. After the candidate has been asked to return to the room, it is the responsibility of the major advisor to inform the candidate of the expected revisions and determine if committee members are to be involved in reviewing the revisions. Revisions must be completed and approved 2 to 4 weeks after the defense. It is the responsibility of the committee as a whole to judge the quality of the candidate's work and recommend approval of the dissertation. All differences of opinion shall be handled by the committee as a whole with the major advisor guiding the candidate through agreed upon required changes. In cases where consensus is not possible, dissenting members have an option of not signing the dissertation approval form. This option shall be exercised very rarely; it is anticipated that differences will be resolved within the committee. In special cases, the Coordinator of the Ed.D. program may be consulted for assistance in resolving committee conflicts. The dissertation will be evaluated using a rubric Because the program is in its first year of existence, there are no data to report at this time.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

12/12 students defending the dissertation in spring 2015 successfully passed the dissertation defense and graduated on time from the program.

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

**APA Style Assistance**

For students in the next cohort, an APA overview will be given at the beginning of the program. Additionally, students will be given the newly created APA resources and contact information for the writing lab early in the program rather than once a need has been identified.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: 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**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 complete the Comprehensive Exam in Semester 1, Year 2. This assessment provides the opportunity for them to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of program content. It is considered a formative assessment. Students complete the literature review synopsis in Semester 1, Year 2. This assessment provides the opportunity for them to demonstrate an understanding of how the literature informs their selected research topic. It is considered a formative assessment. Students complete the dissertation defense in the final semester of Year 3 of the program. This assessment provides the opportunity for them to demonstrate overall mastery of the selected topic both through a demonstration of linkage to the literature and through the carrying out of the research study. It is considered a summative assessment.

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's assessment findings demonstrate that students have the skills to do what we are asking of them in the program. This demonstration is evident for both cohorts reported in this cycle.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 unit meets on a bi-weekly basis and discusses the outcome of all assessments as they relate to individual candidates and cohorts of students. Additionally, we share with program participants and potential students the success rate of our students with regard to completing the program on 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.

At this time, there are no plans to make changes to the assessment processes. However, as indicated in the action plan section, we are meeting with the RMS unit to examine both the research courses and the content of those courses in an effort to better support the students in designing their research studies. The outcome of these meetings will be implemented for EdD Cohort V, beginning Summer 2016.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Educational Leadership EdS**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST)

(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: 1, 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: 3, 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: 5, 6)**

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 (O: 1)**

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 2014-2015 - 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 (O: 2)**

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.5 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Of the 12 students in Section 1 of the program, 10 exceeded and 2 met the expectations on the assessment as articulated by the completion of the Major Project Revision assessment. Of the 8 students in Section 2-10 of the program, 5 exceeded and 3 met the expectations on the assessment as articulated by the completion of the Major Project Revision assessment. Of the 8 students in section 3-25 of the program, 4 exceeded and 4 met the expectations on the assessment as articulated by the completion of the Major Project Revision assessment.

### M 5: Dispositions Assessment (O: 3)
1) The dispositions assessment is a required element of all programs in the College of Education. 2) The dispositions assessment is linked to Goal (ELCC Standard) 5: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 3) The Dispositions Assessment results show that the majority of students received high ratings in 2011 with 2 of 12 students rating marginal and no students with an unacceptable rating. In the 2010 results all students (100%) were highly rated. 4) The Dispositions Assessment specifically examines the five dispositions of effective educational professionals as documented in the attached rubric and is aligned with Goal 5 which addresses the integrity, fairness, and ethical behavior of administrators, staff, teachers, and students.

Source of Evidence: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
There is no data to report for the 2014-2015 cycle because this assessment is longer in use.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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: Portfolio Students begin constructing this portfolio during the first term of their programs in EPEL 8970. The Seminar for Advanced Leadership. This is a three-term course which includes embedded standards-based leadership experiences supervised by a college-based coach and a field-based mentor. The portfolio follows students throughout their programs of study. Entries include archives of field-based experiences and level of involvement (observed, participated, led) and attached evidence and artifacts. During the internship, students prepare and complete a school improvement project, which includes a literature review, a statement of the problem, an action plan, and a reflective summary. Students also write reflexive papers to each Georgia Leadership Performance Standard, making connections to their field work and to current research. A final reflexive component is a blog where students share their impressions and questions about their field experiences and receive feedback from their professor and classmates. LiveText serves as the repository for the portfolio. SLO: Equity Audit This assignment a requirement in EPEL 8020, Leadership for Change in a Diverse Society The purpose of this assignment is to determine whether the student's school has policies, ideas, staff, missions, and goals, etc. to be considered a multicultural organization. Students identify one particular aspect (e.g., the school curriculum - content integration and knowledge construction, the school culture, student placement, faculty and staff representation, parental involvement, teacher and administrator disposition towards diversity, school policies, self efficacy of students, hiring practices, etc.) of the school in which to conduct a thorough equity audit analysis. Students submit a paper and present their findings to their classmates. The paper and presentation include appropriate rationale for conducting the equity audit, overview of research as it relates to the equity audit, definition of important terms, analysis of findings, and implications.

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 previously noted, all candidates either met or exceeded expectations for the SLO's. Unit faculty are using Georgia Leadership Performance Standards due to a delay in the finalization of updated standards from ISLLC and CAEP. We expect to review and refine our expectations when the updated standards are released. For any given cohort, there are two to four professors who supervise students in EPEL 8970. In reviewing student outcomes for the portfolios in this internship course sequence, faculty noted slight differences in the assessment criteria among the professors. The current professors for the Fall 2015 EPEL 8970 sections are working to design a uniform rubric for the portfolio. This will enable us to better analyze our results.
3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

EPEL faculty meet weekly to review program data and to make adjustments as needed. EPEL faculty meet monthly with the entire EPS department to share findings and get input from other units within the department. EPEL faculty also participate in meetings twice each semester with the Professional Education Faculty and with the full faculty from the College of Education and Human Development. In these meetings faculty members share progress and program adjustments. They also receive input from faculty in other departments who have different perspectives. Conversations from these meetings recently led to a joint work session with the EPEL and RSM faculties to improve the delivery of the research courses which support the literature review and research connections in assignments for the portfolio and the equity audit. EPEL faculty recognize that input and perspective from partners in the field is critical to the success of our leadership programs. We have a Memorandum of Understanding with every district where our students are placed for the field experiences in EPEL 8970. We engage in ongoing conversations with our field partners to verify the effectiveness of our programs and to get input on necessary revisions. Conversations from these relationships recently resulted in a decision to align our portfolio with the Georgia Leadership Performance Standards. Changes in the licensure structure at the Georgia Department of Education led to revisions in our courses to reflect the upcoming Tier 1 and Tier 2 leadership certifications that will become effective in Summer 2016.

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 analysis and input from our colleagues and field partners, we will implement a uniform rubric for the portfolio in December 2015. Based upon changes in the licensure structure at the Georgia Department of Education, we are adjusting our programs to include a new Master’s degree that will meet the requirements for Tier 1 certification in Georgia. This program will launch in 2016. The EdS program will also incorporate changes in the portfolios to reflect the requirements for Tier 1 and Tier 2 licensure. These changes will become effective in Summer 2016.
**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for</strong></th>
<th><strong>Successfully complete comprehensive examinations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>95% of students in the PhD program with a concentration in educational leadership will successfully prepare and defend their comprehensive examinations. The Comprehenshive Examination Rubric will be used to evaluate the examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students in the PhD with a concentration in educational leadership completed the comprehensive exam during this reporting cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 2: Committee evaluation of prospectus (O: 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for</strong></th>
<th><strong>Successfully complete prospectus</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>95% of students will successfully prepare and defend their prospectuses. The Prospectus Evaluation Rubric will be used for evaluation purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

1/1 PhD students (100%) successfully defended his/her prospectus upon the first preparation and presentation during this reporting cycle. Success was determined by showing that he/she: 1. Sufficiently understood the concepts and tools of inquiry in foundational disciplines 2. Sufficiently demonstrated knowledge of previous research or literature in the field 3. Sufficiently demonstrated normative or critical judgments that were insightful and detailed 4. Successfully demonstrated the above through written and oral presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 3: Committee evaluation of dissertation (O: 3)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for</strong></th>
<th><strong>Successfully defend dissertations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>95% of students will successfully prepare and defend their dissertations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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. = Both MET 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 4: Advisor review of disposition assessment (O: 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for</strong></th>
<th><strong>Develop effective dispositions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>95% of students will score 3 or higher on the post assessment. Measure will be used when admissions to the program are re-activated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

As there were not new students accepted into the program during this reporting cycle, and as the COEHD is eliminating this assessment, it was not administered to the students during this reporting cycle.

**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

## Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 complete the comprehensive exams at the end of their coursework. This is considered a formative assessment as the exam is analyzed through the lens of improvement in moving toward the prospectus presentation. The prospectus presentation is completed after successful completion of the comprehensive exam and serves as a formative indicator of readiness for the dissertation study. The dissertation defense is the summative experience of the program. Successful demonstration of the theoretical concepts and their connections to the research study are the hallmarks of the defense.

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?

   Analysis of this year's findings show that the students who reached either the prospectus or dissertation stage were well prepared to successfully complete the stage.

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 the program's admissions are currently on hold, any discussion of how the assessment findings impact the program's future is TBA at a later date.

## Georgia State University

### Assessment Data by Section


(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST

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

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics unit of Educational Policy Studies Department is to cultivate and develop educational researchers capable of investigating problems of the 21st. century. This is in keeping with Georgia State University's overarching goal to be recognized as a dynamic academic community where teaching and research combine to produce leaders and create solutions to conquer the challenges of the 21st. century.

### Goals

**G 1: Key Educational Researchers**

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 (M: 1)**

Students will design a research study to address educational questions using an appropriate methodological framework

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: LOA Assessment Results (O: 1)

Students studying within the Research, Measurement, and Statistics area learn qualitative and/or quantitative methods of social investigation and assessment. Qualitative methods focus on the meaning supporting social interaction whereas quantitative methods focus on empirical description and influential relationships that occur within our social environment. The assessment of students who were enrolled in the program, during the 2014 – 2015 academic year, took place at three stages of program matriculation: Comprehensive Exam, Prospectus Presentation, and Dissertation Defense. The survey instrument (Learning Outcome Assessment for WEAVE Online - Degree Programs) provided an opportunity to score and comment on student performance at each of these three stages. Five students reached the Comprehensive Exam Stage, five students reached the Prospectus Presentation Stage, and four students reached the final Dissertation Defense Stage. The assessment instrument, which was addressed to the evaluators, consisted of five questions that could reveal a student's knowledge, ability, and judgement. The student's performances were rated on a scale of 1 – 3 (with 3 = Exceeds, 2 = Meets, and 1 = Does Not Meet, there was also a Not Applicable rating). An opportunity for evaluator comment was also provided. The Learning Outcome Assessment questions follow: Q1: Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology(ies) Q2: Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Q3: Document adheres to the standards of quality writing. Q4: Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. Q5: Potential for contribution to the discipline. (1) Ph.D. students in RMS write a comprehensive exam after they have completed their course work. This exam covers the knowledge a student may have gained through matriculation in the major / content / cognate areas of the program. The members of the advisory committee evaluated the learning outcomes by appraising the students responses during the oral defense segment of the exams. A scoring scale from 1-3, supported by an analytic guide that the faculty of the RMS program created, capture the assessment. Please note that the ratings presented are averages of the scores awarded to the participants.* At the Comprehensive Exam Stage 5 students were evaluated. For the five questions the highest average rating was 2.80, which was recorded for three of the assessment questions: "appropriate methodology," "knowledge of literature in the field," and "contribution to the discipline." The "standards of writing" and "oral communication" assessment questions received a slightly lower mark of 2.60.* (2) Students' dissertation proposal was evaluated using a rubric and analytic guide. The students work in close collaboration with their research adviser and their dissertation committee to prepare a prospectus report. The learning outcomes are assessed by the dissertation advisory committee members following the student’s oral presentation of the prospectus. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 3. The criteria for these scores are set by the RMS faculty. An analytic guide accompanies this rubric. At the Prospectus Presentation Stage 5 students were evaluated. For the five questions the highest average rating was 3.00, which was recorded for two of the assessment questions: "quality of writing" and "contribution to the discipline." The three questions "appropriate methodology," "knowledge of literature in the field," and "oral communication" received a slightly lower mark of 2.80.* (3) In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents a review of the literature, an exploration of the methodology, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to content knowledge of the issue, design of the study, review and critique of the literature, application of methodological expertise, and implications. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 3. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and adviser evaluation form. At the Dissertation Defense Stage 4 students were evaluated. For the five questions an average rating of 2.75 was recorded for all five of the assessment questions. Furthermore this average score 2.75 is 75% of the way to the Exceeds category from the "Meets" category.* In summary, the assessments indicate that the participants at all three stages were performing at a high level, as all of the ratings recorded ranged from 2.60 to 3.00, which is a segment well above the "Meets" mark of 2.00. * Attachment “A” - Excel sheet containing the raw data.

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

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

Yearly Assessment Plan and Presentation Plan
The department is developing a yearly assessment form to track the progress of all PhD students. In addition, based on an item related to presentation, one focus will be student presentations through poster session at the Student Mixer.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2016

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Five Student Learning Outcomes were assessed at all three stages of matriculation (Comprehensive Examination, Prospectus Presentation, and Dissertation Defense): Q1: Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology(ies) Q2: Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Q3: Document adheres to the standards of quality writing. Q4: Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. Q5: Potential for contribution to the discipline. The program is design so that 27% of the student's course work (5 out of the 18 courses required) address methodology (quantitative, qualitative, single-case, historical/philosophical, or measurement). At each of the three stages of matriculation students present a literature review which presents their knowledge of the theories, arguments, and ideas that set the parameters for their field of study. As part of class participation students are required to orally present a topic, paper, or final project. Finally, at every step of the way students read numerous articles that present the form and standards for publication in their discipline.

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 at all three stages convey high average marks. Because the Assessment scale is minimal (1 – 3) the instrument does not discern different levels of student achievement. In the future more emphasis will be place on the comment section, so that we may get a better idea of how students are meeting the five assessment categories.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 PHD RMS program coordinator will present a summary of the WEAVE report to faculty at the upcoming faculty meeting.

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 PHD RMS program is reviewed annually in conjunction with course offerings and course enrollment. The Student Learning Outcomes represent a prominent feature of design when considering program adjustment. The current SLO findings will be a feature of the debate that addresses program strengths and weaknesses. The administrative coordinator, at the October faculty meeting, will present a report on our action item to create a yearly review of student progress.
**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 master's level prepares students to exceed the standard in greater numbers.

**Goals**

**G 2: Participates in scholarly activities**

Participates in scholarly activities

---

**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 (2013-2014), EPS implemented a new and more detailed assessment, with students rated on one of 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, 3) exceeds standard. This provided EPS with a refined data set, which was maintained as well for the current cycle (2014-2015). For 2013-2014, three Social Foundations doctoral students defended dissertations, with two of the three meeting but not exceeding the standard for quality writing. For 2014-2015, eight Social Foundations doctoral students defended Comprehensives, with all eight meeting the standard for quality writing; seven Social Foundations doctoral students defended the Dissertation Prospectus, with all seven meeting the standard for quality writing; four Social Foundations doctoral students defended the Dissertation, with all four meeting the standard for quality writing. More specifically, for the Dissertation,

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 by the Social Foundations Doctoral Program coordinator with Social Foundations faculty through a spreadsheet. The assessment findings are then discussed by Social Foundations faculty in a special meeting, generally after a meeting of the full faculty. Overall trends are mapped through comparison to performance in previous years and interventions for improvement, if necessary, are brainstormed and brought back to the full faculty for discussion and possible implementation.

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 planned for the 2014-2015 cycle, the faculty worked with the newly formed EPS Graduate Student Association to host a series of workshops focused on professional development. Topics included “Navigating the Doctoral Process from Coursework through Completion,” a two-part “CV Writing Workshop,” “Publishing Workshop,” and two Student Mixers for informal advisement, networking, and community building. In this way, students were presented with various structured opportunities to discuss and refine their writing and research. All of this has enhanced the scholarly culture of the department, preparing students to exceed the standard in greater numbers.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2014-2015 Educational Psychology MS  
**As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to master content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the master’s 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 in the Master's program as of summer 2015; of these 11 students graduated during this report period.

**Goals**

**G 2: Participates in scholarly activities**

Participates in scholarly activities
**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.

**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, a project, or taking the master's examination. For the thesis, students conduct their own research, for the project students write an in-depth analysis of an area within the field, for the master's examination students take a 4-hour, in-house, written examination on a question or questions determined by the committee in collaboration with the student and advisor. The written component of the comprehensive exam is followed by an oral defense of the thesis, project, or exam 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.

**M 2: Thesis, Project, or Examination (O: 2)**
Each MS student in the Educational Psychology program must complete a thesis research study, a comprehensive literature review project, or complete a 4-hour, in-house, written examination on a question or questions determined by the committee in collaboration with the student or advisor. For the thesis, students conduct their own research, for the project students write an in-depth analysis of an area within the field, and for the examination students write a in-depth answer to a selected question on a topic within the field. The written component of the comprehensive exam is followed by an oral defense of the thesis, project, or exam 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

**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, or complete an 4-hour, in-house examination 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.

**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.

### 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.

#### 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
- Additional Resources: none

**Master’s Handbook**

The Master's Handbook will be updated to reflect new changes in policy and new URL addresses.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: This is an ongoing action
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and EPY faculty
- Additional Resources: none

**The Master’s Handbook was updated**

The Master's Handbook was updated to reflect new changes in policy and new URL addresses

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Made available to students
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: EPY Coordinator
- Additional Resources: none

#### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**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 most recent change has been the addition of the master's examination which consists of a 4-hour, in-house written test on a question or questions to be determined by the committee in collaboration with the student and advisor. Only one student during 2014-2015 elected to take the examination option so it is not possible to determine whether there is impact on timely graduation rates. Another addition to the master's program was the course sequence that leads to eligibility for the Board Certified Behavior Analyst Examination. This certification is very popular with students, and we feel that the option to take courses that lead to this certification will attract many students. We are gathering data regarding the positive impact of this option on our enrollment numbers.

**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.

Plans are to assess the number of students who elect to take the Master’s examination option. We will ask for feedback from the advisors on whether this option facilitated completion of their program for their students. Data will be gathered each year regarding the number of students who sit for the BCBA certification exam. Since Georgia State is one of the few institutions where the course sequence leading to certification is available, we anticipate this will have a positive impact on enrollment numbers.
**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Doctoral level prepares students for careers in teaching in schools, colleges, and universities; as researchers in state and city departments of education; and professionals in training research programs in government and industry. There were 13 students as of Summer 2015 in the Ph.D. program; 6 graduated during this academic year.

**Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 4: College teaching</th>
<th>Develop competence in college teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 5: Scholarly activities</td>
<td>Participates in scholarly activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1: Annual Review</td>
<td>Students will undergo an annual review of their phd performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2: Professional Seminar</td>
<td>Students will attend a professional seminar in their first semester of enrollment in the EPY PhD program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3: Dissertation</td>
<td>Students will undergo the scholarly activity of writing and defending a dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

| SLO 2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing (G: 1) (M: 1) | Students will receive a satisfactory or better on their annual reviews, indicating their developing abilities to communicate professionally, orally and in writing |
| SLO 3: Exposure to the field of EPY (G: 2) (M: 2) | Students will attend EPY 8961 to obtain exposure to major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Educational Psychology |
| SLO 4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation (G: 3) (M: 3) | Students will successfully write and defend their dissertation, indicating that they understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation. |
| SLO 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 4) (M: 4) | Develop competence in college teaching |
| SLO 6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities (G: 5) (M: 5) | Demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities. |

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Annual review (O: 2)</th>
<th>This review includes all students who have not completed the comprehensive examination. The evaluation of each student includes a review of academic progress, residency progress, professional growth, and professionalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing**

All students will receive a rating of “satisfactory” or better in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 3)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Exposure to the field of EPY**

All students will receive a rating of “satisfactory” or better in their annual review.
All doctoral students will complete this professional development seminar during the first semester of their first year.

**M 3: Dissertation (O: 4)**

All students must defend a dissertation based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation**

All students who attempt, will successfully defend their dissertation.

**M 4: Teaching Internship (O: 5)**

The teaching internship includes attending class sessions, teaching a specified unit of the class under supervision of the instructor, assessing students on the material taught during the unit, and providing feedback to the class regarding their performance.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Develop competence in college teaching**

All students who attempt the teaching internship will successfully complete the requirements.

**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.

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

**EPY 9660**

The teaching residency will become an official course, called EPY 9660: Internship in Educational Psychology.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The course became available in August of 2009.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

**Remedial Plan**

When a student receives a rating of unsatisfactory, students are informed in writing about areas in which they are not meeting goals of the program, and a remediation plan is prepared and signed by both the student and the advisor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing process.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Remediation Plan**

When a student receives a rating of unsatisfactory, students are informed in writing about areas in which they are not meeting goals of the program, and a remediation plan is prepared and signed by both the student and the advisor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing process and no longer needs to be included in our action plan.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Tracking of Applicants**

Applicants’ demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores) will be tracked for the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected. We will also keep records in the same excel file for each applicant in regards to evaluations of the different sections of their applications.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This was conducted during this past year and will continue as an action plan. A new addition that we started this year, is to also record our evaluations of the different aspects of their application, such as their essays, vita, letters of recommendation, etc.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Phd Handbook**

The Phd handbook will be continuously reviewed and updated to reflect new requirements and URL address changes.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This is an ongoing action
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: EPY coordinator and faculty
Additional Resources: none

Improve our Recruitment efforts to the Ph.D. program
We have established a recruitment committee with the focus attracting more highly qualified students to our program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We will design additional recruitment materials and strategies.

PhD Handbook was updated
The PhD handbook will be continuously reviewed and updated to reflect new requirements and URL address changes

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: EPY Coordinator

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 continue to monitor our acceptances in terms of GRE scores and demographic characteristics.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 English Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Lower Division Studies in the English Department is committed to providing the highest level of writing and reading instruction for our students as they enter the University. We seek to develop students' writing skills, critical thinking, and reading comprehension by engaging them in a variety of expository, argumentative, and literary (on the sophomore level) readings that lead to competent writing skills; and through encouraging understanding of the social and discourse communities that shape writing. Our program's work with students also aims to connect writing to larger University initiatives. The FLC program, the First Year Reading Book, Student Success Academy, WAC, and the Department's Writing Studio have influence on the course curriculum and stated outcomes and goals.

Goals
G 1: Competency in Writing
Student will demonstrate competency in writing through consideration of the rhetorical situation, and through their ability to identify key issues, present their findings in a logical structure, formulate an alternative point of view, formulate a central/anchor thought (thesis), and use effective support and evidence.

G 2: Reading Comprehension
Student will demonstrate ability to interpret a text accurately, particularly in terms of main ideas or important concepts. Additionally, students will demonstrate ability to identify, summarize, and evaluate both major and minor issues, as well as the interrelationships between them.

G 3: Developing Critical Readers and Writers
To realize our mission of developing critical and effective readers and writers, the core courses in English are committed to helping our students 1) develop critical thinking through analytical reading of literary, cultural, and other works. 2) Develop their writing style by engaging in several forms of writing (summary, expository, argumentative, etc.) 3) Help student connect their writing process to the
larger University community, 4) Work with University programs (FLC, First Year Book, Student Success Academy, Writing Studio, Writing Across the Curriculum, etc.) to create and maintain writing program initiatives, and 5) train Graduate Teaching Assistants in the proper assessment and feedback models needed to encourage and direct our students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identification (M: 1)**
Identification and articulation of key issue(s) (does it answer the question?).

**SLO 2: Logical Structure (M: 1)**
Identification of valid positions on the issue (presented in a logical structure).

**SLO 3: Alternative Viewpoints (M: 1)**
Student is able to formulate and effectively articulate alternative view points.

**SLO 4: Thesis (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate their formulation of a position on an issue. Their papers will develop a central thesis, and their papers will follow the structure and line of argument supported by this thesis.

**SLO 5: Evidence (M: 1)**
Students will show demonstrate effective use of reasons in support of stated position.

**SLO 6: Reading Comprehension (M: 2)**
Students will demonstrate their ability to effectively summarize and evaluate texts (in this case, The Other Wes Moore). Students should be able to identify major arguments and the interrelationships between the major and [minor] sub-arguments.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Written assignment assessing writing skills (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
In order to assess writing skills, instructors gave ENGL1101 students a prompted essay question for the University's freshman reading book, The Other Wes Moore. Instructors graded these essays using the revised 2012 rubric (in documents section).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identification**
We expect 50% of our students to receive at least a 3 or 4 on the identification portion of the rubric.

**M 2: Written assignment assessing reading comprehension (O: 6)**
In order to assess reading comprehension skills, instructors gave ENGL1101 students a reading comprehension quiz. The instructors graded these quizzes using the revised reading comprehension rubric (attached in documents section).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O6: Reading Comprehension**
We aim to have 80% of our students receive 3 or 4 on the reading comprehension exam.

**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
- Evidence

Responsible Person/Group: Lower-Division Studies
Additional Resources: RA for LDS to collect and report data.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 English Concentration in Creative Writing
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 3: Demonstrate Authentic/Engaging Writing (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate authentic and engaging writing.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 2: Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 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 O3: Demonstrate Authentic/Engaging Writing**

The target for this outcome is 4.2 out of 5.0.

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

**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
- **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
- **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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Creative Writing faculty have improved the sequencing of courses and made the course offerings more coherent in an effort to attract more poetry students and help them to graduate in a timely way. The director will continue to monitor student numbers and course sequences.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Creative Writing

---

**Georgia State University**
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**2014-2015 English Concentration in Literature**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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

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 awareness of the history, biographical, and/or literary context.

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 English 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 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.

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.

Target for O4: Imaginative understanding/engagement with text
4.2 of 5

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

Advise students about portfolio contents
Because the writings in a number of the Literature portfolios have demonstrated a limited breadth of knowledge, we need to help students see the importance of including a wider range of essays (American/British/world literature, from different periods, with theoretical engagement). More detailed instructions about the need to a diverse selection of writings will be supplied to instructors of the senior seminar so that these instructors can provide better guidance to students as they prepare their portfolios.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
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
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies
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 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.

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.

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.

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

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 él 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.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 English Concentration in Secondary Education
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

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.

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

Target for O2: Knowledge of language and linguistics
According to the 2009-2010 assessment report, the target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

Target for O3: Effective Written Communications
According to the 2009-2010 assessment report, the target for this outcome related to the effective written communications is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

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.

M 2: Senior Seminar Exam (O: 4)
Starting in 2009-2010, the Senior Seminar for students in the Secondary English concentration has included a question on the final exam that asks students to reflect upon what they have learned about the profession of English teaching from the various elements of the course (lesson and unit planning, the integration of the standards in teaching, resources available for classroom instruction, classroom management as demonstrated by teachers at their observation sites, and content enhancement possibilities through teaching conferences). Scores for the question on the exam that asks students to reflect upon teaching will be tabulated and reported as part of the assessment report.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching
The expectation for the teaching philosophy assignment to be completed by students in the senior seminar is that at least 75% will receive a 90% or above for this assignment.

Requirements 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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English Committee
Additional Resources: Funding needed to provide one course release for an instructor to direct this specialized internship program.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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 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

Devising other measures for senior seminar
Secondary English faculty will consider other measure 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

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 English Creative Writing MFA
As of: 12/13/2016 09:47 AM 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.

**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)

**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

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

---

**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 in 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 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.

**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.

---

**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 &
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) (G: 2) (M: 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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. 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 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 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 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 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>
M 6: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

M 7: Dispositions (O: 5)
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O5: Dispositions
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

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 Academic Affairs

Program Assessment for 2010-2011

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge, Planning, Effects on P-12 Learners, Pedagogical Knowledge, Dispositions, and Clinical Practice.

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

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2011 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 terms.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Michelle Zoss, Mary Deming, and Ewa McGrail
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 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 Education Faculty

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
2014-2015 English MA: Literature
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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.

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.

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.

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). If their are dissenting opinions about the scores, those different scores can be indicated on the assessment form. The committee chair is responsible for making sure that the assessment form is completed and turned into the assistant to the Graduate Director after the thesis work has been submitted. A student cannot be advanced for graduation if this assessment step has not been done.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**

Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 for all the criteria used in assessing the thesis. The data that is generated from this year's results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the M.A. thesis is intended to demonstrate.

**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.

**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.

---

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

**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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** the Director of Graduate Studies

**Consider limiting the number of outcomes used to assess thesis work**

In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work of the M.A. theses. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** 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,
They will also discuss how to norm assessments among the Pro-Seminar instructors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: DGS implements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: DGS/Graduate Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Meetings needed to coordinate efforts of literature studies faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: DGS and Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 English MA: Rhetoric/Composition**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 1: Encourage a scholarly engagement with theoretical frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2: Assure mastery in content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3: Effective Written Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department will strive to produce M.A. students who can demonstrate effective written communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Knowledge of the History, Theory, and Practice of Rhetoric (G: 2) (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Mastery of Writing (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Communicates Arguments and Results (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. students in Rhetoric and Composition will be able to communicate the argument and results of their thesis research effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: M.A. Thesis in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 2, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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.

**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.

---

**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

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 English PhD in Creative Writing**

*As of 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The English department prepares PhD students in Creative Writing with comprehensive knowledge of literary composition, aesthetics, vocabulary and techniques, expertise with established literary models, ability to teach Creative Writing at the college level, familiarity
with the publishing literary marketplace, and ability to produce publishable literary works.

**Goals**

**G 1: Exemplary writers**
Graduates of the PhD are exemplary writers, both in terms of communication skills and imaginative expression.

**G 2: Knowledgeable about history of genre**
Graduates of PhD are experts in the history of the significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, and literary vocabulary of their chosen genre.

**G 3: Experienced teachers of the workshop method of Creative Writing**
Graduates of the PhD are experienced teachers in the use of the workshop method of teaching the craft of Creative Writing.

**G 4: Able to produce publishable work of high quality**
Graduates of the PhD have a working understanding of the writing profession and are able to produce publishable work of high quality.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of Form, Theory, and Aesthetics (M: 1, 2)**
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.

**SLO 2: Progress in Composition (M: 1, 2)**
The student's dissertation demonstrates progress in literary composition from early workshop manuscripts.

**SLO 3: Knowledge and Use of Technique (M: 1)**
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.

**SLO 4: Valid and Original Creative Project (M: 2)**
Student proposes a valid and original creative project.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Graduating Ph.D. students in Creative Writing are assessed on the work of their dissertation. This assessment is facilitated by the Graduate Director at the student's dissertation defense, and the form is completed by faculty members on the student's committee. The dissertation assessment form, which uses a 6-point scale, rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes. In the summer, the Graduate Director meets with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. Those suggestions are brought to the Graduate Studies Committee in early fall for review, 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 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Target for O2: Progress in Composition**
A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.
**Target for O4: Valid and Original Creative Project**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.

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

**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

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 English PhD in Literature**

As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 ground-breaking 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
Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies
A target of 4.5 was set for this learning outcome related to content knowledge.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this with the Graduate Director
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director

Review mission statement and goals to see if they need to be more particular to the concentration
The Director of Graduate Studies will review the mission statement and the goals of the Literature concentration to see if they need to be revised to add more specific information about this particular graduate concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Director of Graduate Studies, at the request of the Assessment Coordinator, will review the mission statement and goals and decide if they need to be revised.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

Implement new assessment measure
The Director of Graduate Studies will begin to track the number of PhD students with Advanced Teaching Fellowships, which reduces the teaching load for graduate students to three courses. The goal is that eventually 100% of PhD students will have a 3-course load. The DGS will determine the % of students currently holding ATFs and appropriate targets for 3, 5, and 10 years out.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The DGS has noted that while the department is in the process of increasing the number of ATFS, it is also requiring students to finish dissertations faster. Those students under pressure to finish their dissertations may be those with lower scores on our assessment forms this year. The DGS will continue to track student progress according to workload and funding.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: DGS

New early measure: dissertation prospectus
The Coordinator and DGS determined that the PhD exams are not the best place for an early measure. Instead, starting in Fall, 2013, we will assess the dissertation prospectus as the early measure.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Coordinator created assessment tool for the prospectus.
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator

Re-structure PhD Exams
The Director of Graduate Studies will discuss with the Graduate Committee whether to move the current exam structure to a take-home only structure. Currently, the exams include three components: a take-home exam, an on-site exam, and an oral exam.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: DGS discusses with Graduate Committee, brings results to the department. Such reconsideration of the Ph.D. exam is ongoing.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: DGS

Monitor quality of Ph.D. dissertations
While our target for Ph.D. dissertations was 4.5 for three different measures, for the first time this year students did not meet any of the targets (scoring, on average, 4.2, 3.6, 4.0). This dip may not be significant, as two of the outcomes are new this year and we had a small sample (just 5 dissertations). However, we think that excessive GTA workload contributed to the results. With the support of the College and University, we are working to provide Advanced Teaching Fellowships for all of our Ph.D. students. With such support, we expect the quality of dissertations to improve.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: DGS will continue to watch this pattern. DGS and Chair will keep working to secure more ATF for Ph.D. students.
Additional Resources: Funding for more Advanced Teaching Fellowships.
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.

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.

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.
**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Knowledge of History, Theory, and Practice of Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Mastery of Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Communicates Arguments and Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator

#### Consider limiting the number of outcomes for the assessment of Rhetoric and Composition dissertations

In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the work of assessing the dissertations for this concentration. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Rhetoric and Composition faculty member assigned to assessment work.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** the Rhetoric and Composition faculty

#### Continue tracking dissertation results

This year's dissertation results included two scores that did not meet the target (regarding criteria related to effective written communications and graduate level research). But since this was based on one dissertation alone, the department will continue to monitor dissertation results next year rather than making particular action plans for these areas at this time. This is based on the assumption that the low scores had more to do with the individual student than with the success of the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The Rhetoric and Composition faculty will give special consideration to the dissertation results when provided with the assessment data by the Assessment Coordinator at the end of the spring semester.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** the Rhetoric and Composition faculty
**Early measure**

In the coming year the concentration will be instituting an early measure in Engl 8120, 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.

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Kinesiology and Health in accord with the College of Education and the other colleges and departments of the university seeks an ever increasing degree of excellence in a wide variety of programs. The Department’s mission includes instruction, research and scholarly activity, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, health and physical education, and recreation. The department provides professional preparation and continuing education in each of these fields, generates and communicates knowledge, and serves the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

**Goals**

**G 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.

**G 1: Problem Solving**
Exercise science students will become better problem-solvers.

---

**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

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

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

SLO 5: Pathophysiology and Risk Factors (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 14, 15, 16, 17)

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the risk factors that underlie the major chronic diseases.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

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

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

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

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Student retention

2. Student promotion and progression

3. Timely graduation

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

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

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

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

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

**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).

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2. Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 8: Patient Management and Medications (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 29, 30)**

Students will be able to identify and discuss the effects major cardiovascular, pulmonary, and metabolic medications and how these are used to manage patients with these diseases.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2. Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 9: Exercise Prescription and Programming (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 31, 32, 33, 34)**

Students will be able to use assessment data to design scientifically sound exercise programs for apparently healthy individuals as well as for those with controlled cardiovascular, pulmonary, or metabolic disease

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

3. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
5.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 10: Nutrition and Weight Management (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 35, 36)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss basic nutrition and weight management concepts as they apply to those who will engage in exercise programs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 11: Human Behavior and Counseling (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 37, 38)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the application of basic human behavior and counseling strategies as they apply to physical activity and exercise programs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: First Aid Cpr Certification (O: 1)**

CPR and First Aid certification pass rates in KH 3390 Advanced First Aid and Emergency Care

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**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
<p>| Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) |
| --- | --- |
| <strong>M 4: Practical Exam KH 4630 (O: 1)</strong> |
| Practical Exam Score in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription |
| Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) |
| <strong>M 5: KH 4350 Project (O: 2)</strong> |
| Performance on KH 4350 Fitness Center Management Project (CTW) |
| Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |
| <strong>M 6: ACSM Domain score (O: 2)</strong> |
| Domain score on ACSM Exam |
| Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| <strong>M 7: KH 4630 Case Study Presentation (O: 3)</strong> |
| Performance on KH 4630 Case Study Presentation |
| Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| <strong>M 8: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 3)</strong> |
| Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Case Study |
| Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| <strong>M 9: Domain Score on ACSM Exam (O: 3)</strong> |
| Domain score on ACSM Exam |
| Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| <strong>M 10: KH 3650 lab scores (O: 4)</strong> |
| Lab scores in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise |
| Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| <strong>M 11: KH 3600 Lab scores (O: 4)</strong> |
| Lab scores in KH 3600 Biomechanics |
| Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level |
| <strong>M 12: ACSM Domain Score (O: 4)</strong> |
| Domain score on ACSM Exam |
| Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| <strong>M 13: Pre Post Test KH 3650 (O: 4)</strong> |
| Pre Post test KH 3650 |
| Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery |
| <strong>M 14: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 5)</strong> |
| Performance on Case Studies in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription |
| Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| <strong>M 15: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 5)</strong> |
| Performance on Case Studies in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology |
| Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group |
| <strong>M 16: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 5)</strong> |
| Domain score on ACSM Exam |
| Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |
| <strong>M 17: KH 4360 Final Exam (O: 5)</strong> |
| Performance on Final Examination in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology |
| Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| <strong>M 18: KH 4630 Practical Exam (O: 6)</strong> |
| Performance on practical exam in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription |
| Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) |
| <strong>M 19: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6)</strong> |
| Domain score on ACSM Exam |
| Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on Case Study in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on Case Study in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: KH (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on lab practical in KH630 Lab Practical 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: KH 4360 Lab practical (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on lab practical in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 25: KH 3650 Lab assignments (O: 6)</th>
<th>Performance on lab assignments in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 26: KH 4360 Exam (O: 7)</th>
<th>Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 27: KH 4360 Practical Exam (O: 7)</th>
<th>Performance on practical exam in KH-4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 28: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 7)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 29: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 8)</th>
<th>Performance on case study presentation in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 30: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 8)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 31: KH 4630 Case Study (O: 9)</th>
<th>Performance on KH 4630 Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 32: KH 4630 Exercise Prescription Project (O: 9)</th>
<th>Performance on exercise prescription project in KH4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 33: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 9)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 34: KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Exam (O: 9)</th>
<th>KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology exam.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 35: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 10)</th>
<th>Domain score on ACSM Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### ACSM Examination Procedures

Students will begin taking the required ACSM examination during the Fall of 2009. Meetings will be held with all students registered for KH 4750 Practicum in Exercise Science to inform students of the examination requirements and to conduct a review session. Practice examinations have been posted on ULearn that allow students to check their readiness for the examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeff Rupp, Program Coordinator Other exercise science faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Implementation of new Objectives

During the past academic year (2010-2011) faculty in the exercise science program identified and adopted all new program objectives for the B.S. in Exercise Science program. These new objectives better reflect the knowledge skills and abilities that students must exhibit in order to successfully pass the American College of Sports Medicine professional certification program. Because this was an extensive revision of the current objectives, the process was very time consuming and performance data was not collected during this time period.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** During the 2011-2012 academic year faculty will be determining achievement targets and measures as well as collecting performance data on each objective. This data will be compiled and reported during the next evaluation cycle.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** KH Exercise Science faculty. Dr. Andy Doyle, program coordinator.

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

### Mission / Purpose

The M.S. degree program in Exercise Science prepares students at the graduate level to enter fields of worksite health promotion or fitness, cardiac rehabilitation, or related clinical programs; or to perform research in exercise science, including biomechanics and exercise physiology. The program includes classroom, laboratory, research, and field experience biomechanics, exercise physiology, fitness assessment, exercise program design, and program management and related interdisciplinary coursework. The concentration areas within the degree program provide advanced academic preparation for a successful career in the health and fitness field or for advancement to doctoral-level study.

### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge**

Students will gain knowledge of Exercise Science.

**G 2: Skills**

Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in their chosen Exercise Science field.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science (G: 1) (M: 1, 6)**

Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise physiology and related exercise science, including pathophysiology and risk factors and exercise prescription and programming.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter
areas 1, 2, and 7. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**O/O 2: Apply knowledge to practical situations (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**

Students should demonstrate practical skills related to the knowledge base of the program, including health appraisal, fitness and clinical exercise testing, electrocardiography, and diagnostic techniques.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 3 and 4. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**O/O 3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**

Students should demonstrate knowledge of basic equipment, facility requirements, absolute and relative contraindications, procedures, and protocols for the exercise test.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.1, 4.6.1.7, and 4.6.2. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**O/O 4: Understands research and human subjects issues (G: 1) (M: 4)**

Students should understand and interpret research in exercise science and should understand issues associated with clinical testing and research involving human subjects, including informed consent.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.6, 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.8, 2.6.0.4, and 2.6.0.5. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes (O: 1)**

Written examinations and quizzes in KH courses 6280, 7500, 7510, 7550, 7620, 8270, and 8390.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science**

75% scoring at or above 80% on exam

**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
Mission / Purpose
The film program at Georgia State multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are focused on student development beyond the academic unit. The program promotes a broad appreciation of both artistic, creative endeavors and intellectual, critical traditions in the study of film and media. It is the program's belief that a graduate's success will largely be determined by a developed sense of critical thinking, aesthetic contemplation, and the intellectual cultivation. Our program seeks to enhance the Department of Communication's mission of participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication.

Goals
G 1: understand and interpret
Students will be able to understand and interpret ideas presented in media involving moving images.

G 2: identify structures
Students will be able to identify narrative structures in stories using moving images.

G 3: fundamental concepts
Students will understand fundamental visual production and post-production concepts.

G 4: spectator/textual pleasure
Students will be able to recognize a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure in media involving moving images.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: understand and interpret (M: 1, 3, 4)
Understand and interpret ideas presented in media and can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.

SLO 2: narrative structures (M: 2, 4)
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
Students will understand the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scene, editing and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning.

SLO 4: spectator/textual pleasure
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 course Film 4750 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
More than 75% of students will earn 3 or higher using the measurement rubric.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
In the selected Film4750 class, slightly more that 75% of the class met the target (scoring 3 or higher).

M 2: descriptive writing assignment (O: 2)
Students in Film4750 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
More than 75% of students will receive 3 or higher using the rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just around 75% of students in Film 4750 met this goal; however, many students failed to earn even 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: mise-en-scene (O: 1)**

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 O1: understand and interpret**

More than 75% of students will receive 3 or higher using the mise-en-scene rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students received 3 or higher using the mise-en-scene rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students received 3 or higher using the mise-en-scene rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: spectator/textual relationship (O: 1, 2)**

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 O1: understand and interpret**

More than 75% of students will receive 3 or higher using the spectator/textual relationship rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 50% of students received 3 or higher on this rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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

- **Measure:** spectator/textual relationship | **Outcome/Objective:** understand and interpret

**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 míse-en-scene, editing, and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning can be measured.

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

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

- **Measure:** spectator/textual relationship | **Outcome/Objective:** understand and interpret

**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.
Narrative Structure Assessment
Develop system to determine if students can identify and discuss various narrative structures media employ for story delivery.

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.

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.

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.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Using Film4750 (the program's CTW and capstone course) as a measurement of student outcomes should reveal educational growth toward the goals and SLO our program first outlined 8 years ago (as presented in WEAVE's goals). However, the moderate achievement success of this SLO shows tenuous student success with respect to our program's goals. The gateway course to the film/video major (Film 1010) should be the place to set up these goals that then all other upper-level courses can work toward each semester. All of our department's sections of Film 1010 are taught by graduate students. There is no course director guiding these TAs and therefore no uniform structure to the course. This course should be the one in which students are introduced to the
concepts the faculty has deemed important (represented in our goals/SLO) so that students can then practice the analyses and interpretation we find value. However, this year’s findings fall short of our goals. CF with 4 below.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

I am uncertain how our program’s assessment findings are shared among TT faculty.

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 FA16, the film program is piloting Film1010 (the program’s gateway course) as a breakout model used successfully for Film2700. We believe we can better address the fundamental components of our SLO’s by having at least student’s in front of at least one full-time faculty (in contrast to present model that can graduate students with out them ever taking a FT faculty’s class). The breakout model will give us a clear starting point for addressing the curricular goals set forth in the program’s stated SLOs in this early class.

---
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**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 be proficient 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 indicate proficiency in use of quantitative skills for financial analysis.

G 2: Students will be equipped with a broad knowledge base in finance.

G 3: Students will become well 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 macroeconomic theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

**SLO 2: The development and application of technical skills (G: 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 performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Possess the necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building. (iv) Possess computer and technology skills, including (but not limited to) spreadsheet capabilities, familiarity with those software packages employed in analysis of financial issues, and general operating procedure capabilities.

**SLO 3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)**

(i) Possess knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization from corporate finance, investments, or financial institutions and markets (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on the corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for the purpose of solving real world financial problems (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from globalization of finance

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)**

To examine student performance in select courses (FI 4000, FI 4040 and FI 4300), the course-instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exams] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the
course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 1a-Fall2014: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2014 and "Exhibit 1b-Spring2015: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2015. This measure has 5 related learning outcomes as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2015: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. Please see this document 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

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**

Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates the level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 the level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 the level of proficiency for effective engagement in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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: RCB Student Performance Test Results (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Prior to Fall 2013, all GSU BBA students were required to take the Educational Testing Service ("ETS") Major Field Test that evaluated 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. Beginning in Fall 2014, the RCB developed its own cross-discipline exit survey administered at the end of BUSA 4900, the capstone taken by all RCB students. Results from the Fall 2014-Summer 2015 exit survey results are presented in "Exhibit 3-2015: RCB Student Performance Test Results".

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

Students should achieve at the 90th percentile in Finance and Accounting and at the 80th percentile in International.

**M 3: Alignment of student learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)**

This measure relates course level student outcomes to program level learning outcomes. In the Document Repository, please see "Exhibit 2-2015: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

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**

The student learning outcomes of the representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) should be aligned with and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map completely onto program learning objectives.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

The student learning outcomes pertaining to development and application of technical skills in representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) should align and map completely onto program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The student learning outcomes pertaining to the development and application of technical skills in representative courses (FI
**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 indicating 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Systematic course-level assessment initiated during the Spring 2015 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 2015" uploaded with the related measure.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Systematic course-level assessment initiated during the Spring 2015 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 2015" uploaded with the related measure.

**M 5: Selected questions for foundation knowledge (O: 1)**

The selected questions that pertain to 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 the courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300), the course-instructors selectively chose five representative questions from the assignments, quizzes, cases, midterm 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-Fall 2014: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2014. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2015: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 the 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 2014-2015 - 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 foundation knowledge partially meets our targets. The target of 80 percent this past year replaced the old target of 70 percent or above; thus, the target was partially met. The change in target level reflected the Department’s ongoing efforts to improve quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.

**M 6: Selected questions for technical skills (O: 2)**

The selected questions that pertain to technical skills 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 the courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300), the course-instructors selectively chose five representative questions from the assignments, quizzes, cases, midterm 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-Fall 2014: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2014. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2015: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 O2: The development and application of technical skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates the level of proficiency for the development and
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. In 2014 the Department initiated a Finance Honors Track wherein students are required to attend extra sessions whose focus is on bolstering their career and professionalism development. These sessions include workshops working with representatives of the College's Career Services Center as well as visits by key alumni from industry.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Representative questions from courses | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills
  - Measure: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance 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. The University's formal CTW plan ended as a QEP initiative in 2014. While the Department will continue to emphasize critical thinking and written communication skills in FI 4020, it will not be part of the formal assessment program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

- **Implementation Description:** continuous
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Rich Fendler
- **Additional Resources:** student assistants

**Practical training**
The field study in finance course "FI 4391" has been found useful for providing BBA-Finance majors with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). This has become increasingly important given the global recession and the decline in employment in the financial and non-financial sectors of the economy. We will continue to seek and partner with participating corporations to provide students the opportunity to acquire...
Use applications outside finance to improve general knowledge

Emphasize use of sophisticated technical capabilities

Program Innovation: Honors Track in Finance

Curriculum Innovation: New courses

Emphasize use of sophisticated technical capabilities

Use applications outside finance to improve general knowledge
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.

Curriculum Innovation: "Flipped" FI 3300 Classroom

During the 2014 academic year, the Department changed the traditional lecture method of instruction in FI 3300 (the core course in Corporate Finance taken by all RCB students) to the flipped classroom method. Early findings indicate that this initiative has resulted in enhanced student learning and retention. During the next academic year, the Department will continue to train instructors in this method as well as continue to analyze the effect on student learning and performance.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Jonathan Godbey

Program Innovation: BV Student Case Competition

During the next academic year, the Department plans for GSU to become the host university for the BV Challenge, a national student case competition event. This event will provide our participating students to develop skills unique to the valuation of privately-held firms and to showcase such skills while competing against student teams from other universities. It is anticipated that this initiative could also lead to curriculum innovation related to firm valuation; this will be explored during the coming year.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Fendler and David Beard

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, in our 2013-2014 review we 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, we decided to raise the target to 80 percent in the spirit of continuous improvement. This standard was maintained during this current 2014-2015 review. In assessing our results, we have fully met the target on one of our primary learning outcomes, and have partially met the target on the remaining two other learning outcomes. As indicated in the action plan tracking, wherever targets are only partially met, action plans have been developed. Specifically, to enhance technical capabilities of students, we plan to conduct two initiatives. First, note that we earlier developed a course FI 4080 Financial Modeling with Excel. This course has proven to be extremely popular and found valuable by students. However, due to the limited availability of university classrooms that are sufficiently equipped to teach this course, we have been constrained in our ability to accommodate student demand for the course. During the 2015-2016 academic year, we plan to find ways to increase the number of offerings of this course. Second, to further enhance student technical capabilities and at the same time, enhance their career and professionalism strengths, we plan on implementing a program to require all Finance majors to receive Bloomberg certification. To support this program, the Department will work with the RCB's Office of College Technology Services to expand the number of Bloomberg terminals located in the Department that can be made available to students for their training. To address our finding that foundation skill targets were only partially met, we believe that enhancing student math skills will help address this issue. We have created a task force of instructors who will look into creating a math module for introduction into the FI 4000 gateway course taken by all finance majors early in their senior year. The purpose of this math module will be to help students identify their math deficiencies and to provide students with training to correct these deficiencies. Together with the FI 4391 field studies program we earlier initiated to enhance practical training a new course FI 4210 "Portfolio Management Practicum" was introduced. This 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 plan to offer this course each semester. Another major initiative that commenced with the Fall 2014 semester involved 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. We will plan to study and assess the impact on student learning of this initiative. Another initiative that was recently launched in January 2014 to enhance the quality of education and student learning for top students was 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 are now recruiting the third cohort of students to begin this program in January 2016 and believe that we will be in position to assess the success of this program during the next academic year. 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 them. A strength of the assessment process over the last few cycles has been to provide enough information to motivate us to introduce the various innovations in the BBA Finance program 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.

In our review of this year's assessment results, we have found that two of our learning outcomes were partially met. These related to deficiencies in student technical and foundation skills. As a result, our plans to address these includes the following: First, to enhance technical capabilities of students, we plan on conducting two initiatives during the current year. In the first initiative, note that earlier we had developed a course FI 4080 Financial Modeling with Excel. This course has proven to be extremely popular and valuable with students. However, due to the limited availability of university classrooms that are sufficiently equipped to teach this course, we have been constrained in our ability to accommodate student demand for the course. During the 2015-2016 academic year, we plan to find ways to increase the number of offerings of this course so as to reach a larger number of students. In the second initiative, to further enhance student technical capabilities and at the same time, enhance their career and professionalism strengths, we plan on implementing a program to require all Finance majors to receive Bloomberg certification. To support this program, the Department will work with the RCB's Office of College Technology Services to expand the number of Bloomberg terminals located in the Department that can be made available to students for their training. Second, to address our finding that foundation skill targets were only partially met, we believe that enhancing student math skills will help address this issue. We plan to create a task force of instructors who will look into creating a math module that will be introduced into the 6-hour FI 4000 course. FI 4000 is a gateway course that is required to be taken by all finance majors early in their senior year and is a pre-requisite for other 4000-level electives. The purpose of this math module will be to help students identify their math deficiencies and to provide students with training to correct these deficiencies. In regard to prior year action plans, one important objective included enhancing what we do to improve student career prospects and professionalism. In addition to the plans discussed above to require all Finance majors to become Bloomberg certified, we will continue to enhance the career and professionalism component in our Honors Tract in Finance program that was introduced in January 2014. We intend to continue emphasizing this component of the program including having special Friday sessions where students have an opportunity to spend significant time with leaders from the College's Career Management Center. In addition, students will be provided access to a number of high level finance executives from industry that will be brought in to meet with students to discuss career opportunities and expectations following their graduation. We are currently recruiting students for the third cohort that will begin this program in January 2016. During the next assessment cycle, we plan to begin assessing the success of this program. Also, during the past year we implemented a major change in the way that the undergraduate core course in finance, FI 3300 Corporation Finance was delivered. With the support of a grant from the Provost office, we switched the method of delivery of the course from a traditional lecture method to the "flipped" classroom method. Beginning in Fall 2014, this method of delivery was implemented in all sections. During the next assessment cycle, we plan to begin assessing the success of this initiative.
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Mission / Purpose
Description: The Master of Science degree program with major in Finance is designed for students seeking an advanced knowledge of Masters level finance, including particular expertise in a chosen area of specialization (one of Corporate Finance, Asset and Wealth Management, and Global Financial Markets and Financial Services). 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 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-Fall2014: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2014, "Exhibit 1b-Spring2015: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2015 and "Exhibit 1a-Fall2015: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2015. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2015: MS-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. 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**

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 2014-2015 - 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 over last two consecutive years.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

Median scores shall be at least at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 least at or above 80 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 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.

**M 2: MS-Finance Exit Survey Responses (O: 1, 2, 3)**

To provide student feedback on the MS-Finance Program we conduct 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 3-2015: MS Finance Exit Survey". On 'Satisfaction about quality of program', 100% agree or strongly agree the program quality is satisfactory. On 'Importance in employment opportunities', 75% agree or strongly agree the
Program is important in seeking employment opportunities. However, the response rate on this survey was very low (only 4 out of 15 students responded to the survey). The findings can certainly be strengthened for validity next year by getting the survey completed during one of the final class sessions. The low response rate can also be attributed to greater emphasis placed by the survey supervisor on a newly launched salary survey the dean's office has initiated. The response rates that we see on this survey are encouraging and findings from the survey are summarized below: All 15 students responded to the salary survey. Of these, 11 students are currently working with an average salary of $68,727 having now seen an average salary increase of $12,460. The firms employing this set of students are SunTrust Bank, Comcast Spotlight, Syrinxus Bank, Deloitte, and Coweta County Schools to name a few of them. Seven of these students indicate that they will continue to look for alternate work. Overall, these findings indicate a growing trend in salaries as a consequence of the students participating in the MS-Finance program.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>The development and application of foundation knowledge</th>
<th>The development and application of technical skills</th>
<th>The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2: The development and application of technical skills</td>
<td>The alignment of representative questions testing student learning outcomes pertaining to technical skills should be completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**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.

**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 2014-2015 - 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

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

**Target for O3:** The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

The selected questions that pertain to analytical and integrative finance skills should be completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes. The alignment of representative questions testing student learning outcomes pertaining to development and application of analytical and integrative finance skills should be completely aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

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 in developing and applying technical, conceptual, and integrative skills 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 quality in the spirit of continuous improvement.

**M 7: Selected questions analytical, conceptual, integrative skills (O: 3)**

The selected questions that pertain to analytical, conceptual, and integrative skills from courses are assessed to see how well the students are learning these skills. These courses 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 "Exhibit 2a-Fall2015: Selected Questions" for findings from Fall 2015. This measure has one related learning outcome objective as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2015: 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 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 in developing and applying conceptual, analytical, and integrative skills 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 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.

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

**Curriculum**

The quality of students entering the MS-Finance Program has maintained its improvement over the 2003-04 baseline year with average GMAT scores during 2012-13 at approximately 625, based on a sample-study of students admitted to the program. To maintain and improve upon these scores in student quality, there is need to refine certain aspects of the program based on formal and informal student feedback. The technical background courses in Management Science can overlap with a student's prior coursework. These courses could be replaced with higher level courses tailored to each student's career goals and prior preparation. These substitutions have now been permitted during the past few years. The Department continues to review its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace. In response, we have most recently added two courses: FI 8350 "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and FI 8260 "Hedge funds and their trading strategies." These two courses have been successfully taught now for 2 cycles and are among our most popular courses. Looking forward to the 2013-2014 academic year, we will continue to review the curriculum and identify potential new courses that will provide students with important skill sets relevant to their professional development.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** MS-Finance Exit Survey Responses | **Outcome/Objective:** The development and application of technical skills
- **Implementation Description:**
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Gerry Gay

**Practical training**

Our experience in developing and offering the field-study in finance course FI 8391 continues to prove highly useful for providing students with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). We will continue to identify additional corporate partners for purposes of expanding opportunities for students to participate in these internships / field-study opportunities every semester. Our goal is to eventually have the field study course become an integral part and distinguishing aspect of the program. Though many of the students in the MS-Finance cohort program have current employment, the remaining students will benefit from opportunities to gain practical experience through internships. We will continue to encourage these students to take advantage of such opportunities.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
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.

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 addition, 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.

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 further 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.

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.

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.
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: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
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.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Selected questions for technical skills | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills

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

Program marketing and student support
The College is planning to introduce its Student Transformation Model (STM) to provide added staff support for the MS-Finance program. Key features of this innovation will be the hiring of an integrated student success professional, an enrollment management coordinator, and a career coach. With these additions, the program will be in a better marketing position and will be able to 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 support in career planning. During 2016 we plan to provide a thorough overall of the MSFI website to reflect the innovations to the program and curriculum that are planned.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Enhance Technical and Data Analyticals Skills
For the cohort entering in January 2016, we introduced an Excel boot camp. Based on the success of this program, we plan to implement this training for future cohorts. Beginning in Fall 2016, we plan to introduce a new course to the curriculum FI 8090 Financial Data Analytics. This will be a required course taken by all students in the first semester of the program and will introduce students to a host of techniques for analyzing financial data and making data-driven decisions.
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Program and Curriculum
Beginning Fall 2016, we plan to implement several innovations to both the MSFI program design and to its curriculum. Program innovations include the following: moving to a Fall start each year rather than a January start; lengthening the program to four semesters from three semesters; adding a required practicum during the summer semester; and adding two new specializations in "Asset and Wealth Management" and "Global Financial Markets and Financial Services" to complement the existing "Corporate Finance" specializations. Curriculum innovations include the planned introduction of two new courses FI 8090 Financial Data Analytics and F18450 Financial Analysis of Asset and Wealth Management Firms, and the addition of FI 8391 Field Studies in Finance to the program.
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.
Following the completion of the 2015 cohort, the Finance faculty have had two meetings to review and discuss the MSFI program and assessment findings and to recommend improvements to the program and curriculum. As a result of these meetings a number of areas for improvement were recommended and will be implemented during 2016. These are discussed in the next section on "Use of Assessment Findings for Program 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.

The course level assessments indicated that some of the student learning objectives of the MSFI program could be strengthened by introducing courses and modules that help students develop both technical and analytical skills as well as expertise in additional functional areas. To this end, we plan to introduce at the outset of each cohort program a one-day Excel boot camp. We also plan to introduce a new course in Financial Data Analytics that we will be a required course in the first semester of the program. Finance faculty instructing subsequent courses will then be able to introduce assignments better utilizing these technical and analytical skills. We have also learned that some students wish to develop expertise in functional areas beyond corporate finance. Thus, we plan to introduce two new specializations in the areas of "Asset and Wealth Management" and "Global Financial Markets and Financial Services".

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 French BA
As of 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is, through the study of modern and classical languages, cultures and literatures, 1. to provide students the opportunity to improve their critical thinking skills; 2. to better appreciate universal humanistic values; 3. to encourage them to acquire an international perspective; 4. to equip them to function as global citizens; 5. to prepare them, through the various majors in modern languages, for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business.

Goals
G 4: Knowledge of French and French Literature
Student shall demonstrate several abilities: 1. to understand French when spoken by a proficient speaker on general and non technical topics at normal conversational speed; 2. to speak French with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy; 3. to read and comprehend general and non-technical materials written in French; 4. 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.
Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section  
2014-2015 French MA  
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of France and French speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in French, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of French and Francophone literatures and cultures, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

**Goals**

G 1: Goals for 2010-11

In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)**

Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**SLO 2: Research and Data Collectioning Skills (M: 1)**

Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**SLO 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1)**

Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thesis, Pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

A committee of French professors will use the thesis, pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in French. The written exam consists of three questions based on three areas from French literature and/or civilization reading list as well as on students' coursework.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Effective writing, communication and editing**

Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1= Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

**Target for O2: Research and Data Collectioning Skills**

Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1= Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard
Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills
Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1 = Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge
Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1 = Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Adding Courses
The French section has added one new course for the new concentration in French Studies, and more are under consideration
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Planned
Responsible Person/Group: French Faculty

Mission / Purpose
The Geography BA in the Department of Geosciences presents an integrative perspective on the relations among social, political, economic, and physical phenomena occurring across space. The program is committed to teaching the concepts and research methods of the discipline in order to prepare geography majors for professional careers or advanced study or both. Students acquire geographic knowledge and thinking skills in order to understand the complex nature of the human and environmental patterns found in the world around them. Therefore, the program is committed to excellence in both the theoretical and applied arenas.

Goals
G 1: 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 3 out of 5

Target for O2: Contemporary Issues - Diverse Disciplines
75% to be proficient in diverse disciplines scoring 3 out of 5 50% to be proficient in diverse disciplines scoring 4 out of 5 25% to
be proficient in diverse disciplines scoring 5 out of 5

**Target for O3: Methods**

75% to be proficient in methods scoring 3 out of 5 50% to be proficient in methods scoring 4 out of 5 25% to be proficient in methods scoring 5 out of 5

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

#### Improve critical-thinking skills of Geography majors

Critical-thinking learning outcomes had the lowest scores among all the outcomes; therefore, critical-thinking skills of Geography majors need to be improved.

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

#### Improve scores on Outcome 10 in GEOG 4764

In order to improve scores on Outcome 10 (Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation) in Geography 4764 (Urban Geography), the instructor will provide students with solid examples of appropriate evaluations of claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

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

#### Increase the number of measures for certain outcomes

It has been determined that the program needs at least six measures per learning outcome. There were 82 outcome/measure combinations for the 2008-2009 assessment, thereby yielding a mean value of six measures per outcome. To reach the minimum number of six measures per outcome, the following is needed: at least five additional measures for Outcome 4 (Communication – Visual) and Outcome 5 (Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations); at least three additional measures for Outcome 6 (Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving); at least two additional measures for Outcome 8 (Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)), Outcome 9 (Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection), and Outcome 11 (Technology); and one additional measure for Outcome 3 (Communication – Oral), Outcome 12 (Collaboration), and Outcome 13 (Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines). Therefore, a high-priority area is increasing the number of measures for outcomes linked to quantitative skills, visual communication, and critical thinking.

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

#### Actions

Geosciences is proposing to combining B.A (GEOG) and B.S. (GEOL) degree programs. All new assessment will be developed reflecting goals and outcome of a new combined degree B.S. degree program. The 3.9 is lower than we want for this particular measure but is close to target; no change in approaches are warranted for this outcome.

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

#### Combining disciplines

This year the department will combine Geography and Geology into one major. We will discuss ways to combine our goals and objectives and find ways to measure these.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Geology BS**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Geosciences at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in instruction and research in the Earth Sciences. We expect all our graduates to develop a thorough knowledge base in geology which will place them in a good position for moving on to graduate school or to employment in geology. We expect each graduate to have a strong understanding of the constitution of the earth; earth processes, both internal and external; and earth history.

**Goals**
G 1: Structure
Geology majors are familiar with the phases, structures, and workings of the earth.

G 2: Human Impact
Geology majors will be aware of human impact on the earth.

G 3: Data
Geology majors will be able to collect and analyze data related to the lithosphere and hydrosphere.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Student demonstrate knowledge of key geological concepts.

**SLO 6: Critical Thinking - Evidence Collection (G: 3) (M: 2)**
Student collects appropriate evidence.

**SLO 7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)**
Student evaluates claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: "LOESS" Exit Survey**
The Learning Outcomes Exit Survey for Seniors (LOESS) was given to six graduating seniors. The test consisted of 90 questions, 10 questions from each of nine geology courses. The courses are Geol 1121 (Introductory Geosciences I), Geol 1122 (Introductory Geosciences II), Geol 3002 (Introduction to Earth Materials), Geol 4006 (Sedimentary Environments and Stratigraphy), Geol 4013 (Structural Geology), Geol 4015 (Crystallography and Optical Mineralogy), Geol 4016 (Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology), Geol 4017 (Environmental Geology), and Geol 4007 (Hydrogeology). Geol 1121, 1122, 3002, 4006, 4013, 4015, and 4016 are required for the BS degree; Geol 4017 and 4007 are not required but are taken by almost every graduating student.

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

**M 2: Problems (O: 4, 6, 7)**
Students complete homework problems that require them to practice concepts discussed in class. For example, students may be asked to interpret geological maps and cross sections.

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

**Target for O4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition**
75% of students should score 3 out of 5, or proficient, in foundation knowledge acquisition. 50% of students should score 4 our of 5, or high, on foundation knowledge acquisition. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on foundation knowledge acquisition.

**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
## 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**

Students 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
**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. We strive for our students to be excellent in the following areas: (1) acquiring foundational knowledge; (2) oral and written communication; (3) understanding and working with software and/or equipment; and (5) applied and critical thinking.

**Goals**

**G 1: Students will be well-trained Geoscientists proficient in content knowledge and research skills.**

Students will learn content and gain valuable research experience in their respective fields of Geography and Geology.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Students will have a mastery of specific Geosciences content (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 7)**

Students will have a mastery of specific Geosciences content

**SLO 2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences (M: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thesis/Project - Introduction (O: 1, 2)**

The introduction for each thesis and non-thesis project 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: Students will have a mastery of specific Geosciences content**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.7, and 33% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was partially met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.7, and 33% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was partially met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Thesis/Project - Information (O: 1, 2)**

The quality of information and evidence for each thesis and non-thesis project 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: Students will have a mastery of specific Geosciences content**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.7, and 50% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of students score a 4.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.7, and 50% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Thesis/Project - Evidence Support (O: 1)**

The support of ideas and evidence for each thesis and non-thesis project 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: Students will have a mastery of specific Geosciences content**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.5, and 33% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was partially met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Thesis/Project - Organization (O: 2)**

The organization of each thesis and non-thesis project 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 O2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.7, and 33% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was partially met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Thesis/Project - Language Conventions (O: 2)**

The language conventions for each thesis and non-thesis project 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 O2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences**

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 3.9, and 37% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Thesis/Project - Documentation (O: 2)**

The documentation for each thesis and non-thesis project will be measured on a five-point scale. 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = very good 5 = excellent
Target for O2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

There were six theses and three non-thesis projects used for this measure. The mean score was 4.0, and 50% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was met.

M 7: Thesis - Defense (O: 1, 2)

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: Students will have a mastery of specific Geosciences content

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

There were six theses used for this measure. The mean score was 3.5, and 50% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was met.

Target for O2: Students will have excellent research and communication skills in the Geosciences

The mean score of students for the measure equals or exceeds 3.5 and at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

There were six theses used for this measure. The mean score was 3.5, and 50% of thesis students scored a 4.0 or higher. This outcome was met.

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

Thesis Action Plan

The areas of weakness in many theses are the support of ideas and evidence and the organization and development of ideas. Therefore, the parts of the theses that are associated the most with critical thinking are where our students performed the worst. Graduate faculty members in the Department of Geosciences will place more emphasis on guiding their advisees in 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 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

Multi-temporal Thesis Assessment

The three members of the thesis committee will evaluate a student’s work at the time of the defense and when the final thesis is submitted using the rubric we have been using for the past several years. The student will see in what areas they need improvement and the student will work with his/her adviser and the other committee members to improve in those areas. This practice should help to improve student performance in all assessed areas except for thesis defense.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Committee members will complete rubrics at the time of the thesis defense and again after the final thesis has been submitted.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Jeremy Diem
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 would have liked to have met all the targets for our seven measures, but we only partially met the targets on three measures. We slightly changed our targets from previous years by reducing the mean value to meet a measure and also adding a second criterion (i.e., at least 50% of thesis students score a 4.0 or higher) for a measure. The scores were slightly lower than in previous years. We have learned that our students are still struggling in the areas of critical thinking and writing. For example, they struggle to put pieces of information together in a coherent way in order to answer questions. We have not made any program changes or substantial recent changes in the assessment process.

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 response to this year’s findings, we will be making the assessment a two-step process. The three members of the thesis committee will evaluate a student's work at the time of the defense and when the final thesis is submitted using the rubric we have been using for the past several years. The student will see in what areas they need improvement and the student will work with his/her adviser and the other committee members to improve in those areas. This practice should help to improve student performance in all assessed areas except for thesis defense. We have yet to see the benefits of previous years' action plans, since most of the students who have been affected by those plans have yet to complete a thesis or non-thesis project. We expect to see better results in the next reporting cycle not only from the assessment of students with enhanced skills but also from the implementation of the two-step assessment process.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 German BA
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of German speakers, to promote their interest and involvement in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation, and other areas.

Goals
G 4: Knowledge of German Literature
Student will understand the particularities of German literature in light of broad historical and cultural contexts.

G 5: Outcomes for the current period
After consultation with GSU's Director of Academic Assessment, the German Section decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to Literature course, a requirement for all majors in French, German and Spanish. The new rubric for this goal was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment. It includes 4 weighted criteria of a literary text: Focus on Topic (35%), Literary Lens Use (35%), Organization (15%) and Accuracy of Grammar and Spelling (15%).

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 6: Knowledge of German Literature (M: 1)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with German literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Paper (O: 6)
In German 3312 (Introduction to Reading German Literary Texts), students wrote a paper whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

Target for O6: Knowledge of German Literature
Students will achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.
**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.
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 master 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.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance

The following discussion is a summary of the principle findings, faculty’s interpretations of those findings and changes planned for the preparation program resulting from analysis of the data. Steps the HPE faculty will take to use the information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the preparation program also are addressed. Content Knowledge Summary of principal findings. After analyzing the data from the two major assessments chosen to demonstrate content knowledge (GACE and average GPA for content courses) it can be determined that these two assessments measure the content knowledge of HPE candidates. GSU program completers are passing the GACE content knowledge test with between 88-98% pass rates and have pass rates within 2 percentage points and above on all 6 subareas on tests 115 and 116. In addition, HPE candidates have a content core average GPA of 2.97, 3.1 and 3.24 for the last three years, respectively. Steps taken to use information from assessments. The HPE faculty as a group are reflective and responsive to candidate performance. Last year, in response to faculty perceptions regarding the sequencing of course content, the HPE faculty developed a content matrix for the Initial preparation program (BSEd and MEd non-T4) to better determine in which courses specific content was taught. This information serves two purposes; the first is to improve student performance, and the second, to ensure the program effectively addresses the dual curriculum of health and physical education across P-12. Changes planned for the preparation program. The current plan is to maintain and monitor both GACE and average GPA. Candidates’ subscores will be shared with program faculty responsible for teaching related content so they can improve or add additional time for developing content in existing classes. Scores also will be shared with HPE faculty so we can revise curriculum sequencing and/or add new courses to ensure content is effectively addressed. Lastly, the HPE faculty plan to review core content average GPA at each transition point in the program. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, skills and Dispositions (including planning, clinical practice and dispositions) Summary of principal findings. There are multiple assessments for analyzing HPE candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions. These include a contextual analysis, lesson planning, learning goals and objectives, lesson reflections, task presentation, analysis of student learning, and dispositions. After analyzing the data from the contextual analysis, lesson planning, and learning goals and objectives between 84-92% of candidates were very good or outstanding in their performance across these three assessments at the end of student teaching suggesting that HPE candidates have a readiness to teach and a confidence and clarity to meet their teaching goals, ensure continuity of learning from lesson to lesson, provide for individual differences and strive to adapt learning material to the needs of the students. On lesson reflections, 84% of candidates were rated very good or outstanding at the end of student teaching suggesting that candidates developed the ability to engage in self-evaluation not only on what they did as teachers but on the reasons their decisions may or may not have been effective. Following student teaching, 81% of candidates were very good or outstanding in task presentation highlighting the importance of full time teaching with full classes of students to strength teaching skills. Data from dispositions (100% rated as very good by faculty) are strongly supportive of the professional expectations and behaviors demonstrated by candidates at the end of student teaching. Steps taken to use information from assessments. The information from these assessments e.g., goals and objectives, has been used, where appropriate and relevant to adjust assignment directions and the grading rubric for the models project conducted during the second half of student teaching this Spring 2011. Changes planned for the preparation program. The current plan is to maintain the assignment selection and to review the expectations and directions for each assignment to ensure candidates are given clear guidelines. The HPE faculty will continue to work on a content matrix for the MEd program including the non-T4 candidates to ensure candidates across the two programs are gaining similar quality and quantity experiences. The content matrix will help ensure improvements of both HPE candidate performance and the preparation program in general. To this end, efforts are currently underway to revise the MEd non-T4 program to include a full 16 weeks of full time student teaching in place of the current 8 weeks of student teaching. Non-T4 candidates, who are not currently employed by a school district, will do two student teaching placements at the elementary and middle or high school, similar to that done by BSEd candidates. Several changes for the BSEd program go in effect Fall 2011 which are anticipated to improve candidate performance in the areas of pedagogical knowledge and skills. These changes include: (a) moving KH 3420 to the fall semester to be taught with KH 3200, (b) having KH 3020, 3030, and 3040 taught by full time HPE faculty, and (c) having teacher education requirements completed prior to taking courses in area G. Lastly, the HPE faculty plan to maintain and monitor the disposition data yearly to maintain current levels and will implement PDP’s where necessary to help candidates improve their performance in this area. Impact on Student Learning Summary of principal findings. Data for this assessment are taken from an instrumental models project, a major unit involving planning, teaching and assessing student learning. HPE candidates scored well on this assessment with 91% of candidates obtaining a rating of satisfactory, very good or outstanding at the end of student teaching suggesting that candidates are able to alter their plans based on results from daily assessments. Steps taken to use information from assessments. Any immediate action with regard to this assessment would have had negative and detrimental effects on the performance of candidates currently in their second half of student teaching. Steps to use this information going forward are outlined below. Changes planned for the preparation program. While the assignment itself is a meaningful exercise in combining planning, teaching and assessment, the HPE faculty will have to revisit the expectations for this assignment as well as the explanations for project completion to ensure that candidates demonstrate their best and most thorough work and to better evaluate the impact on student learning. Additionally, the expectations for assessing P-12 student learning must be reviewed to better reflect the real constraints of teaching physical education in schools.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The HPE faculty as a group are responsible for ensuring the goals and objectives are met and the recommended changes are put in place.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance

See description of the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance discussed in the Planned section.

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

**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.

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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

### 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 supervision knowledge and skills
Students are performing well in this area. The action plan is to maintain this level of performance while monitoring students in subsequent course sections.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Project to demonstrate supervision competence
- Outcome/Objective: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers

Implementation Description: Ongoing.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

Assessment of teaching
In several assessed areas at least one student was rated as "Not met": Knowledge of growth and development, Communicative skills, Use of class time, Instruction, Evaluation of students, Self evaluation, Planning/preparation, Teacher/Student interaction in class, and Class climate. While the number of areas is substantial, in most areas it was only one student who did not meet the standard; and it was almost always the same student. In the future the course instructor will conduct more formative assessments during the course, to identify students who are not meeting this standard at those times. Additional monitoring and interaction with the instructor will be planned for those students, as needed.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching experience
- Outcome/Objective: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching

Implementation Description: This plan will start with the next offering of this course and continue indefinitely.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

Summary of 2008-2009 Assessment data
Using the selected assessments in 2008-2009, it was determined from the Faculty end-of-program ratings that 100% of all students were meeting each of the five NBPTS Standards. The data were essentially the same for the 2007-2008 program completers, indicating consistency over time. Nonetheless, the HPE graduate faculty have begun discussions to revise the major research project in the program, away from the Collaborative Action Research (CAR) Project, to participation in ongoing faculty research efforts. Those discussions will proceed through the 2009-2010 academic year.

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

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Health Administration MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 (USNEWS, 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 during residency
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance (O: 6)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty (O: 6)**
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

### Administrative residency and field study

The two semester health care management residency facilitates the transition from the classroom to the workplace by providing students with an entry point and extensive exposure to a health care management career. The full-time, off-campus residency assures that all graduates have an integrated experience that applies didactic knowledge in a real world health care setting.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** % CAHME educational content areas provided  
**Outcome/Objective:** Competency in Business skills and knowledge  
**Description:**  Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment  
**Description:**  Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills  
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas  
**Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills  
**Description:** 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  
**Description:** 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 course case HA 8990 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 professionalism knowledge/skills  
**Description:** Develop real world experience in the HA field  
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty  
**Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field  
- **Measure:** Capstone questions | Outcome/Objective: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas  
- **Measure:** GPA of each HA student  
**Outcome/Objective:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A.  
**Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills  
**Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field  
**Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field  
**Outcome/Objective:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas  
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas  
**Outcome/Objective:** Competency in Business skills and knowledge  
**Description:**  Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment  
**Description:**  Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills  
**Description:**  Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills  
**Description:** Develop real world experience in the HA field  
**Description:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2010 target for CAHME competencies in IHA  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche  
**Additional Resources:** Development and Implementation of CAHME competencies requires much additional faculty effort.

### Marketing of MHA and MSHA program

Many potential students are not aware of HA area of study, including many that are 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
Georgia State University
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2014-2015 Health Science-Nutrition MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
17 of 21 (80.9%) received a score of at least 90%; 21 of 21 (100%) received a score of at least 80%

M 2: Future Technology Assignment Presentation (O: 2)
NUTR 6102 (Nutrition Intervention) – Future Technology Assignment Presentation
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
### Target for O2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
15 of 16 (93.8%) received a score of at least 90%; 16 of 16 (100%) received a score of at least 80%

### 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Evaluations not felt to be reflective of student learning. Course will be taught by a different instructor in 2015-2016.

### M 4: Micronutrients Chapter Reviews (O: 3)

NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Micronutrients) - Thirteen (13) chapter reviews are completed 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 chapter reviews, 10% of students will score >90% and 50% will score >80%

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
23 of 24 (95.8%) received a score of at least 90%; 24 of 24 (100%) received 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
38 of 38 (100%) received a score of 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 Chapter Reviews | 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: Future Technology Assignment Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

Continue to Monitor
This assessment measure was not met in the last academic year but was met in the current academic year. We will continue to monitor this assessment measure.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Continue to Monitor
This assessment measure will continue to be monitored as the faculty instructor changed from academic year 2010-2011 to 2011-2012.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Action Plan
Continue monitoring

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

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 Chapter Reviews | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Continue to monitor
This measure will continue to be monitored as the instructor has changed from 2013-2014
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 will continue to monitor this measure because the instructor for the course and Coordinated Program Director have changed.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Future Technology Assignment Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

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

Continue to monitor
We will continue to monitor this measure because the instructor for the course has changed
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 will continue to monitor this measure because the instructor for the course has changed
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Future Technology Assignment Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

Continue to monitor
We will continue to monitor this measure because the instructor for the course has changed
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Micronutrients Chapter Reviews | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes
Continue to monitor this assessment and encourage students to utilize this assignment as a means of beginning their research interest for a future thesis project.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Proposal Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research

### 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 of the targeted measures were met. We plan to continue to assess our students' competency in research and the use of technology to provide nutrition care as well as their understanding of nutrient metabolism and nutrition policies. These targeted measures have been met in the past. However, we have new faculty teaching the courses and wish to assess whether or not the students continue to succeed. Our educational program (course curriculum) did not change in the current academic year. The primary strength of the findings is that our students continue to meet our core competencies/learning outcomes. Although the majority of assignments reviewed are the same assignments that have been used in the past, one course assignment (targeted measure #4) changed from quizzes to chapter summary reviews. The assignments are not the same but cover the same course material. Another course assignment (targeted measure #2) changed from a group to individual presentation. These changes were implemented by our new faculty members. The primary weakness of the findings is that targeted measure #3 (macronutrient final exam) could not be evaluated because the faculty member who taught the course during the academic year left the university. We do not feel that the changes in Nutrition faculty have impacted our students' learning. The new faculty have been assigned faculty mentors who have reviewed the course syllabi and provided recommendations when necessary. One faculty member has contacted the Center for Instructional Effectiveness for support.

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 Nutrition will be discontinuing its undergraduate Didactic Program in Dietetics and beginning an undergraduate Nutrition Science. The impact of this change on the graduate program will be minimal. At least one course will be double numbered to include undergraduate and graduate students who require similar course content. NUTR 6104 (Advanced Normal Nutrition: Macronutrients) and NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition: Micronutrients) will be combined and the content changed to focus on organ systems and all nutrients. However, the content of Macronutrients and Micronutrients will still be taught in two different courses (NUTR 6500 and NUTR 6700, respectively). Targeted measures #3 and #4 will need to be modified in 2015-2016 accordingly. We will continue to require SNHP 6000 (Research Methodology), NUTR 6102 (Nutrition Intervention) and SNHP 8000 (Trends Affecting Health Policies) for our graduate program in Nutrition. As in previous years, our targeted measures were met. All of our graduates in 2014-2015 who have taken the National Examination for Registered Dietitians have passed the examination (100% pass rate).

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

### Mission / Purpose

The U.S. History Survey (2110) introduces students to the fundamentals of historical thinking and historical methods through analysis of political, economic, and social developments in the United States.

### Goals

**G 1: Historical Knowledge and Critical Thinking Skills**

The 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

Over the course of the 2014-15 school year, students in HIST 2110 (our U.S. History survey) responded to questions/assignments that tested their ability to differentiate between primary and secondary sources. Each instructor of 2110 was to submit work from five students (the first three students and the last two students on the roster) that tested this Student Learning Objective. Student material was submitted for 35 different sections of 2110 over the course of the year (which constitutes about a third of the total number of sections of HIST 2110 taught in 2014-15). 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 Freshman Studies/Core Assessment Committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Jeff Young). FINDINGS: Of the 118 usable answers of student work submitted for this SLO: 12 received a 1 (10%); 30 received a 2 (25%); 45 received a 3 (38%); and 31 received a 4 (26%). Therefore: 90% of students received a 2 or above (which exceeds our target of 80%); 64% of students received a 3 or above (which exceeds our target of 60%); and 26% of students received a 4 (which just misses 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 understanding of multiple historical perspectives in a sophisticated way.

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

Target for O2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context

80% to receive 2 or above; 60% to receive 3 or above; 30% to receive 4.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

Over the course of the 2014-15 school year, students in HIST 2110 (our U.S. History survey) responded to questions/assignments that tested their understanding of historical context, through a range of historical perspectives, including but not limited to political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental history. Each instructor of 2110 was to submit work from five students (the first three students and the last two students on the roster) that tested this Student Learning Objective. Student material was submitted for 35 different sections of 2110 over the course of the year (which constitutes about a third of the total number of sections of HIST 2110 taught in 2014-15). 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 Freshman Studies/Core Assessment Committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Jeff Young). FINDINGS: Of the 145 usable answers of student work submitted for this SLO: 12 received a 1 (8%); 35 received a 2 (23%); 67 received a 3 (45%); and 35 received a 4 (23%). Therefore: 92% of students received a 2 or above (which exceeds our target of 80%); 68% of students received a 3 or above (which exceeds our target of 60%); and 23% of students received a 4 (which misses our target of 30%).

M 3: Historical Geography (O: 3)

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 identify selected geographic features or understand the historical significance of geography. A student who receives a 2 can identify selected geographic features, but cannot explain them in a historical context. A student who receives a 3 can identify selected geographic features, and demonstrates reasonable proficiency in explaining them in a historical context. A student who receives a 4 can identify a range of geographic features, and demonstrates creativity and insight in explaining them in a historical context.

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

Target for O3: Historical Geography

80% to receive 2 or above; 60% to receive 3 or above; 30% to receive 4.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Over the course of the 2014-15 school year, students in HIST 2110 (our U.S. History survey) responded to questions/assignments that tested their understanding of geography, through a range of geographic perspectives, including but not limited to political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental geography. Each instructor of 2110 was to submit work from five students (the first three students and the last two students on the roster) that tested this Student Learning Objective. Student material was submitted for 35 different sections of 2110 over the course of the year (which constitutes about a third of the total number of sections of HIST 2110 taught in 2014-15). 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 Freshman Studies/Core Assessment Committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Jeff Young). FINDINGS: Of the 145 usable answers of student work submitted for this SLO: 12 received a 1 (8%); 35 received a 2 (23%); 67 received a 3 (45%); and 35 received a 4 (23%). Therefore: 92% of students received a 2 or above (which exceeds our target of 80%); 68% of students received a 3 or above (which exceeds our target of 60%); and 23% of students received a 4 (which misses our target of 30%).
Over the course of the 2014-15 school year, students in HIST 2110 (our U.S. History survey) responded to questions/assignments that tested their understanding of historical geography, or the ways in which geography both determines and is constructed through human history. Each instructor of 2110 was to submit work from five students (the first three students and the last two students on the roster) that tested this Student Learning Objective. Student material was submitted for 35 different sections of 2110 over the course of the year (which constitutes about a third of the total number of sections of HIST 2110 taught in 2014-15). 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 Freshman Studies/Core Assessment Committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Jeff Young). **FINDINGS:** Of the 75 usable student answers submitted for this SLO: 3 received a 1 (4%); 13 received a 2 (17%); 37 received a 3 (49%); and 22 received a 4 (29%). Therefore: 96% of students received a 2 or above (which exceeds our target of 80%); 78% of students received a 3 or above (which exceeds our target of 60%); and 29% of students received a 4 (which misses our target of 30%, but at a rate that is statistically insignificant).

### 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. All data will be collected by the end of the spring semester of 2015.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Freshman Studies Committee, History Department

**Organize and present model assessment assignments to faculty**

Freshman Studies (the body in the History department responsible for Core assessment) will improve upon and add to the packet of model assessment assignments distributed to faculty and graduate instructors, to ensure that as many of the submitted assignments are usable for assessment and are in keeping with the SLOs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Freshman Studies has already created a packet of assessment assignments. This packet will be added to every year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Freshman Studies Committee

**New Assessment Instrument for HIST 2110**

Create a uniform assessment instrument for HIST 2110

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Freshman Studies/Core Assessment committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Jeff Young)

### 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 the first year (of the three in which we have been assessing the Core with these SLOs and instruments) when we have not met our targets on all three measures. This year, for both Objective 1 (Source Differentiation) and Objective 2 (Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context), we were under our target goal for the percentage of students who would receive the best possible ranking on performance on the assignment in question. This is not a worrisome development -- in general, students are meeting our expectations, and the gap between our targets and our actual measures is not wide. Still, it is worth thinking about why this drop has taken place. It would be difficult to come to any definitive conclusion about this. This year was only the second time that HIST 2110 has been assessed, so we cannot know whether this year represented a drop in student performance, or whether 2012-13's findings were uncharacteristically high. We would only be able to know this by using the same assessment materials for several more cycles. Even then, it would be hard to say whether this drop tells us something about our students, or rather about our instructors. Because each instructor is asked to construct his/her own assessment tool to test each of the SLOs, the assignments tend to vary, in terms of both content and incisiveness. Some of the assignments instructors use are, in fact, not usable for our purposes, despite the fact that we give them many model assignments and are available for consultation throughout the semester. This concern about our assessment program -- along with others -- has led us (in the Core Assessment/Freshman Studies Committee) to seek to rethink and revise our assessment program.

4. Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement: Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and (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 Freshman Studies/Core Assessment committee (Marni Davis, Denis Gainty, Jeff Young) has been discussing the creation of a different assessment instrument. Our goal is to devise a more uniform set of questions, so that all of our students in a course (HIST 2110, HIST 1111, HIST 1112) will be answering the same set of questions, regardless of instructor. This, we hope, will give us a more accurate account of our students' abilities, performance, and learning. We are not currently able to be specific about what that new assessment instrument will look like; we are still discussing possibilities, and it is important that our faculty approves of the direction of these changes. But our new action plan will reflect our intentions, and will be in process through the summer of 2016.

---
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Mission / Purpose
Description: By majoring in history, students hone a set of practical skills while developing timeless values that will help them in numerous professions. Particular to the study of history is an awareness of changing interpretations--historiography--over time. The history student develops an appreciation for both interdisciplinary awareness and a comparative-global-transnational perspective of the past best suited for understanding the rapidly changing world of today. Therefore history students are better able to evaluate primary and secondary sources gleaned through a variety of research methods and assemble as arguments in both written and oral formats, all the while being tolerant of different approaches to and maintaining the integrity of historical knowledge. Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2009-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008

Goals
G 1: Professional skills and values
The history department works to ensure that its majors know how to access, use, and evaluate various kinds of historical evidence to determine relative worth, while teaching students professional values regarding fidelity to sources and how to build upon the scholarship of others.

G 2: Interdisciplinary and Comparative Perspectives
The history department is committed to helping students develop an awareness of historiography -- that is differing interpretations or debates over particular historical questions -- while encouraging interdisciplinary and comparative approaches to the past.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Professional Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
The history student is able to 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.
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.

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.

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.

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 faculty members from the Department of History Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being Professional Skills, 2LO being Historiography, and 5LO being Professional Values. Two of the Department of History Standard Learning Outcomes, 3LO being Interdisciplinary Awareness and 4LO being Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective, were not assessed using the HIST 4990 papers. Over the past three years when engaged in self-assessment, it became apparent to the Undergraduate Studies Committee that the assessment tool, the use of the capstone paper from HIST 4990, failed to adequately demonstrate competency in both LO3 and LO4 because faculty who teach the class often design the research assignment around certain topics that might not engage these particular Learning Outcomes. Nevertheless, these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet the requirements to graduate with a degree in history by 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. 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 faculty members from the Department of History Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being Professional Skills, 2LO being Historiography, and 5LO being Professional Values. Two of the Department of History Standard Learning Outcomes, 3LO being Interdisciplinary Awareness and 4LO being Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective, were not assessed using the HIST 4990 papers. Over the past three years when engaged in self-assessment, it became apparent to the Undergraduate Studies Committee that the assessment tool, the use of the capstone paper from HIST 4990, failed to adequately demonstrate competency in both LO3 and LO4 because faculty who teach the class often design the research assignment around certain topics that might not engage these particular Learning Outcomes. Nevertheless, these two outcomes are demonstrated by students who meet the requirements to graduate with a degree in history by 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 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 results are listed under 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. [Preview Formatting] During 2011, the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee evaluated 18 final research papers written for the Department of History Capstone Course Hist 4990 taken from classes offered in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning some evidence of outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Five Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being professional skills, 2LO being historiography, 3LO being interdisciplinary awareness, 4LO being comparative/global/transnational perspective, and 5LO being professional values. The results are listed under 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. [Preview Formatting] During 2011, the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee evaluated 18 final research papers written for the Department of History Capstone Course Hist 4990 taken from classes offered in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning some evidence of outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Five Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being professional skills, 2LO being historiography, 3LO being interdisciplinary awareness, 4LO being comparative/global/transnational perspective, and 5LO being professional values. The results are listed under 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. [Preview Formatting] During 2011, the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee evaluated 18 final research papers written for the Department of History Capstone Course Hist 4990 taken from classes offered in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning some evidence of outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Five Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being professional skills, 2LO being historiography, 3LO being interdisciplinary awareness, 4LO being comparative/global/transnational perspective, and 5LO being professional values. The results are listed under 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. 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.

**Target for O2: Historiography**

The department's target is for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

The department's target is for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**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.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**
The department's target for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

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

**comparative/global/transnational**
The majority of our student papers performed well in this area. Those that did not treated topics that made comparison difficult. We plan to circulate our department's standards to remind students and faculty that this is one of our defined goals.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: capstone course seminar paper  
Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective

**Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Historiography**
We plan to do more to emphasize historiographical debates in our upper-division courses. Students learn about historiography in HIST 3000, Introduction to Historical Studies. Many of the intervening courses drop the issue of historiography to a large extent. We hope that by assigning more short research-type assignments in our upper-division courses, our students will become more comfortable with talking about historiographical debates in their seminar papers. We have also changed to pre-requests for HIST 4990, our capstone course, to require at least two 4000-level classes prior to enrolling in the class. By ensuring that all our majors get some experience doing research and writing about historiography in our 4000-level classes, we hope that their performance will improve in 4990.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: capstone course seminar paper  
Outcome/Objective: Historiography

**Implementation Description:** We have already submitted the proposal to change the prerequisites for 4990 in the course catalog, and the department agreed with the idea of working on emphasizing research skills and historiography in our upper-division courses.

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Interdisciplinary Awareness**
We seem to be doing quite well in terms of interdisciplinary awareness as all but two of our sample group satisfied the criteria. We continue to emphasize different disciplines and their impact on history in HIST 3000.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: capstone course seminar paper  
Outcome/Objective: Interdisciplinary Awareness

**Professional Skills**
To improve our students' level of preparedness for the capstone seminar paper, we have agreed as a department to do more to emphasize research skills in our upper-division courses. We will be organizing a pedagogy workshop on research and writing assignments for these classes later this semester.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: capstone course seminar paper  
Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Professional Values**
We hope that the changes described under in action plan for the "historiography" outcome will have a similar effect in this area. We are going to emphasize more research-type assignments in our 4000-level classes so as to give students more research and writing experience in the classes that lead up to 4990. This experience should help them to develop the skills and values described here. The faculty have agreed to attend a workshop on research assignments during the upcoming semester.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: capstone course seminar paper  
Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson
Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: The history department's undergraduate studies committee will work on revising the outcomes in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: The department's undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: The undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions during Fall 2010 and then present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be ready in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: The undergraduate studies committee will be working on these revisions during the fall semester and then bring them before the department as a whole early in the spring 2011 semester. They should be ready in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes

The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: The department's undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Historiography

Implementation Description: The history department's undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. The new version should be ready in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Re-evaluate assessment tool as appropriate measurement for desired outcome

While Hist 4900 is designed as the department's capstone course, it is set up as a research class whose subject is determined by the individual faculty member assigned to teach it each semester. The rough parameters of the course require the student to do work in primary sources and then write a research paper arguing an original thesis about a subject chosen through conversations between the student and the professor. The course and the paper's subject might or might not include a Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. Given the need to use archival sources in the Atlanta area, some professors design their Hist 4900 classes around American topics that do not engage Comparative/Global/Transnational themes, thereby making the subjects of the student papers from these classes poor products for assessing student understanding of a Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. Consequently some other method of measurement needs to be developed or this Learning Outcome changed.

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

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 History MA
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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).

**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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 History PhD
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

What do students need to learn to prepare for careers in the hospitality field? Students are expected to understand the business processes essential to profitable, sustainable operations. Every hospitality course incorporates quality service principles including service to internal and external stakeholders and continuous improvement principles. Because this is a labor-intensive industry, there is a dedicated Hospitality Human Resources course and HR processes are covered in most hospitality courses (Hospitality Law - employment law, Cost Control and Financial Analysis - employee productivity, for example). Every hospitality course incorporates ethical decision-making and business practices. Technology is also a fundamental in the courses in terms of understanding how technology is used in any industry segment from hotels to restaurants to venues and event management. Technology applications that support the delivery of quality service are the focus. Marketing in the hospitality curriculum focuses on marketing principles for services rather than tangible goods. Industry specific courses (hotel management, restaurant management, event management, private club management, tradeshows and meetings management, for example) cover the trends and issues of that segment as well or organizational structure, functional areas, metrics used and service standards. The hospitality curriculum consists of seven required major courses and a variety of elective courses from which majors can select three (9 hours.) Hospitality majors are required to work at least 570 hours in industry-related positions. To certify that these hours have been worked, students are required to take "Hospitality Work Study" (HADM 4900) for which there is no fee and no credit hours. Students complete a work portfolio as part of this process.

The focus of the 2012-2013 report will relate to three overall, general programmatic goals and the outcomes that are directly connected to these goals. These outcomes are linked to the School of Hospitality’s senior-level courses, HADM 4100 (Cost Control and Financial Analysis) and HADM 4800 (Hospitality Strategic Management.) Since the lower-level courses are pre-requisites to HADM 4100 and HADM 4800, it is logical to expect the lower-level outcomes will have been achieved and will be built upon in HADM 4100 and HADM 4800. HADM 4100 and HADM 4800 require a composite of knowledge and skills reflecting the other five hospitality courses.

Goals

G 2: Students will be prepared with business knowledge and service skills.

Students will be prepared for the hospitality industry with business knowledge and service skills to optimize the success of companies and corporations.

G 3: Students will develop the analytical skills to evaluate the business environment of today and the future.

Students will be prepared with analytical skills in all functional areas to evaluate the business environment of today and of the future.

G 1: Students will be prepared for management and leadership positions in the hospitality industry.

Hospitality students will have the knowledge and skills in all major functional areas to be effective managers and leaders in hospitality businesses.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4, 6, 7)

Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills in gathering, analyzing and applying relevant information in making strategic and sound business decisions. This information will include both internal and external influences on the respective business operation. For example, current economic conditions, competitive forces, social trends, demographics and legal/governmental/political affairs are involved in the analysis of external business conditions. An internal analysis includes factors such as profit and loss ratios for the business, condition of facilities, product and service levels in competing with other businesses, marketing strength, ownership/management relations, employee stability (in recruiting and retention), and knowledge/skill level of the internal workforce.

Relevant Associations:
The School of Hospitality is accredited through the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA). Required curricular content areas required by ACPHA and related to this objective include an introduction, emphasis and reinforcement of:

1. The marketing of goods and services
2. The legal environment
3. The economic environment
4. Exposure to critical thinking skills
5. Financial management
6. Ethical and socio-political influences affecting organizations
7. Strategic Management
8. Human resources
9. Exposure to critical thinking skills
10. Provision of an evaluative culminating experience

SLO 2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)

Students will be able to apply concepts and principles of financial analysis applied to the hospitality industry including cost control techniques and evaluate their effectiveness.

SLO 3: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills (M: 4, 5, 6)

A graduation requirement for hospitality majors is to work in the industry a minimum of 570 hours. The application of service skills is measured through a self-analysis of the student's work experience in a required work portfolio. The application of service knowledge and skills is also evaluated through an evaluation completed by the employer.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 4: Work Experience Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3)
Hospitality majors are required to work a minimum of 575 hours in the industry prior to graduation. The Work Experience Portfolio is an in-depth analysis of this work experience. It requires for the student to evaluate key business components (service levels - internal and external; human resource approaches - dealing with diversity, optimizing employee satisfaction and effective teamwork; financial results - potential areas for growth, areas of waste, pricing structure; strategic principles - clear mission, goals and objectives and responding to the environmental changes.) In addition to evaluating the work experience, students are asked to make recommendations for improvement (analysis and application of knowledge). The topic of sustainability is included in the work portfolio in order to address green operational practices and what the business could be doing. This measure is related to all of the three stated objectives. The student portfolio includes sections that require the student to provide examples of their work behavior in providing quality service and products to external customers, providing quality service to internal customers, handling ethical situations, dealing with organizational change, workplace conflicts, working with cultural diversity and analyzing areas of opportunities for profitability as well as cutting costs. Based on their work experiences, students are also asked evaluate their knowledge and skill areas in the work portfolio and are asked to elaborate on specific career goals.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations**

The target is for a minimum of 90% of students to show critical thinking skills in evaluating the application of service skills (internal and external), organizational change, conflict management and working in a diverse workplace.

**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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Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Human Learning and Development BIS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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, Deaf Studies, Educational Psychology, Family and Community Literacy, Learning Technology, Physical Activity And Health, and/or Sport Coaching and Human Performance.

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, Deaf Studies, Educational Psychology, Family and Community Literacy, Learning Technology, Physical Activity And Health, and/or Sport Coaching and Human Performance.

G 3: Understand the role of and be able to effectively work in careers/pursue graduate degree in human
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, Deaf Studies, Educational Psychology, Family and Community Literacy, Learning Technology, Physical Activity And Health, and/or Sport Coaching and Human Performance.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets 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 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.
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 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: Student Presentations- EDUC 3100 (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 on their insights/understanding of the educational/professional/career aspects of the discipline of their choice by drawing on the site visits they've conducted, information they've gathered from in-class presentations/guest speakers. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The rubric item Content for students’ presentations in the EDUC 31 course represents a measure of students’ ability to present their analyses and evaluations of the processes and systems related to the human learning and development field by ensuring their presentation (a) included interesting and creative use of information from papers, fieldnotes, and interview data; (b) provided a thorough, and informative introduction to the discipline(s) and the sites visited, (c) provided a detailed description of the method of gathering and analyzing information, (d) provided illustrative glimpses into the educational contexts and work lives of individuals in the discipline(s), and (e) provided critical and important insights gained as a result of their experiences. Students whose presentations evidenced implementation of these expectations were graded 5 (exceeds standard). Students were expected to score at least a four (4) on this rubric area in order to "meet standard". Data was available from 62 students enrolled in the sections of EDUC 3100 offered in Fall 2014, Spring 2014, and Summer 2015. Of these students, thirteen (13) students failed to "meet standard". Other students' scores were at 4 or above. With 13 students not meeting the standard on this rubric item, the achievement rate of this objective is at 79%, which is at about our 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
EDUC 3100 Presentation is one of the data sources used to evaluate achievement of student learning objective #5 (use of effective oral and written communication skills). For this assignment students share their findings/insights gained from the site-related visits and classroom work on disciplines. Students' presentations are graded from 1 to 5. A grade of 4 (Meets Standard) and 5 (Exceeds Standard) is needed for a student's presentation to meet expectations in this area. There were data available from 62 students enrolled in three sections of this course offered in Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Summer 2015.
Of these 62 students, only 2 earned a total grade of 3 (Does not meet standard) or below. The presentations of the rest of the students were observed to meet or exceed standard by the three instructors who taught these sections. This represents 96.7% achievement rate of our this learning objective as gauged by student presentations in EDUC 3100.

**M 2: Final Paper for 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.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

In the current reporting cycle (2014-2015), data from this measure was not available in the form of a breakdown of the grades on the final paper. Thus no reporting from this measure will be made for informing program evaluation on this learning objective. An action plan will be developed for ensuring instructors of this course are adequately informed of the rubric items that will be needed to contribute to reporting of this learning objective.

**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 one of the disciplines associated with 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 for sections a and b. Students' scores on b will be used for an assessment of the achievement of learning outcome #4: Use critical thinking in their decision processes.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Section 1 of the EDUC 3100 Final Paper is used towards evaluating the achievement of learning objective “Analyze and evaluate the systems and processes associated with human learning and development disciplines”. On this section, expectations that exceed the standard (score of 5) are that (a) Detailed discussion of disciplinary area and the systems and processes in the work context is given with examples used to support contentions and (b) Documentation for all three visits is detailed and analytical in nature. Students are expected to meet the standard by achieving a score of either 3 or 4. Of the 58 students enrolled in one of the three sections of EDUC 3100 in Spring or Summer 2015, six (6) students achieved a score of 2 that does not meet the minimum expected standard. This represents (52/58) an achievement rate of 89.6%, which is greater than the 80% target achievement rate.

**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.

**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.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The rubric for this assignment includes "Section 3: Use of Effective Written Communication Skills". Students are expected to achieve at least a level of 3 (Meets Standard) and above. Data was available from 57 students from sections of EDUC 3100 offered in Spring 2015 and Summer 2015. All 57 students earned a grade of at least 3 or above on this rubric item showing a 100% achievement rate of this learning outcome on the final paper they submitted for EDUC 3100 course.

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

Despite the 75% achievement rate is below the 80% target. Content is only one of the five (5) areas that are graded in each student's presentation. The other areas include: elocution in oral presentation; organization of oral presentation; nonverbal communication skills; mechanics – presentation. With the other areas primarily focused on oral and written communication...
Annual Report Section Responses

**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?

On all learning objectives, our analyses showed achievement at the target rate of 80%. In addition, our findings are similar to the results reported for the previous report cycle (2013-2014) although they were derived from a larger data set than the one used last year; this year’s data source was in the vicinity of 60 for each of the measures used compared to about 15 students measured used last 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 findings indicate that overall our program is achieving students’ attainment of the learning objectives at the desired (80%) target rate. Without a clearly defined connection/correspondence with any of the measures in our repertoire, Learning Objective #2 will need to be assigned to a new measure(s), particularly those utilized in the internship courses (EDUC 4982 and 4670) that are focused on students’ ability to function in workplace/graduate study contexts of fields associated with human learning and development. Also, with the lowest achievement rate of 79% observed on the on the Content area of EDUC 3100 Student Presentations rubric in this year’s report and lack of data submission from one of the data sources (EPRS 4900), we expect increased attention in the program to revisit rubrics with instructors of EPRS 4900 and EDUC 3100 courses. Doing so will help with data submission and and help increase accuracy in using the rubrics.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

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

In the EDUC 3100 course, which is the introductory course to the program where students develop and understanding of the program requirements, disciplines, career/graduate school prospects, a renewed focus on inter-disciplinarity will be espoused. This will be reflected in activities/assignments students will complete. For example, students will watch videos of/interact with experts from all nine disciplines that are in this program as they consider the intersections of each of the disciplines. The assessments that are currently used will be modified to reflect the incorporation of this novel student engagement into the classroom activities/assignments.

**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.


Informing instructors of EPRS 4900 of the final paper evaluation rubric

Instructors of this course are typically assigned from the body of doctoral students in the EPS program. Coordinator of the program offering EPRS 4900 will be contacted prior to the semester of an offering of this course to ensure that any new instructors are informed of the data needed from the final paper component of this class in reporting on students’ achievement of learning objective #5.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final Paper for CTW EPRS 4990 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills

Implementation Description: Email/phone correspondence will be conducted with program coordinator and any new instructors regarding expectations for final paper data.

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator of EPS Department offering EPRS 4900
Additional Resources: None.

Additional Resources:

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator of EPS Department offering EPRS 4900
Additional Resources: None.
Goals

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 MSHRM 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 MSHRM 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 MSHRM program with the ability to perform training and development needs analysis, program design, program delivery, and evaluation.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Compensation System Design (M: 1, 2, 12)**

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to design a comprehensive compensation system that incorporates strategic alternatives, job and pay structures such as grades and bands and incentive programs, and compensation budgets.

**SLO 2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment (M: 3, 4)**

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to design an accurate, valid, and detailed employee recruitment and selection system that incorporates job analysis, behavioral interviews, work samples, and tests.

**SLO 3: Employment Law (M: 5, 6)**

The MS-HRM graduate will understand and effectively apply employment law. The student will be able to identify relevant case issues and laws, draw reasonable conclusions, and recommend policies to address the situation.

**SLO 4: Employee Relations (M: 7, 8)**

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to understand and effectively choose and design performance management techniques that enhance employer productivity and minimize bias.

**SLO 5: Quantify contributions and costs of HR (G: 5) (M: 9, 10)**

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to use all relevant costs and benefits of HR activities to compute the ROI of HR functions in organizations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 6: Understand and manage compensation budgets (G: 6) (M: 11, 12)**

Manage the setting, monitoring, and final reporting of compensation budgets.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**SLO 7: Perform training and development (G: 7) (M: 13)**

The MS/HRM student will be able to perform training and development needs analysis, develop a training and development program, design the delivery of the training, and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 8: Use all data to complete forecast of future HR needs (G: 8) (M: 15, 16)**

The MS/HRM graduate will be able to identify all relevant data needed to forecast future HR needs, including turnover data and projected growth.

**Relevant Associations:** Student will be able to find and use all relevant data to use in developing an HR forecast.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 9: Develop case to support contingent workers (G: 9) (M: 17, 18)**

Develop a business case to support contingent workers, including costs and benefits

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Inclusion of and appropriateness in MGS 8390 project of strategic alternatives and rationale for various recommended strategies.

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

**Target for O1: Compensation System Design**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 1: Accurate description and usage guides for job analysis, descriptions, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage in detail of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal.

**M 2: Integration of All Compensation Components (O: 1)**

Inclusion, integration, and proper usage in MGS 8390 project of all components of compensation systems, including job evaluation, market wage analysis, pay structures, and compensation budgets.

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

**Target for O1: Compensation System Design**

At least 80% of the students scoring higher than 2.0 on the criteria in the Measure 2 Rubric. To be scored from randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately and in detail describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

**M 3: Job Analysis and Description (O: 2)**

In the final project in MGS 8360 students will Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE include a clear explanation of job analysis procedure and resulting job description and job specification.

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

**Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment**

Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Below Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 3: Inclusion and proper usage of job analysis, job descriptions, and job specifications Student uses 2 of 3 bases for selection system (job analysis, description, and specification) in adequate detail Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system (job analysis, job description, and specification) in adequate detail Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system in extensive detail.

**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.

**M 5: Law Issue Identification (O: 3)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Identification of relevant case issues and laws and expression of reasonable
| Target for O3: Employment Law | 80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 3: Understand and effectively apply employment law Standard Not Met (1) Standard Met (2) Standard Exceeded (3) Measure 5: Identification of relevant issues, laws, and reasonable conclusions Incomplete or incorrect identification of issues, laws, or conclusions Complete and correct identification of most issues, laws, and conclusions Complete and correct identification of all issues, laws, and conclusions |

| M 6: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements (O: 3) | Students will be able to produce appropriate and clearly-written HR policies in response to situations and laws. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

| Target for O3: Employment Law | 80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 6 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Rubric for Measuring Learning Outcomes – MS in HRM Criterion 3: Understand and effectively apply employment law Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds the standard = 3 6. Appropriate and clearly-written HR policies A few ambiguous or inappropriate HR policies Most appropriate and clearly-written HR policies All appropriate and clearly-written HR policies |

| M 7: Performance Management Concepts (O: 4) | Students will be able to discuss appropriate use of performance management tools and the advantages and disadvantages of each as exhibited in answers to exam questions in MGS 8300. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

| 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 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 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 |

| M 11: Develop and manage compensation budgets (O: 6) | Students should be able to construct, defend, monitor, and evaluate a final compensation budget. Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |

| 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

M 12: Link compensation budget to firm performance (O: 1, 6)
Link all facets of compensation budget to firm performance and develop and defend a case for labor costs at the organizational level
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

M 13: Analyze training needs (O: 7)
Analyze training and develop needs from various sources at the levels of the employee, organization, and task.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

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

M 15: Develop HR forecast (O: 8)
Students will identify all relevant measures of turnover and projected growth to develop an HR forecast.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 16: Develop and "sell" an HR forecast to management (O: 8)
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.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 17: Use of contingent workers (O: 9)
Identification of all relevant costs and benefits (monetary and other) to support the business case for use of contingent workers
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 18: Use all inputs to build a case for contingent workers (O: 9)
Students will be able to use all relevant costs and benefits to develop and present a business case to support contingent worker use.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

Compensation System Design
With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's ability to design comprehensive compensation system, two actions will be taken: · In MGS 8390 add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering. · In MGS 8390 provide a written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Integration of All Compensation Components | Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Employee Recruitment and Selection
With respect to the second learning outcome, the student's ability to understand and effectively apply all major components into a comprehensive employee recruitment and selection system, two actions will be taken: · In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise job analysis, job description, and job specification. Evaluate after next offering. · In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise questions, scoring system, work sample, and other tests. Evaluate after next offering.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Behavioral Interview Questions | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
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
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None

Case for use of contingent workers
Add a case in MGS 8360 concerning building a business case to support the use of contingent workers

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Add a case to MGS 8360 concerning contingent workers. Look for identification and use of costs and benefits
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None

Expand budget portion of compensation project
Expand the budget portion of the MGS 8390 term project to include more emphasis on compensation budgets and linkages to firm performance
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Expand budget requirement for MGS 8390 term project
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8390
Additional Resources: None

Perform training and development design
Add a project to MGS 8300 to expand coverage and application of design of needs, delivery and evaluation of training and development programs.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Add a project to MGS 8300 where students will get hands-on experience in performing needs analysis, design of delivery, and evaluation of training
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300
Additional Resources: None

Provide a second case example
Provide a second case example with class discussion on case law conclusions. Continue to monitor.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Law Issue Identification | Outcome/Objective: Employment Law
Implementation Description: Use a handout to illustrate case conclusions and relevance to HR.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8320.
Additional Resources: None

Quantify HR functions and benefits
Include questions on HR metrics in MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Include exam questions and discuss in MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None
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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)
2. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**SLO 4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

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

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

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

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge.

**Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% 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

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.
Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

M 4: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

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

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the comprehensive exam.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the comprehensive exam.

Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the comprehensive exam.

Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the comprehensive exam.

Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the comprehensive exam.

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program
**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

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

**Continue to Monitor Curriculum**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - Measure (Key Assessment): End of Course Assessments | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Internship Report | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - 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)

**Implement Certificate in Online Education Program**
We implemented our add-on certificate program in online education.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**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  
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  
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty  
Additional Resources: None

**Deactivate Endorsement of Online Teaching**
Program enrollment has been low and we have had difficulty keeping up with the reporting burden. We will deactivate this program this year.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Shoffner  
Additional Resources: None

**Increase Focus on Corporate Training**
As part of an effort to diversify program offerings in the College of Education we will seek to increase the focus of our MS program on
Continue to Recruit Students from Business and Industry
As a new division (Learning Technologies) we continue to focus on targeting growing our recruitment from students in business and industry.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: As a new division (Learning Technologies) we continue to focus on targeting growing our recruitment from students in business and industry. This will include new/revamped website, and creation of a graduate level certificate.
Responsible Person/Group: Learning Technologies Division

Create Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology
Create new Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Create new Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology as: 1) a way to grow our program and also to; 2) offer classes to students who wish to take classes in our field but not necessarily to earn a masters, for example if they already have a masters degree or are working toward a masters in another field.
Responsible Person/Group: Learning Technologies Division
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Mission / Purpose
The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals
G 1: Produce Researchers in Learning Technologies
The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of conducting world-class research in Learning Technologies.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies
The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of world-class teaching in Learning Technologies.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Understands and uses technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

SLO 3: Demonstrates research expertise (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student demonstrates a general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

SLO 4: Engages in scholarship (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

SLO 5: Understands foundations of education (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

SLO 6: Develops a professional identity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The Ph.D. student develops an identity as a professional and contributes to a professional community of scholars and educators.
The Ph.D. student develops an extended knowledge base that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Develops leadership for the profession (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**  
The Ph.D. student provides leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Understands and uses technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Develops leadership for the profession</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4: Engages in scholarship</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6: Develops a professional identity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Understands and uses technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field. A new course was added for the 2015-6 school year.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field. A new course was added for the 2015-6 school year.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field. We reviewed agreements with other departments offering foundational courses to ensure that our students had timely and adequate access.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**M 3: Residency Report (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Develops a professional identity</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understands and uses technology</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Develops a professional identity</th>
<th>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)</strong></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>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

<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>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

<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>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)</strong></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>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

<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>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.

<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>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first or second attempt.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Improve Post Completion Jobs

Improve the quality of the positions students accept upon graduation from the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Monitor student completers and mentor them through the job search process.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All IT Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Increase Number of Program Completers

We will monitor and try to increase the number of doctoral graduates per year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Increase student monitoring in order to improve graduation rates.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All IT faculty.
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Increase Research Opportunities

We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

#### Monitor Standards

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year. Due to the increasingly rapid pace of technology evolution and the core function of technology in this program, it may be necessary to shorten the syllabus review cycle to bi-annually. Additionally, faculty may need additional resources in the future to fund professional development in order to stay current with technological change.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship
  - Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
  - Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** IT Unit
- **Additional Resources:** Funding for Professional Development
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $3,000.00 (recurring)

#### Recruit Full-time Students

As we transition to becoming a more research oriented institution we need to recruit more full-time Ph.D. students to assist in that effort. We have added a couple of additional full-time Ph.D. students and we will continue to pursue additional students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

#### Seek External Funding

In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
Relationships | Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective:
| Measure (Key Assessment): Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
| Measure (Key Assessment): Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Engages in scholarship
| Measure (Key Assessment): Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
| Measure (Key Assessment): Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
| Measure (Key Assessment): Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
| Measure (Key Assessment): Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Review Program Length
In order to improve time to completion rates and enhance the research skills and marketability of our graduates, we will review the entire Ph.D. program with an eye to shortening it overall and including more research experience. Such a change is now possible thanks to recent revisions in college policy.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We shortened the program form 66 to 60 hours, eliminated the cognate, and increased the number of research hours required.
Responsible Person/Group: All Faculty
Additional Resources: none

Revise Standards
The Association for Educational Communications and Technology is in the process of revising professional standards in the field. As our standards are based on these we will need to review and possibly revise our standards once their revision is complete.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: in process
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty
Additional Resources: none

Revise Curriculum
In keeping with the greater emphasis on research at the university, and in accordance with revised guidelines from the college, we have revised the program of study requirements for the Ph.D. We have reduced the number of required courses and increased the amount of required research activity for our students.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Implemented Fall 2013
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty
Additional Resources: none

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 International Business MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The MIB program is designed for individuals who aspire to organizational or entrepreneurial leadership and/or managerial positions across functional areas in firms with significant presence or activity in international markets. The primary objectives of the MIB program are to: develop an in-depth understanding of the international business environment, build capabilities to deal effectively in international markets, extend functional skills to deal with managerial issues in the global marketplace, demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, develop intercultural awareness and sensitivity, develop team skills to be contributing members of an effective global team, and complete an extended work experience outside of the student's native country.

Goals
G 1: Goal 1: Understanding of International Business Environment
Full Description: Students will have the ability to identify and analyze strategic and operational opportunities or problems in a specific international setting. The measurements may incorporate case histories, analytical papers, market studies, etc.

G 2: Goal 2: Country Market Analysis
Full Description: Students will be able to conduct systematic country market analysis from the perspective of potential exporters, investors, global procurers, and other firms. Students will identify the factors that contribute to global market opportunity, identify diverse sources of data, and systematically analyze it in order to generate practical recommendations for managers.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Complete analyses Goal 1 (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

G 3: Goal 3: Extend Functional Skills in International Operations
Full Description: Students will be able to demonstrate their functional knowledge to analyze a case in the international context. They will be able to delineate the impact on business practice of international and cross-cultural issues. Students will demonstrate expertise in such areas as: Cross-Cultural and Collaborative Skills; Global Supply Chain Management; Global CSR; International Marketing and Positioning; Global Financial System Analysis; Global Legal Environment; International Entrepreneurship.

G 4: Goal 4: Second Language Proficiency
Full Description: The students need to be proficient in a second language in order to conduct business. If the students do not have proficiency in a second language before they are admitted to the MIB program, they must take language courses while they are in the program before they are granted the degree.

G 5: Goal 5: Team Skills
Full Description: Students will complete an internship providing foreign business experience, cultural awareness and functional expertise. Students will file monthly internship reports that consist of three parts: a) examples of foreign business experience, b) examples of comparisons for cultural differences, and c) particular examples of tasks and responsibilities undertaken.

G 6: Goal 6: Extended Work Experience
Full Description: Students will complete on-the-job experience and will have a manager in the company that will provide a report about the student's work.

Note: All students must meet the following standards to be eligible for the degree:

- 90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria.
- 30% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceeds Standards” criteria.
- Fails to meet standards = 1: The student cannot generate viable alternatives that are aligned with the critical success factors in the environment. Meets standards = 2: The student can generate viable alternatives that are aligned with the critical success factors in the environment. Exceeds standards = 3: The student can fully capture the implications of four or more functional area decisions.

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.

The students need to be proficient in a second language in order to conduct business. If the students do not have proficiency in a second language before they are admitted to the MIB program, they must take language courses while they are in the program before they are granted the degree.

Students will engage in a team based project in the Capstone Course that will be self-assessed, team-assessed, and faculty assessed.

Exceeds standards=3. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student can bring multiple views and perspectives to create synergies from diverse perspectives and demonstrate critical thinking. * Kaufman, Felder, and Fuller (2000); May and Guelenzoph (2003)

90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria. 30% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceeds Standards” criteria.
SLO 11: Complete Analyses Goal 6

M.11: Faculty assessment of monthly internship report. 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. Cumulative internship report Non Pass: The company/supervisor fails to file a cumulative internship report, or files an incomplete report with missing sections. Pass: The company/supervisor files a cumulative internship report and provides brief description of the student's responsibilities and adequate execution of these tasks. Exceed: The company files a cumulative internship report and provides a commendation for outstanding work ethic and accomplishment of tasks and responsibilities assigned.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Target Levels Goal 1

90% of students will get 2.0 on Measures 1, 2 and 3. 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 1, 2 and 3.

O/O 3: Complete Analyses Goal 2

Related Measures: M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use. M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations. M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and firm level variable. M.4: Country Market Analysis - Explicit Identification of criteria. Fails to meet standard=1. The student fails to consult reliable data sources and considers trends in less than three macro variables. Meets standard=2. The student identifies and consults two sources for data and analyzes the trends in three macro variables. Exceeds standard=3. The student consults three or more reliable sources for data and analyzes trends in four or more macro variables. M.5: Country Market Analysis - Data Interpretation. Fails to meet standard=1. The student does not apply the techniques developed in IB for country market analysis in data interpretation. Meets standard=2. The student generally accesses tools developed in IB in interpreting the data collected for a country market analysis. Exceeds standard=3. The student uses tools developed in IB to develop rich and insightful interpretations of the data collected in a country market analysis. M.6: Country Market Analysis – Delineation of different Levels in Analysis. Fails to meet standard=1. The student does not effectively distinguish between the different levels of analysis in the country market analysis. Meets standard=2. The student shows an understanding of the different levels of analysis and conducts the country market analysis in that way. Exceeds standard=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 MBA students pass one of the three measures on their first attempt. 90% of MBA students pass one of the three measures on their second attempt.

O/O 12: Target Levels Goal 6 (M: 12, 13)

90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Pass” criteria. 10% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceed” criteria.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Measures (O: 1)

M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis
M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives
M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives

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

M 2: Measure 1 (O: 1)

M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis

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

M 3: Measure 2 (O: 1)

M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives

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

M 4: Measure 3 (O: 1)

M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives

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

M 5: Measure 4 (O: 4)
M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 6: Measure 5 (O: 4)**
M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 7: Measure 6 (O: 4)**
M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and from firm level variable to conduct the analysis
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 8: Measure 7 (O: 6)**
M.7: Case analysis or a final paper that shows how business decisions are subject to international dynamics by demonstrating functional area knowledge in the context of international environment
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 9: Measure 8 (O: 8)**
M.8: There are three assessment methods, either one should be met. Completion of foreign language requirement at a foreign institution Or Passing an examination approved by the GSU IIB Department Or Sit for an examiner as determined by IIB
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**M 10: Measure 9 (O: 10)**
M.9: Team Assessment: Ability to bring multiple views/perspective to problem solving, and demonstrate individual performance when functioning in the team.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**M 11: Measure 10 (O: 10)**
M.10: Faculty Assessment: Ability to drive towards consensus in the presence of diverse perspectives, and demonstrate that the student has improved the team's performance.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**M 12: Measure 11 (O: 12)**
M.11: Faculty assessment of monthly internship report
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 13: Measure 12 (O: 12)**
M.12: Faculty assessment of cumulative supervisor/company report
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

---

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

**Update Assessment Plan**
In order to attract more students the program has been modified in terms of format and focus. We are working to develop a new assessment plan in light of these program revisions.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** In coordination with the Assistant Dean for Assessment, a committee consisting of faculty teaching in the program is engaged in the development and implementation of the assessment plan with the intention of collecting the first assessment data for this cohort in Spring 2013.
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** Leigh Ann Liu, Program Faculty, Tracy Widman

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2014-2015 Journalism BA**
*As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: evaluate information</strong> Students will be able to find and evaluate credible sources of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 3: apply standards when originating content</strong> 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.,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Write correctly and clearly (M: 3)</strong> Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Critically evaluate own/others' work (M: 4)</strong> Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Apply numerical/statistical concepts (M: 5)</strong> Apply basic numerical and statistical concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Writing (O: 8)</strong> Students were provided with a set of facts about an accident and required to produce a short news article following a standard journalistic format using the following instructions:  · You are to write a news story on the facts provided below.  · Story may not exceed 250 words  · Do not 'make up' any facts  · Must conform to AP Stylebook Each was graded on a rubric, including grammar, punctuation and spelling errors. Eleven upper division students completed the writing assessment with an average score of 79.91 percent. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Editing (O: 9)</strong> Students were provided a news story and to edit and score using the following instructions: You are to review the following story and rewrite. Identify problems using track change and comment and complete rubric below by circling levels of achievement. Assign a grade from 35 – 0 based on your rubric. DO NOT WRITE HEADLINE Students were assessed on ability to locate and change basic grammar, punctuation and spelling errors as well as edit the piece for coherence. Seven upper division division students complete the assessment with an average score of 81.65 percent. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Computation (O: 10)</strong> Students were provided with a set up tables draw from a quantitative survey. They were required to:  · Explain most salient data in each table (in other words, what is most important figure and what does it mean in narrative form above tables)  · Prepare a brief summary of findings (without tables)  · Give two recommendations to the Study Abroad Office based on based on findings  · Your findings/recommendations may not run more than 150 words and should highlight the most important information drawn from tables. Fourteen upper division division students complete the assessment with an average score of 84.99 percent. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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 |
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

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

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

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

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

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

The revised Journalism curriculum has more technology in more courses earlier in the major map than the existing curriculum.
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
Mission / Purpose

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Kinesiology PhD
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Journalism History and Professionalism

Students should be required to have understanding of a minimum of 20 historical events that shaped modern journalism. Students should be required to identify 10 key elements that demonstrate professionalism in the field of journalism.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of journalism history courses

Revamping Assessment System

Each year, the university requires us to assess our program based on the outcomes we created. This is done at the end of spring term and up until now, we have had mixed results because of two factors: 1. The assessment tools have, at best, been haphazard and too subjective. 2. I have had to conduct the assessment and have had limited support from faculty to allow assessment in upper division classes. Because of this, and the fact we are moving to a new assessment system, I would like to enlist your help in developing assessment tools that actually measure what we say they measure. Let me note that we are only required to assess three outcomes per year, one of which must be write correctly and clearly in forms and styles to conform to CTW requirements. I will work with our 1010 and 3010 instructors to create this assessment. Since this assess reflects on the entire journalism program, I think it is critical to have the entire journalism faculty involved in this process.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: So how can you help? I would like to create an assessment for each of the outcomes this semester that can be administered to senior students next semester. These assessment tools must be: 1. Quantitative 2. Objective 3. Require minimal time to complete (not more than 10 minutes) 4. Are not part of assignment packages 5. Can be scored without a lot of interpretation Because not everyone teaches courses that touch on these outcomes, I would ask that if your courses do inc

Projected Completion Date: 01/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism Faculty
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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 objectives are integrated into our upper division curricula. Faculty is asked to include outcomes on syllabi and ensure that applicable outcomes are addressed within the course. Obviously, writing and sourcing material are paramount to a journalist and therefore receives the greatest attention in coursework.

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 greatest challenge is to integrate assessment into the culture of our program. I have asked faculty's assistance in creating assessment tools across our objectives and to offer access to classes to complete the assessment process. I want to establish objective, quantitative assessments that 'actually' assess our students' abilities. Until now, this has been an ad hoc process, but we want to make it more formal

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Findings have been shared with our undergraduate faculty, but given our need to standardize the assessment process, the impact this year will be minimal

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.

Again, we first have to establish a real baseline to adequately address how our program can achieve our stated objectives.
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All eligible students passed their comprehensive exams. Of the two students that completed their dissertation, one is employed as Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at a medical school and the second is working in industry related to the students field.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met
85% of the students met the requirement of presenting research at conferences. Students not meeting this requirement are typically either completing their dissertation or just starting the program.

Target for O2: Understanding of research
100% of eligible students will complete this requirement

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All eligible students met this goal. Students presented research papers and successfully completed research methodology courses.

M 3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)
Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
**Target for O2: Understanding of research**
100% of eligible students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
All eligible students successfully completed research method coursework.

**M 4: Cognate (O: 3)**
Successful completion of the cognate portion of their doctoral program
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Specialization**
100% of students that successfully complete the program will develop skills in areas of specialization within their respective fields

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
All students that graduated the program met the criteria of developing appropriate skills in areas of specialization within their field.

**M 5: Seminar and professional development (O: 4)**
Successful completion of seminars and dissertation grant proposals
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Grant writing and management**
95% of students will meet this requirement

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
77% of the eligible students have completed seminars addressing grant writing/management and/or have written grant proposals. Of the remaining 23% of students that have not completed this requirement, most stem from being new to the program.

**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.

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

**Implementation Description:** Task is performed during annual review of doctoral students in summer/late spring

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2017
**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

**New Assessment Plan**

A new assessment plan has been drafted and is in the process of being reviewed by faculty. The use of annual review of doctoral students will be added to the assessment with the possibility of using rubrics of comprehensive exam and dissertation strengths and weaknesses that would be included in annual review of doctoral students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty are reviewing draft changes. Department Graduate Research Faculty will vote on changes later this fall or early spring semester.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Chris Ingalls

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 are addressed and/or learned in both program coursework and specific residency programs. The students' progress on coursework and residency requirements are reviewed annually in the spring semester during a meeting of the Graduate Research Faculty. Proposed changes to the Program Assessment include adding qualitative and/or quantitative assessments of students progress that are assigned at the annual meeting. Currently, students are notified formally in writing by committee chair of their assessment of progress, and informally by the adviser. Deficiencies in quality of performance in classes and/or their residency requirements and suggested remediation steps are included in their letters.

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 percentage improvement in a number of the measures being met is noted. However, many of these improvements stem from the natural matriculation of students in the program considering that last year we had a significant increase in the number of new students, and to students in a relatively new concentration. A continued strength of the program is our annual review of doctoral students, however our new assessment program will try to take advantage of this assessment by including new metrics that can used for better tracking of students' progress in the program, but to allow for additional constructive feedback to the students.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 in program meetings. However, specific changes to the assessment program are made via the Graduate Research Faculty which includes faculty members that do not have doctoral programs. Starting this spring semester, the assessment program and findings will be discussed at our annual review of doctoral 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.

As mentioned in a previous response, we are drafting new goals, outcomes, and measures. Part of this change reflects an attempt to refine the process we have currently, but also to address the possible addition of a fifth PhD concentration in Sports Administration.
The department has voted to approve this concentration, and this curriculum proposal is currently being reviewed at the college level.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2014-2015 Law**  
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

### Mission / Purpose

The Georgia State University College of Law is committed to providing a high quality legal education in its full time and part time, day and evening programs. In order to fully prepare students for professional lives as practicing attorneys or professionals making other uses of their professional knowledge and skills, the College of Law uses a variety of teaching methodologies, including the case study method, the Socratic method, lectures, seminars, writing workshops, and clinical education. The College of Law seeks to produce students whose knowledge, performance and behavior exemplify the best of the legal profession. In addition to taking classroom courses, students are encouraged to participate in our two live-client clinics, the Tax Clinic and the HeLP Clinic. The Tax Clinic helps clients resolve issues with the IRS. The HeLP Clinic helps clients who come to the clinic with a variety of legal problems related to health problems. The Tax Clinic works closely with the IRS, while the HeLP Clinic works closely with Egleston Hospital and Atlanta Legal Aid. We also encourage students to engage in significant pro bono activities related to skills they develop in the College of Law. As of Spring 2007, 701 students are enrolled in our JD program. In the academic year 2006-07, beginning with Summer 2006 and ending in Spring 2007, 212 students earned J.D. degrees from the College of Law. Ten of those students earned joint degrees; a breakdown follows: JD/MPA - 2; JD/MBA - 7; JD/MPA - 2; Other -1.

Since the issuance of the Carnegie Report evaluating legal education in the United States, the College of Law has been undergoing a long-term rigorous review of our entire curriculum. In year one, every member of the College faculty was required to read the entire Carnegie Report and participate in "book club" sessions held on weekend days at faculty members' homes. In year two, the Faculty Curriculum Committee was charged with studying our entire curriculum, with an eye to suggesting changes responsive to the Carnegie Report. A student representative was appointed to serve on the Committee, as well. By the end of the year, the Committee had made a series of findings and proposals, and presented them to the faculty. In year three, the faculty held a day-long retreat to consider the Committee's proposals. The retreat, attended by nearly every faculty member, revealed that there were still some wrinkles to be ironed out in the proposals. As a result, significant changes were not approved at the retreat. Nevertheless, there was a consensus that the faculty was committed to moving forward to making substantial changes in our curriculum, primarily those addressed to students' writing skills. All agree that the current required RWAs I and II classes do a good job of improving students' writing skills. At the same time, we recognize that many students come into law school with such deficient writing skills that we need far more than two semesters of first year courses to bring them to a "practice-ready" skill level.

### Goals

**G 1: Basic proficiency in legal writing**  
Any accredited law school graduate, whether she practices law in a traditional sense or not, needs to be an effective communicator. While oral communication skills often get the most attention in modern American society, the reality is that written communication is more common, more permanent, and more important. For this reason, we seek to produce law graduates who can communicate in clear written form with clients, the courts and the public. Generally, their written communications are intended to perform three distinct functions: (i) identify relevant legal issues; (ii) identify, explain and analyse the existing law dealing with such issues; (iii) predict resolution of the issues by applying the existing facts to the existing law, or propose legal solutions to deal with them in the future.

**G 2: Basic proficiency in legal research**  
All students must learn how to find the existing law, whether it be in the form of statutes, regulations or caselaw. Students must also learn the proper format for using and citing the law in memos, briefs, and other relevant forums.

**G 3: Basic proficiency in fundamental legal principles**  
All students must learn the fundamentals of the American legal system. Once they learn these fundamentals, they may choose to "specialize" and take courses in specific areas of the law.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing (M: 2, 2)**  
The primary vehicle via which all students must demonstrate writing proficiency occurs in the required RWAs 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 association 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


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Production of satisfactory written product (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Writing Intervention exercises (O: 1, 2, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 estoric (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 &quot;writing intervention&quot; 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 throughout the course of the semester, 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 &quot;practice&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Basic proficiency in advocacy legal writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: xxx</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;legal writing requirement,&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, 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 them as managers.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Skills in General Management (O: 1, 3)

The MGS BBA Rubric #1 captures the student's skill level in performing identification, making application, doing analysis and supporting recommendations with respect to the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations in addressing problems in management. The MGS BBA Rubric #3 captures the student's general use of critical thinking aspects of their work.

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

Target for O1: Student Performance for All Areas

Students will average a 2.8/4.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #1. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

In the 2014-2015 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area is not represented here due to changes in the entrepreneurship program in the college. For this assessment cycle a total of fourteen papers were selected. Seven papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. With respect to the first learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.71, 2.64, 2.07 and 2.30 respectively. None of these means were above the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 14, 14, 14, and 14 respectively. None of the components of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 36, 36, 86, and 79 respectively. Only the first two components met the goal. Components 3 and 4 exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is improvement on average across components 1 and 2, components 3 and 4 are higher measures when compared to the prior cycle. The goals are still not being met. It should be noted that the sample size of 14 papers is lower than previous cycles.

M 2: Skills in the Student’s Concentration (O: 2, 3)

The MGS BBA Rubric #2 captures the student's skill level in performing identification, making application, doing analysis and supporting recommendations with respect to problems in the area of their concentration. The MGS BBA Rubric #3 captures the student's general use of critical thinking aspects of their work.

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

Target for O2: Student Performance in their Functional Concentration

Students will average a 2.8/4.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #2. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

In the 2014-2015 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area is not represented here due to changes in the entrepreneurship program in the college. For this assessment cycle a total of fourteen papers were selected. Seven papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. The Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the first learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.57, 2.50, 2.14 and 2.14 respectively. None of these means met the desired average of 2.8. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 14, 14, 21, and 14 respectively. None of the components of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 36, 43, 71, and 79 respectively. Only the first component met the goal. Components 2, 3 and 4 exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is improvement on average across component 1, components 2, 3 and 4 are higher measures when compared to the prior cycle. The goals are still not being met. It should be noted that the sample size of 14 papers is lower than previous cycles.

Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making

Students will average a 2.8/4.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #3. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met

In the 2014-2015 cycle there were two different CTW classes offered in Managerial Sciences. The Entrepreneurship area is not represented here due to changes in the entrepreneurship program in the college. For this assessment cycle a total of fourteen papers were selected. Seven papers were taken from each of the two discipline areas with CTW classes, HR and Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. The Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the first learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.57, 2.50, 2.14 and 2.14 respectively. None of these means met the desired average of 2.8. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 14, 14, 21, and 14 respectively. None of the components of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 36, 43, 71, and 79 respectively. Only the first component met the goal. Components 3 and 4 exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is improvement on average across component 1, components 2, 3 and 4 are higher measures when compared to the prior cycle. The goals are still not being met. It should be noted that the sample size of 14 papers is lower than previous cycles.
Operations. The rubrics that were used were the same as in prior years and are in the Document file. The Assessment Rating Summary provides a grid with the distribution of ratings on all elements of all learning outcomes. With respect to the first learning outcome the average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.79, 2.36, 2.07 and 2.07 respectively. The first of these means met the desired average of 2.8 on the first component. The distribution across the scores showed that the percentage of students on each of the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” was 14, 21, 21, and 14, respectively. None of the components of the learning outcome met the goal of having 10 percent or less of the students scoring a 1.0. The distributions across the scores showed on each of the four components of the learning outcome with a rubric score of “1.0” or “2.0” to be 36, 43, 71, and 79 respectively. Only the first component met the goal. Components 2, 3 and 4 exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less of the students in these two lower categories. While there is improvement on average across component 1, components 2, 3 and 4 are higher measures when compared to the prior cycle. The goals are still not being met. It should be noted that the sample size of 14 papers is lower than previous cycles.

### 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 initiatives for bite classrooms.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MGS Assessment Committee

### Review and Revise Assessment Process

The person responsible for overseeing the MGS assessment program changed, so the process of current assessment is under review for the new academic year. A committee consisting of faculty from each discipline has been created to review current assessment goals, outcomes/objectives, and measurements. In addition, the university has removed the critical thinking requirement in the curriculum for a 4000- level major course beginning AY 2015-2016. So, this is a good time to review what has worked and where and how we can improve our process of assessment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2016

### 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 review of the results of the three inter-related rubrics for the 2014-2015 cycle showed that students are able to effectively write a case analysis, then identify and apply social, psychological and cultural aspects of the management problem. However, the weakest areas of student performance are in the areas of using data for analysis, and knowing how to apply the appropriate data to support their recommendations and solutions. These weaknesses apply to critical thinking in general and their application to managerial sciences dimensions as well as their area of concentration. The new assessment committee will review the current assessment program including goals, outcomes/objectives, and measurements. Then an intervention plan will be developed by working with all instructors on ways to develop better skills in these areas across the MGS 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 changes and improvements to the assessment plan in the coming academic year are: 1. Change in person overseeing the program. 2. New committee of faculty representing each discipline has been created to review all aspects of the assessment process. 3. More active involvement of undergraduate faculty in determining assignments to assess.
**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 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 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 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 "Hundies." 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 Advance Materials. Exhibits good insight into the into the introductory program that Advanced Materials has used to market Nundies. For the 2013-2014 Reporting Period (15 Points) Total possible points for this item = 15 Target score average = 12.5

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The average score for this item in the 2014-2015 Cycle was 13.0 (86.8) Of the 47 students included in this assessment, 43 were at or above average, and 4 were below average. Given the number who met or exceeded our target we believe this Learning Objective has 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

For this Assessment Cycle, the average score across all students included was 10.15 (68%). 18 students were at or above target, while 29 fell below the target,

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The average score on this item was 83.4%. 32 students (76% of the total) were at, or above, average for this item. We would note that, scores on this item would bear some relationship to scores on the Metrics Objective, since providing good support for one’s recommendations would depend on the accuracy of the metrics being developed. Because the recorded score is less than 2 percentage points below the target, we would consider the Target to have been met, albeit minimally.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score for this Objective was 83.0. 35 students out of 47 (76.5%) of our students were at or above this target. We would consider this score as having partially met this objective. This is because we believe that students with a BBA in Marketing should be proficient in writing and in displaying data, at least in fundamental forms such as tables and graphs.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

The average score across all sections was 84%, which is an improvement over the previous year’s outcomes. 25 students scored at or above target while 10 scored below target. Because this was an improved result and because results on this measure are often affected by students who are not willing to participate in case discussions, we consider this objective to have been met.

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

**Increase Usage of Written Assignments**

We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they develop more assignments that require writing in their classes. This can be as simple as short, one-page reaction papers. We will also encourage them to require students to employ specific writing frameworks (e.g. memorandum) that force them to develop their thoughts logically and clearly. We must also note, here, that we are not writing instructors, and our students are required to take only one business communication course.

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

Introduction of 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 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

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.
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's possible that this year's findings are an anomaly, since case discussion is a required part of the course. One of the instructors of our capstone class will be taking the Harvard Business School seminar on case discussion leadership this (fall) semester. We are hoping that this will lead to new ideas and improved techniques for encouraging case discussion.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: David Nasser
Additional Resources: None

Increased Case Analysis in Curriculum
We are implementing a plan to increase the use of case analysis throughout our undergraduate curriculum.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Recommend increased emphasis on Metrics in Curriculum
We will continue to recommend a systematic emphasis on metrics throughout the undergraduate curriculum. We strongly urge all faculty to include at least basic metrics in their course planning so that students have adequate exposure to these items before entering our metrics and capstone classes. Even where students know the mechanics of calculating certain key metrics, they are not always able to see the connection between data found in a case and the proper metric to apply, nor how to employ the data in developing strategy and supporting recommendations.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools

Implementation Description: Discuss in committee. Issue a department wide memo. Include in next department meeting. Assign members of the UCC to track implementation across the curriculum
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Improved Preparation
Seek greater cooperation among faculty, especially in required courses (but ideally in all courses) to provide students with more practice in critical thinking exercises, improvement of writing skills and application of marketing metrics. These are three areas that
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?

Once again, we find that our students, on average, do not solidly meet Learning Objectives related to Critical Thinking and Metrics. Our Undergraduate Assessment Committee has recommended that all faculty include exercises in critical thinking and metrics in their 400 level courses. Those of us who teach the Marketing Metrics and Marketing Strategy (Capstone) course are in agreement that these two courses alone are not sufficient to accomplish the task of meeting our SLO’s. It is somewhat senseless to think that we can stimulate critical thinking skills and instill comfort with metrics with only two courses. Although some of our colleagues have adopted our recommendations based on past assessment reports, more need to join the effort.

With respect to the Capstone Class (MK 4900) the reporter has had some apparent success by spending more time providing students with repeated drills, via examples and mini-cases, in identifying the metrics needed for proper analysis, accurately constructing them and assessing the implications of the results. This seems to have improved the work of several students, but not enough to make a difference on overall scores. Anecdotal evidence from a handful of students who have taken other undergraduate courses with me, wherein they were required to conduct case analyses suggests that this would help many. Our conclusion, based on this, is the more...the better.

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 formal, department wide changes have been implemented at this time. The reporter will discuss next steps with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee after we share the results of this cycle with the entire faculty and they have had the chance to offer feedback.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 2:</strong> Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of viable target market(s) and positioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 3:</strong> Impact of Competition (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of impact of competition on the firm's actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 4:</strong> Solution Consistent with analysis (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solution Consistent with analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 5:</strong> Realistic implementation plan (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 6:</strong> Attention to customer satisfaction (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention to customer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7:</strong> Attention to customer loyalty (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention to customer loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 8:</strong> Student defines the necessary information (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student defines the information necessary to address question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 9:</strong> Student correctly interprets information collected (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student correctly interprets information collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 9 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Communication of Assessment Results**
Provide each faculty member who teaches classes to our MS students with the results of the assessment. These results, including the outcomes/objectives, measures and grading rubrics for each criterion, will communicate to the faculty what the program is striving to achieve. This information in combination with the assessment results will guide faculty in knowing what areas need or would benefit from additional emphasis.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Application of Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
Measure: Attention to customer loyalty | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
Measure: Impact of Competition | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
Measure: Solution Consistent with analysis | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
Measure: Student correctly interprets information collected | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
Measure: Student defines the necessary information | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
Measure: Viable Target Markets/Positioning | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

Evaluate current assessment case.

Evaluation of the current case being used to generate the assessment material. Specifically, we need to gauge whether or not this case provides sufficient emphasis on customer loyalty and customer satisfaction.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

"Basic quantitative literacy depends on students being introduced to the foundations of quantitative reasoning and then given reinforcement experiences which develop and deepen in the student the habits of thinking which the student has been encouraged to develop. Taking one course is not enough to endow a student with a habit of mind, but completing a carefully devised program can provide sufficient practice to make a pattern of thought part of the student's intellectual tools. The construction of such a program requires leadership from the mathematics faculty and other faculty as well as commitment to the three other major points of this report."1 The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is fully committed to providing all of the students of Georgia State University with these foundations in the core courses and providing the university with baseline data for its students' abilities to perform quantitative reasoning. In particular, the department will use placement testing to help determine appropriate entry into the quantitative literacy program; and, provide foundational experience(s) within (usually) the first year of the student's college work. 1 From the Preface of Quantitative Reasoning for College Graduates: A Complement to the Standards, Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics (CUPM), MAA. http://www.maa.org/past/ql/ql_toc.html

**Goals**

**G 1: Quantitative Literacy**

Quantitative literacy is knowledge of and confidence with basic mathematical/analytical concepts and operations required for problem-solving, decision-making, and real-world applications.

**G 2: Translation**

Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
**SLO 1: Computation (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students effectively perform arithmetic operations, as well as reason and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information.

**SLO 2: Translation (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: PreQL Success Rates (O: 1, 2)
Pre/Post testing of student abilities basic quantitative literacy. Our idea was to test during the first week, middle of the semester as well as at the end. This would tell us the length of time associated with their learning. We have currently implemented the first two weeks and end of the semester quizzes. 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 2014-2015 - 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. The results of Math1111 and Math1101 are missing in Fall/Spring.

**Target for O2: Translation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 2211 and 1113 in the fall and spring. The results of Math1101 and Math1111 are missing since the pre/post quizzes were not installed properly. The coordinators could not retrieve the data.

### 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 the five classes, an improvement on this question is clear at the end of the semester. It is interesting to note that the class that had formal Problem Solving Activities ( Math1113) often outperformed students in Math2211. Though probability is not a topic covered in Math1113, it is clear to see an improvement on this question. As students complete the Problem Solving Activities (in Math 1113) during the semester, it is possible students might have developed analytical abilities to solve those QL problems and their performance shows an improvement at the end of the semester. 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. Our department had a target of 50% response (these are voluntary quizzes) and this target was met in Math 1070, 2211,1113 for both semesters.

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

**Target for O1: Computation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Target for O2: Translation**
Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

### M 3: Class Summary Tables (O: 1, 2)
Looking at the data by class makes it easier to determine improvement levels of the students. Student performance similar from Fall to Spring.

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

**Target for O2: Translation**

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

**Improve Response and Success Rates**
Better communicate with all instructors (especially GTAs) the importance of providing the students with these QL Quizzes. Instructors should emphasize that students will receive bonus points if they take QL Quizzes. Track students to see how many are progressing from Math1070, Math 1111, 1113 to 2211 to see if “seeing” the quizzes more than once is inflating the success rates of later classes.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: PreQL Success Rates | Outcome/Objective: Computation

Implementation Description: Course coordinators will implement their strategies for increasing student participation in the fall semester.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Yichuan Zhao

**Improve Response and Success Rates**

Better communicate with all instructors (especially GTAs) the importance of providing the students with these QL Quizzes. Instructors should emphasize that students will receive bonus points if they take QL Quizzes. Check the improvement for increasing the participation after using the strategies.

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

Implementation Description: Course coordinators currently implement their strategies for increasing student participation.
Responsible Person/Group: Yichuan Zhao

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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 easier 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 program wrong than right in Math2211. Math1101 is changed to MyMathLab for online homework, quizzes, pre/post QL, etc. It makes a little easy to retrieve the response results. We continue to adopt the new teaching and assessment methods in the coming academic year. We believe an 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 provide 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. 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 1113 student learning outcomes have been improved to 75% from 60%. 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 have a great impact to identify the weaknesses and strengths of the program. The assessments 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. 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. 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 response the needs of the industry and higher education. 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 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. 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.

---
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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).
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

95% 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. 75% 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 2014-2015 - 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.

---
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**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 both theoretically and practically important problems in both pure and applied mathematics

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 translate real world problems into concrete mathematical problems, and to use technology to solve concrete mathematical problems, and use technology to present their results and findings.

SLO 5: Ability to consult and understand the specialized literature in their major (G: 2) (M: 1)
The ability of the students to consult mathematical journals and identify scientific articles that address their needs and interests; 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 rigorous 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 or other related publications in the discipline.
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Fall 2014: The students in Math 4991 were first given instructions on how to access GSU library and use JSTOR to search for literature in mathematics and statistics. The students were required to select an article from the American Mathematical Monthly within the last five years, review the paper, do an in-class presentation on the paper, and write a review report on the article. The students were also taught how to write a scientific paper, which improved their ability in appreciating and understanding a mathematics paper. The student final reports were based on their presentations and feedback on their presentations. All students accomplished both the written report and in class presentation beautifully. Those final presentations amply demonstrated their grasp of the topics and papers of their choice. Spring 2015: The students in Math 4991 were able to review, present, and discuss scientific papers that were of interest to the students, including additional references related to the subject of the paper. The students searched for additional references in major databases (such as Web of Science, Google Scholar, and PubMed) suggested by the instructor, from the web pages of mathematical journals, and from the textbooks from the library. They also answered questions from other students and the instructor.

M 2: In-class presentations (O: 7)
In-class presentations are designed to measure critical thinking, oral, and writing skills necessary for reading, analyzing and presenting mathematical results as well as their 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 topics from the textbook involving mathematical proofs and on research topics.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Fall 2014: The first set of lectures in Math 4991 was designed to show the students how to state mathematical theorems and write mathematical proofs with clarity and structure. The examples came from number theory, geometry, and algebra. The students then had to choose two theorems to prove and report as their first project, one out of the textbooks and one from other 3000 or 4000 level mathematics courses. It was required that the reports include an introduction to each of the theorems before their statements and proofs. Correctness and clarity were the main criteria for the proof presentations. After receiving feedback on their written report, they had to present the proofs of their theorems in class in 20 minutes. Spring 2015: The students learned how to prove new theorems, lemmas, etc. in Project 1. They consulted the instructor about the proofs. They presented their projects to other students (25 min presentations), answered questions of other students and the instructor. Proofs were taken from the textbook Mathematical Connections: A Capstone Course, by John B. Conway, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. The students also presented their reviews of scientific papers. They made 2 presentations totally during semester.

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

**Engagement of the Undergraduate Mathematics Commit**
Undergraduate Mathematics Committee will play an active role in the development of the assessment program for Math BS in AY 2011-2012. Members of the committee will discuss effective ways to perform assessment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** AY11-12
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Enescu (the chair of the Undergraduate Mathematics Committee)

**Improvement of student proof writing skills**
We continue to make the prerequisite courses, Math 3435 (Introductory Linear Algebra) and Math 3000 (Bridge to Higher Mathematics), significantly more effective in order to give our students a better opportunity to master their proof writing skills and to integrate their knowledge in the subsequent coursework. That will help our students to succeed in the capstone Senior Seminar (4991) course as well as in their future research and teaching work. In particular, students will be much better prepared to comprehend and perform mathematical proofs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** In-class presentations | **Outcome/Objective:** Mathematical proofs
- **Implementation Description:** AY11-12
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Guantao Chen (chair of the Department)

**Introduction to the software**
Students should be introduced to various types of mathematics software, which is needed 1. to solve mathematical problems numerically and display the results (Maple, Matlab, Geometry Pad); 2. to typeset a project report, a paper, or any other math text (LaTeX); 3. to make a quality presentation on a topic in undergraduate math (LaTeX-Beamer, LaTeX-Proseminar). The Department now has all the necessary resources. Students learn various types of software in Math 4991 as well as in some elective courses. Also the department will continue to actively support Mathematics and Statistics club and an undergraduate research program (RIMMES). Both of these have become a focus of interest among math majors. During the RIMMES final conference students make presentations using LaTeX-Beamer, LaTeX-Proseminar. They perform numerical simulations for their research projects with Matlab and other software.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Technology Projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Technology
- **Implementation Description:** AY11-12
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Guantao Chen, the Department chair
- **Additional Resources:** Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) should always be taught in a computer lab. Maple, Matlab and LaTeX must be installed on every machine.

**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 fact that our department has students in areas of both pure and applied mathematics, we tried our best to expose the students to a broad range of knowledge. To better prepare the students for the task of carrying large computations, some courses on software computations have been proposed. Overall, the capstone course (Math 4991) has proved to be important course for the undergraduate student. This is a course that students need to take in order to graduate. And the assessment process gives us an opportunity to analyze the outcome of the capstone course and find ways to further improve the quality of the capstone course as well as the assessment process.

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 keep improving our program by carrying out the action plans. We try our best to improve the students’ skills on writing proofs (via the CTW courses in particular), and we make sure that the students master the skills on software and technologies commonly used in pure and applied mathematics. We strive to produce quality students that are ready to face the challenges in the real world after graduation.

---
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---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Mathematics Education (MTE) is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge, and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. The MED-MTE program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Informed and Knowledgeable to Teach**

Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach Mathematics in Grades 6-12. The major goals of the MED-MTE program are to ensure that candidates: 1) have gained knowledge and understanding of mathematics content and process skills, 2) are able to create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences, 3) are able to demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision, and 4) are able to use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction and to monitor student learning.

**G 2: Attitudes and Dispositions**

Candidates are professional educators exhibiting positive attitudes and dispositions toward teaching Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

**G 3: Highly Effective Educators**

Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the Mathematics learning of their students.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

Candidates have knowledge and understanding of mathematics content and process skills (NCTM Standards), the history and evolution of the mathematics, the philosophical foundations, an extensive range of advance mathematics content. (Goal 1) (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standards 1-4)

**SLO 2: Diverse Learning Environments (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials and view-teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. (Goal 2) (Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Portfolio Standards 5-8)

**SLO 3: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Goal 2) (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Portfolio)

**SLO 4: Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 1)**

Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Portfolio Standard 9)

---

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**
The program had three completers in Summer 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015. 

**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 2013-2014 academic cycle marks the seventh year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired targets.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For 3 completers in 2014-2015 100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective

**Target for O2: Diverse Learning Environments**

Students averaged 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For 3 completers in 2014-2015 100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective

**Target for O3: Dispositions**

Students averaged 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For 3 completers in 2014-2015 100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective

**Target for O4: Student Learning and Assessment**

Students averaged 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For 3 completers in 2014-2015 100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective

**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.
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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>To continue to monitor student/program outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**To 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>To continue to monitor student/program outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)</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>

---
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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<td>09/2010</td>
</tr>
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<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**To 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>To continue to monitor student/program outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To 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.
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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
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
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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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: To continue monitoring students/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 students/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 students/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
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)

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)

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

Annual Report Section Responses
Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
We report that one of significant accomplishments of the program is graduating students within a reasonable timeline. We also report from last year that one third of our graduates are pursuing their PhD degrees in Mathematics Education.
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 for next year is recruiting a strong cohort of full time students who will be proactive in completing their program of study within the suggested timeframe.

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

We have had many students presenting at national and international conferences as part of their coursework. We believe that one of the strengths of our program is allowing our master level students to take PhD courses which provide them with opportunities to engage with research projects in collaboration with their doctoral peers.

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

Students are offered courses which includes a study abroad component where they travel and conduct ethnographic projects related to teaching and learning of mathematics from an international perspective. Engaging in global experiences expand students’ views on what counts as mathematical knowledge and position them to be well prepared to each in diverse settings.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Mathematics Education Online MEd

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Portfolio section &quot;Content&quot; (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Demonstrates strong content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;2&quot; out of a possible &quot;3&quot; for each standard and the supporting artifacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Portfolio section &quot;Impact on Student Learning&quot; (O: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;2&quot; out of a possible &quot;3&quot; for each standard and the supporting artifacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Microteaching Video (O: 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are expected to videotape themselves while teaching and write a reflection about their teaching practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are expected to get at least 7 out of 10 to achieve this goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Portfolio Section &quot;Teacher Preparation and Connections&quot; (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;2&quot; out of a possible &quot;3&quot; for each standard and supporting artifacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Demonstrates effective dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are expected to get at least 7 out of 10 in the rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
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.
Projected Completion Date: 03/2014
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching for MEd. in Mathematics Education (Online)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

**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.

**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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: KA#4 Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners’ needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will demonstrate that all learners can learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: KA#5 Effects of Student Learning (O: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will demonstrate sensitivity to diverse learners’ needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will effectively create productive learning environments for diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will demonstrate that all learners can learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: KA#6 Disposition (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates will demonstrate the attitude of a reflective educator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Increasing mathematics proficiency for teaching
Faculty members will focus on developing and enhancing teachers' proficiency for teaching mathematics. Two courses are being developed to address this national and local concern in light of student learning. In the meanwhile the program is being maintained and monitored.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Two courses are being developed and must be sent for approval before implementation.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mathematics Education Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** 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
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

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
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#3 Planning | **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#5 Effects of Student Learning | **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#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
### 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)
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.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of the thesis students completed at least eight graduate courses toward their degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 by the end of their second year in the program.

Target for O2: Conducting Research or Data Analysis
50% of the thesis proposals are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Approximately 60% 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.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
90% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
90% 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.
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Student evaluation of HA program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation of HA program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of residents by HA faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Student assessment of residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment of residency experience/learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Oral Presentation - HA 8190 (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xyz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

**2014-2015 Mental Health Counseling MS**

As of 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Characteristic and behaviors that influence the counseling process (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain an understanding of the counseling process in a multicultural society, including counselor characteristics and behaviors that influence helping processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Diversity and competence multicultural counseling (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Effects of crises, disasters and other trauma-causing events (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Group Work in Mental Health Counseling (M: 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Principles of Mental Health Counseling including Advocacy in a Multicultural Diverse Society (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Human Growth and Development (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Addiction and Addictive Behaviors (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain knowledge of theories and etiology of addictions and addictive behaviors, including strategies for prevention, intervention, and treatment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Diagnosis (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Crisis Intervention and Assessment (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain knowledge of crisis intervention and suicide prevention models, including the use of psychological first aid strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

100% of students (a cohort of 28) 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: 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**

100% students in the Mental Health Counseling program who enroll in CPS 6410 (Basic Counseling Skills) demonstrate basic counseling skill as assessed by a minimum score of 25 on a final performance video.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% students in the Mental Health Counseling program (a cohort of 28 students) who enrolled in CPS 6410 (Basic Counseling Skills) demonstrated basic counseling skill by achieving a minimum score of 25 on the final performance video.

**M 3: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% students (a cohort of 28 students) who are enrolled in CPS 7340 (SocioCultural Issues in Counseling and Psychological Services) earned a minimum of 80% on a group presentation. This assignment requires a synthesis of multicultural models and developmental theories specific to a diverse community.

**M 4: Applied Case Study Exam (O: 3)**

100% of students enrolled in CPS 7340 demonstrate knowledge of social and cultural issues, models of identity development, and counseling interventions by achieving a score of 80% or greater on a final exam. The final exam is a blend of multiple choice and applied case study items.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Diversity and competence multicultural counseling**

100% of students enrolled in CPS7340 demonstrate knowledge of social and cultural issues, models of identity development, and counseling interventions by achieving a score of 80% or greater on a final exam. The final exam is a blend of multiple choice and applied case study items.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students enrolled in CPS 7340 (a cohort of 28 students) demonstrated knowledge of social and cultural issues, models of identity development, and counseling interventions by achieving a score of 80% or greater on a final exam.

**M 5: Midterm and Final Examination Multiple Choice Questions (O: 4)**

90% of all Mental Health Students enrolled in CPS 8470 (Crisis Intervention) will demonstrate 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 by earning 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 demonstrate 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 by earning a minimum score of 80% on the midterm AND final examination.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of all Mental Health Students (a cohort of 28 students) enrolled in CPS 8470 (Crisis Intervention) demonstrated 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 by earning a minimum score of 80% on the midterm AND final examination.

**M 6: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% Mental Health Counseling students (a cohort of 28 students) enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling Systems) completed a group assignment by attending ALL 9 75-minute experiential-based, personal growth groups.

**M 7: Group Leadership (O: 5)**

100% of students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling) will demonstrate group leadership knowledge and skill by planning and facilitating an in-class mock counseling group.

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

**Target for O5: Group Work in Mental Health Counseling**

100% of students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling) will demonstrate group leadership knowledge and skill by planning and facilitating an in-class mock counseling group.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling) demonstrated group leadership knowledge and skill by planning and facilitating an in-class mock counseling group.

**M 8: Research Project and Presentation (O: 6)**

All Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 7000 (Consulting, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) demonstrate knowledge of advocacy models and leadership characteristics by earning a minimum of 85% on the research project and presentation. These assignments are related to specific aspects 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 enrolled in CPS 7000 (Consulting, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) demonstrate knowledge of advocacy models and leadership characteristics by earning a minimum of 85% on the research project and presentation. These assignments are related to specific aspects of the Mental Health Profession.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

All Mental Health Counseling students (a cohort of 28 students) enrolled in CPS 7000 (Consulting, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) demonstrated knowledge of advocacy models and leadership characteristics by earning a minimum of 85% on the research project and presentation. These assignments were related to specific aspects 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 demonstrate 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 by earning a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examinations.

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 demonstrate 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 by earning a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examinations.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of all students (a cohort of 28 students) enrolled in CPS 7500: Individual and Family Over the Lifespan demonstrated 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 by earning a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examinations.

**M 10: Midterm and Final Examination (CPS 8460: Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) (O: 8)**

90% of all students taking CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) will demonstrate knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior by earning 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) will demonstrate knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior by earning a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students (a cohort of 28 students) taking CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) demonstrated knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior by earning a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

**M 11: Midterm and Final Examination (CPS 8100: Psychobehavioral Diagnosis) (O: 9)**

90% of all Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 8100 will demonstrate knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior by earning 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 demonstrate knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior by earning a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Mental Health Counseling students (a cohort of 28 students) enrolled in CPS 8100 demonstrated knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior by earning a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 12: Suicide Assessment (O: 10)**
100% Mental Health Counseling students will demonstrate knowledge of crisis intervention and suicide prevention models, including the use of psychological first aid strategies by successfully completing a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% Mental Health Counseling students (a cohort of 28 students) demonstrated knowledge of crisis intervention and suicide prevention models, including the use of psychological first aid strategies by successfully completing a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: MHC Practicum and Internship Coordinator

**Monitor faculty and site supervisors**
Monitor faculty reports and encourage site supervisors to conduct the department Form 1015 in 10 areas of skill implementation while encouraging site supervisors to conduct skill evaluations in the practice of counseling.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Responsible Person/Group: MHC Practicum and Internship Coordinator and practicum/internship site supervisors

**Program Evaluation and Development 2011-12**
Mental Health Counseling Program faculty (core and affiliated) will meet annually to discuss the current status and future direction of the Mental Health Counseling program. Current academic and programmatic issues will be discussed and faculty will design future directions for curriculum development.

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

**Program Evaluation and Development 2012-13**
Mental Health Counseling Program faculty (core and affiliated) will meet annually to discuss the current status and future direction of...
the Mental Health Counseling program. Current academic and programmatic issues will be discussed and faculty will design future directions for curriculum development.

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

### Program faculty will maintain and monitor 2011-12
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes.

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

### Program faculty will maintain and monitor 2012-13
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes.

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

### Assessment of development in practicum/internship experiences 2013-14
The Clinical Mental Health Faculty will meet every semester to discuss student issues as they matriculate through the practicum and internship program. If faculty members express concern, the Coordinator of the program will meet with the student to discuss the aforementioned issues and ways to address faculty concerns.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**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:** In-Progress  
**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:** Finished  
**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MHC program faculty.

### Revise 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:** Medium  
**Responsible Person/Group:** MHC Practicum and Internship Coordinator

### Assessment and Evaluation of Practicum and Internship Experience 2015-16
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:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

### Program Evaluation and Development
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:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

---

### Revise Practicum and Internship Process

Program coordinator and key staff members of CPS will examine and revise process for MHC student matching with practicum and internship experience. The expectation is to increase the quality of training that students receive during practicum and internship while placed in community counseling settings. A procedure for matching students with sites will be developed that focuses on quality supervisory experiences that empowers both students and site supervisors.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Host focus groups with students and with site supervisors Reduce number of approved sites Ensure quality sites and diverse experiences via site visits to each approved site. Revise the practicum and internship orientation Revise practicum and internship handbook Host site-supervisor meet and greet with current students Revise (as needed) paperwork for practicum and internship to reflect these changes.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and key CPS staff members

---

### Student Evaluation and Development 2015-16

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MHC faculty

---

### Georgia State University  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2014-2015 Middle Level Education (LA and SS) TEEMS MAT**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Arts in Teaching program for Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty, which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the TEEMS program in Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. Specifically, at the program level, the MAT MLE TEEMS LA/SS program is designed to develop preservice teachers’ social studies and language arts content, education knowledge, professional dispositions, and ability to apply said knowledge in contemporary classroom settings to the benefit of a diverse student body at the middle level, grades 4-8.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Unique needs of middle level learners**

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

**G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners

**G 3: Innovative technology**

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who: 1. Are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; 2. Are knowledgeable of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning, instruction, and assessment 3. Use of innovative technology 4. Are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners 5. Believe that all students can learn and are advocates for their students 6. Are community-oriented educators 7. Pursue professional development as life-long learners
Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner (G: 1, 4, 5) (M: 3, 4)
Possess a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students.

SLO 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge in Language Arts and Social Studies with technology integration to create, implement, and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

SLO 3: Learning Environment (G: 1, 4, 5) (M: 3, 4)
Create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

SLO 4: Professional Community Oriented Educator (G: 5, 6, 7) (M: 3, 4, 6)
Demonstrate a) the belief that all students can learn b) advocacy on behalf of their students and profession, and c) an efficacious attitude as a global and community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

M 1: GACE II Content Area Exam Language Arts and Social Studies (O: 2)
Students must have a minimum of 12 credit hours in English coursework and 12 credit hours in Social Studies coursework in addition to advanced content coursework and must pass the GACE II content test in Middle Level Language Arts and Middle Level Social Studies before being recommended for certification.

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

Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts/Social Studies program will pass the GACE II content exams in middle level social studies and language arts.

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 IIII (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student’s mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors. The Teaching Evaluation rubrics are used twice during each student's program - at the midpoint of the program (before clinical practice) and at the end of the program (at the end of clinical practice). The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework, and the portion of the rubric that is used to assess Content Knowledge addresses the
following Conceptual Framework standard: CF 1.2. Data generated from reports of student performance in the area of Content Knowledge are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in preparing students who have a strong background in the areas of Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies.

Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will obtain a rating of “Effectively” or “Adequately” on the observation instrument used to assess their pedagogical content knowledge via teaching.

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.

Target for O3: Learning Environment

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

M 4: Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students’ clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students’ clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is 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 I) 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. This 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 candidate gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

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

Target for O1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" in their field work.

Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students’ field work.

Target for O3: Learning Environment

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students’ field work.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Improve Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

The majority of our students demonstrated effective and/or adequate pedagogical content connections, however at least one student fell below the acceptable target level. Faculty will assess the program via a scheduled program analysis in the Fall of 2013 to assess the presence/strength of pedagogical content knowledge and connections and determine if further curriculum needs to be developed in order to promote PCK and connections within the program coursework. Student performance indicators are strong, however, program coordinators and faculty can continue to focus and provide opportunity for students to improve their pedagogical content knowledge - which is in many ways the core of teaching. Integrative technology, content knowledge, and pedagogical strategies play a critical role in this area.

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

**Established Relationships**

- **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.

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

**Established Relationships**

- **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
## Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) in Middle-level Math-Science is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MAT Middle-level Math-Science program is to prepare educators who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

## Goals

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
1. Candidates will be seen as more knowledgeable others in their classrooms, in their schools, and in their communities with regard to their understandings of the content and ways of knowing within the disciplines of mathematics and science.

**G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions**
2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 4 - 8 mathematics and science classrooms.

**G 3: Impact on student learning**
3. Candidates will be reflective professionals with the capacity to analyze the effect that their teaching practices have on the learning of the students in their grades 4 - 8 mathematics and science classes.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all students.

**SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Candidates will be able use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.

**SLO 3: Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 3)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, parents, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

**SLO 4: Impact on Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 4)**
Candidates will reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

## Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Content Knowledge Assessment (O: 1)**
The measure for content knowledge is the student’s score on the Content section of the Midpoint Evaluation of Student Teaching.

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

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**
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 Stdev 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 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
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

### Additional support in professionalism

Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.

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

**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.

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

### Provide more support for students related to classroom management

The MAT MCE Math and Science students take two methods courses: One with a math focus and one with a science focus. It is difficult as it is for the instructors to prepare students in the methodologies specific to those two disciplines in single courses. And without a third course which could introduce general features of pedagogy such as notions of lesson planning, classroom management, etc., it falls on the instructors of the two methods courses to try to add that content in as well. As a result, it is likely that insufficient attention is being paid to those areas, because students have provided feedback to that effect. The preferred solution would be to find a way to add a third methods course such as exists in the MAT SCE Science program. However, until a way to do that with a schedule which is already over-crowded is determined, some kind of patchwork solutions will be required. One is to require students to read a book related to classroom management to go along with the discipline-specific methods books they are now required to read. Another is something that will be tried this semester: Bringing in a guest speaker (in this case a teacher trained in behavior management techniques). We will continue to look for other options.

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

**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
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 up their impact on their students' learning.

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Student Teaching Evaluation (O: 1)**
Students' knowledge and understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their chosen teaching fields is evaluated by their university supervisors via the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

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

**Target for O1: Candidates 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 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 score a level "3: 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 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: acceptable" or higher, while 50% of students will score at a level of "4: exceptional."

**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.

Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty
Additional Resources: None

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.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
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.

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.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Teacher Work Sample Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Candidates plan, implement, and reflect upon instruction.
The Department of World Languages and Cultures (formerly 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. The department's faculty has been reviewing the mission and goals of our language programs. This is work in progress. The following is a version (not final) of what the new mission and goals of the core curriculum: The mission of the language programs, especially as reflected in the three main languages --German, French, and Spanish-- is to prepare students for the intercultural challenges of the global landscape by pursuing the acquisition of functional language proficiency and cultural competency that can assist them both academically (if they want to continue to pursue language studies or the study of related fields) and professionally after graduation.

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.

G 2: Assessment interview at the end of the 2001
Students studying German, French, and Spanish will be able to participate in a brief (about 10-minute) unplanned conversation with their instructor towards the end of their third semester (2001 level) and show language proficiency that is satisfactory. Students will be assessed in several areas (see attached rubric). A minimum average score of 80% will be considered as minimum evidence of appropriate progress, that is, the student is progressing satisfactorily toward the goal of functional command of the target language. The results for the 2013-2016 cycle are not available at the time of submission of the current 2014-2015 report.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: ORAL COMMUNICATION (G: 1) (M: 1)
Since 2008, the three major languages in the department have been conducting student-instructor interviews at the end of the 2001 level (third semester of language study) during regular semesters in Lower Division. These interviews have been quantified and the results have been used to assess each language program. This assessment has been done in cycles of three years (which is why the results for the 2014-2015 cycle are not available until after the current 2014-2015 cycle. The latest quantitative results were completed in 2013. The current cycle for this assessment will be completed in 2016.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Oral interview with students completing 2001 and 2002 levels. (O: 1)
The oral interview is a conversation (See Oral Interview Outline and Oral Interview Rubric in the Appendices) of about 10 to 15 minutes in which a student completing the 2001 and the 2002 levels talk with an interviewer (his or her own language instructor) about topics of general interest. The interview takes place the last two weeks of the semester. French and German have interviewed all the students taking Span 2001 and 2002, but Spanish, a significantly larger program, has made an effort since 2010 to interview about 25% of the student population in Spanish 2001 and 2002 (See the Results Summary in the Appendices).

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O1: ORAL COMMUNICATION
We expect students to receive a score of at least 8.0 in each category on the rubric.

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

Develop fluency
These results will be used to identify the best tasks for the classroom to increase fluency, an aspect often overlooked in first-year classes. It is expected that the information will help develop lessons on formulaic sequences, paraphrasing, and other real language strategies that are usually neglected in the lower-level language classes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lower Division Spanish instructors

A faculty meeting for review of findings and planning a course of action
During Fall 2011 a meeting with faculty from all languages will take place (date to be determined) in order to review and discuss the results and findings. The WEAVE reporter, also the LOA group leader, will then suggest to focus on the following: 1. Ways to ensure a sample population of at least 25% of the students in every language. 2. To include the 2002 level for French and German starting in Spring 2012. 3. To minimize, and if possible eliminate, the need for the interviews to be done on a purely voluntary basis. For a more reliable assessment of the program, there should be a mechanism that can guarantee a random but reliable sample population. 4. Importantly, to identify innovations and changes to the MCL language program(s) that can reduce the number of students in need of improvement. The plan above was implemented fully and a new meeting is now set for Fall 2013. The LOA committee will now review all the quantitative data and suggest further course of action. The LOA leader for Lower Division courses will suggest that the interviews be continued and that new forms of measurement be added--for instance, DFW rates and student evaluations. Also, new
forms of measurement should be added to include assessment of 'interpersonal communication' and 'presentational communication,' two aspects of language mastery that will require some additions to course design in MCL Lower Division courses. The additions will mainly consist of creating instances --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 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 interview) 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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Multiple and Severe Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the five concentrations in Multiple and Severe Disabilities (Autism, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, Moderate, Severe, and Profound Intellectual Disabilities, and Physical and Health Disabilities), is to prepare graduate level teachers who are grounded in research-based curriculum development, instructional technology, data collection and interpretation, and the ethical foundations of the profession. The program prepares teachers to be responsive to the learning needs of students, the concerns and questions of parents, and the collaborative needs of related professionals. The program provides students with recommendation for certification in its respective areas (e.g., Special Education: General Curriculum, Special Education: Adapted Curriculum, 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

N = 15 11 scored below 3; 4 scored @ 3 or above Range = 2 – 4 Mean = 2.37

N = 15 11 scored below 3; 4 scored @ 3 or above Range = 2 – 4 Mean = 2.37

---

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 19 7 scored below 3; 12 scored @ 3 or above Range = 1.6 – 4 Mean = 2.86

---

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

N = 33 1 scored below 3; 32 scored @ 3 or above Range = 2.9 – 3.9 Mean = 3.15

---

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

N = 37 15 scored below 3; 22 scored @ 3 or above Range = 1.5 – 4 Mean = 3.03
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Current data collection
Indicators for weaved 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.

Action Plan for Lesson Plans
On average students met the objective of 90% for this assessment but that does not meet expectations. We are in the process of moving our key assessments from the previous procedures to new assessments that will align with the edTPA, which students must complete prior to becoming certified. We had considered that perhaps 90% was too ambitious of a percentage because only 60% met the criterion, but because lesson planning is such an important feature of a teacher’s repertoire of skills, we decided not to reduce our expectations. We will compare the old lesson plan rating system with the new lesson plan rating system to make sure that the new one has sufficient rigor. Students are receiving special instruction by our edTPA coordinator in creating plans that will allow them to perform successfully on the edTPA and so we will see in the 2015-16 data if this has made a difference in the percentage set next time around.

Action Plan for Teaching Sequence
We will bring this topic up for discussion and we will also randomly interview 3 non-BLD students to ask them for feedback. We will also determine if they took the course too early in their programs of study.

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?

Indicators for Weave Data for MSD students were not as strong in 2014-15 and in the previous year. Students went down in the area of lesson planning, with only 60% meeting target, whereas the goal was 90%. We sent the target intentionally high as lesson planning is an essential skill for all teachers. The mean score was 3.03 out of 4, with a range of 1.5 to 4, and so many of the students are achieving our target. Yes, lesson planning is so central to what a teacher does that we established an action plan. One very important recent change this Fall, 2015 is that the edTPA has become consequential for all students. As a result we have initiated a series of student training sessions that includes discussion of lesson planning in preparation for the edTPA. We think this will have a positive impact on students’ performance on the lesson plan rubric. This is because they will get a significant amount of instruction in this area immediately upon entering the program AND will continue to receive additional supports throughout all their methods courses.

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 educational programs have undergone significant changes this year. We were required by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission to differentiate between an MAT and an MEd program. We submitted the paperwork to make these changes in Fall of 2014 and were granted permission to offer these differentiated programs in summer of 2015. During the planning process for the MAT/MEd separation we reviewed many course syllabi and differentiated task expectations between the two populations. We have established several action plans for this cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Sequence</td>
<td>Lesson Plan</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Special Education Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.</td>
<td>Effectively plans for instruction.</td>
<td>Compare old lesson plan assessment with new to make sure we are expecting the same rigor.</td>
<td>We will bring this topic up for discussion and we will also randomly interview 3 non-BLD students to ask them for feedback. We will also determine if they took the course too early in their programs of study.</td>
<td>We will bring this topic up for discussion and we will also randomly interview 3 non-BLD students to ask them for feedback. We will also determine if they took the course too early in their programs of study.</td>
<td>Drs. Emerson, Jimenez, Tullis, and Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
just this semester implemented these changes into the university catalog and will most likely not see a change in enrollment sufficient to allow us to speculate on the effectiveness of this strategy for a year or two. This programmatic differentiation occurred simultaneously with the implementation of edTPA preparation and so we shall see next year and the year after that if those two sweeping actions allowed us to move our indicators forward. Our stated action plan for last year was to focus on Content Pedagogy. This area is also related to lesson planning in that the better one understands content and its related pedagogy, the more effectively one can plan.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most important accomplishments for year**—briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Differentiation between MAT and MEd. Implementation of edTPA preparation.

**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.
See previous.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
All assessment measures are being changed from the old Key Assessments to the new edTPA assessment rubric.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
no modifications of intended outcomes

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

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
See Digital Measures data for faculty.

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
See Digital Measures data for faculty.

**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 an extensive recruitment plan and a Student Support procedure for counseling struggling students.

**Service to the External Community**—Note here any initiatives or activities of your department that impact the external community (e.g., providing assistance to needy populations).
See Digital Measures data for faculty.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Music Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

The Spring 2015 sections of this class had 105 students enrolled. Of those 9 scored a 3 or 4 (unacceptable) on the rubric and 95 scored a 1 or 2 (acceptable). Thus 90% received an acceptable rubric.

## 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

### 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

### Consistency Through Sections

A conversation will begin today about using the established rubric consistently through each of the sections of this class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **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?

We believe that the target is an appropriate one and that the rubric being used is a good one. Our data over the last four cycles shows that we met our target twice, didn’t meet it once and did not assess once. We feel that at least one more cycle of data is 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.

A conversation will begin today among the faculty members who teach Music, Society and Culture about adopting the given rubric for assessment within each section of the class. We believe that this is a strong step forward for assessing student learning.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Music Bachelors**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST)

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

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that is consistent with the urban context and mission of Georgia State University and to serve the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellent through experiences of lasting value to all stakeholders.

### Goals

**G 1: Common Body of Knowledge**

All students will possess a common body of knowledge in music.

**G 2: Essential Competencies, Experiences and Opportunities**

All students will possess a set of essential competencies and will receive essential experiences and opportunities.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Performance (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)**

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In the summer 2015 section of this course 15 students were enrolled. Of the 15, all received an assessment of Outstanding on their last conducting assessment. This represents 100% of the class.

**M 2: Repertoire Analysis (O: 4)**

Programs are reviewed for diversity of genres, eras, composers, and styles.
Target for O4: History and Repertory

All students (100%) enrolled in our classical, majority music major, large ensembles (Wind Orchestra, Symphonic Wind Ensemble, University Orchestra, University Singers) will perform music from at least 3 of the style periods (Medieval/Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, 20th Century - present) during each two-year cycle beginning in odd years (2013/14 and 2014/15; 2015/16 and 2016/17; etc.).

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Students enrolled in Wind Orchestra, Symphonic Wind Ensemble and University Orchestra performed repertoire from 4 style periods during the two-year period in question. Students in University Singers performed repertoire from all 5 style periods.

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. REVISION - WE HAVE REVISED THE TARGET TO 80%.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

For the Spring 2014/2015 Academic Year (fall, spring, summer) 37 students were enrolled. Of those 28 received a 1, none received a 2, 2 received a 3, none received a 4 and 7 received a 5. We did not meet our revised target of 80% of students receiving a 1 or a 2. Only 75% received a 1 or 2.

M 5: Wind Orchestra Performance Evaluation (O: 1)

The GSU Wind Orchestra is an ensemble comprised of primarily music majors with some non-major participation. The ensemble gives two concerts per semester. Midway through the preparation of each concert each student provides a recording of selected excerpts from his/her music. The performance is graded according to a rubric developed by the instructor. The grading is quite rigorous. Simply playing the correct notes and rhythms will result in a rating of 3 out of 5 (with 1 being the highest). It is expected that 80% of the students will receive a rating of 3 or higher on this evaluation.

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

Target for O1: Performance

The ensemble gives two concerts per semester. Midway through the preparation of each concert each student provides a recording of selected excerpts from his/her music. The performance is graded according to a rubric developed by the instructor. The grading is quite rigorous. Simply playing the correct notes and rhythms will result in a rating of 3 out of 5 (with 1 being the highest). It is expected that 80% of the students will receive a rating of 3 or higher on this evaluation.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

Thirty-six students participated in the first playing evaluation of the semester. Their ratings were as follows: 1 - 6 students 2 - 7 students 3 - 14 students 4 - 2 students 5 - 7 students Twenty-seven (75%) of the thirty-six students received a rating of 3 or higher. Therefore the target was not met on this cycle.

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

Expanded Repertoire Planning to Other Areas
The band area meets regularly to discuss and plan repertoire for its large ensembles. An action item is to encourage the Choir/Opera area to do the same after which similar measures can be made in this area. Should this prove successful we can then consider expanding this to the entire School of Music.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

Pre-Test/Post-Test and Expansion to Symphonic Wind Ensemble
We would like to add a post-test to measure any changes in playing. One possible post-test is the performance itself, however it is often difficult to discriminate each player separately when an ensemble of 60 is playing. One could say that if the performance is of a high level then the majority of the musicians must be in the "1" category. However, this is not a very robust measure. An actual post-test would give a more accurate assessment of student learning during the given rehearsal cycle. We will commit to (1) doing a traditional pre-test/post-test for a select number of students in Wind Orchestra and (2) will expand the testing to include Symphonic Wind Ensemble which is our most elite wind band on campus.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Basic Improvisation Performance
- **Outcome/Objective:** Improvisation

- **Implementation Description:** As above
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Robert Ambrose, Chester Phillips
- **Additional Resources:** None
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 1 - PERFORMANCE 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 Related Courses: APXX - Applied Instruction MUS 1060/3060 - Wind Ensemble MUS 1061/3061 - Wind Orchestra MUS 1062/3062 - Concert Band MUS 1063/3063 - Marching Band MUS 1070/3070 - Orchestra MUS 1080A/3080A - University Singers MUS 1081/3081 - Choral Union MUS 1083/3083 - Master Singers MUS 1090/3090 - Jazz Band MUS 1540 - Aurral Skills I MUS 1550 - Aurral Skills II MUS 1710/1720 - Group Instruction in Piano III/IV MUS 1730/1740 - Group Instruction in Voice MUS 1750/1760 - Group Instruction in Guitar MUS 2540 - Aurral Skills III MUS 2550 - Aurak Skills IV MUS 2710/2720 - Group Instruction in Piano III/V MUS 3300 - Recital I MUS 3071 - Collaborative Piano MUS 3100 - Opera Workshop MUS 3105 - Acting for Singers MUS 3110 - Brass Ensemble MUS 3120 - Chamber Music for Strings MUS 3130 - Chamber Music for Woodwinds MUS 3140 - Percussion Ensemble MUS 3150 - Guitar Ensemble MUS 3160 - Jazz Combos MUS 4000 - Recital II MUS 4010 - Performance Laboratory MUS 4011 - Singing in Italian and Latin MUS 4021 - Singing in German MUS 4031 - Singing in French MUS 4041 - Singing in English MUS 4360 - Advanced Keyboard Skills MUS 4760 - Advanced Keyboard Harmony MUS 4770 - Advanced Aural Skills STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 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. Related Courses: MUS 1430 - Fundamentals of Music MUS 1440 - Theory I MUS 1450 - Theory II MUS 2440 - Theory III MUS 2450 - Theory IV MUS 4450 - Advanced Tonal Analysis MUS 4460 - Analysis of Post-Tonal Music MUS 4792 - Jazz Theory STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 3 - COMPOSITION Students must acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music Related Courses: MUS 4110 - Instrumentation and Orchestration MUS 4140 - Arranging for Chorus MUS 4170 - Arranging for Large Jazz Ensemble MUS 4210 - Composition Seminar MUS 4980 - Electroacoustic Music Composition MUS 4981 - Computer Music MUS 4982 - Advanced Topics in Computer Music STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 4 - HISTORY AND REPERTORY Students must acquire basic knowledge of music history and repertoires through the present time. Related Courses: MUS 1101 to 1106 - Concert Attendance I to VI MUS 4800 - Music History Antiquity to Baroque MUS 4810 - Music History Classical to Present MUS 4820 - World Music MUS 4500 - Historical Counterpoint MUS 4610 - Piano Literature MUS 4620 - Vocal Literature MUS 4640 - Choral Literature MUS 4660 - Dramatic Music MUS 4910 - Chamber Literature MUS 4940 - Orchestral Literature MUS 4941 - Orchestral Literature II STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 5 - CONDUCTING Students must be a competent conductor Related Courses: MUS 2490 - Basic Conducting MUS 4480 - Choral Conducting MUS 4490 - Instrumental Conducting STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 6 - IMPROVISATION Students must acquire the skills to improvise at a rudimentary leve Related Courses: MUS 2780 - Beginning Jazz Improvisation I MUS 2790 - Beginning Jazz Improvisation II MUS 3010 - Basic Improvisation MUS 3050 - New Music Ensemble MUS 4790 - Advanced Jazz Improvisation I MUS 4791 - Advanced Jazz Improvisation II

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?

Significance of Findings Conducting Proficiency - We have met our target each year that this measure was assessed since 2012/2013. Perhaps that means the target is too low, that it's not a good measure, or that we're doing a great job of teaching conducting. Repertoire Analysis - We learned that for a School of our size, very large, we need to systematically track repertoire in order to assure that students are exposed to a variety of styles throughout their tenure Piano Proficiency - Although this target has not yet been measured, increased discussion among the faculty about piano proficiency has revealed that there are vastly different opinions within the piano faculty and that this faculty, as a whole, feels that it makes a reasonable final assessment for piano. It will be interesting to see how this plays out. Basic Improvisation - We have learned that the target is too high. Even with a lowered target for this past assessment cycle we still did not meet our target Wind Orchestra Performance Evaluation - Learned that the level of individual playing in the ensemble is significantly lower when than when the individuals play together as an ensemble.

Strengths/Weaknesses Many in the performance area use subjective evaluation and assessment. Academic faculty may be more interested to embrace assessment than performance faculty. Impact One of the most tangible results of the assessment process has been the creation of rubrics for various performance evaluations. Creating such rubrics are difficult because performance evaluation is extremely subjective. The fact that several faculty have embraced this idea and have created a rubrics shows a very strong step in the right direction for the School relative to 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.

Current Year Action Items 1. We believe that the new measure of performance ability with the Wind Orchestra is a powerful one. In order to make it even more robust the Wind Orchestra and Symphonic Wind Ensemble will adopt a pre-test/post-test model for a selected number of students in order to compare assessment ratings at two different times in the semester on the same music. These assessments will begin in the first concert cycle of the Spring 2016 semester. 2. We plan to expand the scope of repertoire meetings to include other areas with multiple large ensemble. Potential further expansion could include the School’s chamber music program as well. 3. We do not currently have a plan to address the fact that we repeatedly miss our target relative to Basic Improvisation. The instructor is a master improvisation teacher and we believe that the rubric is solid.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Music Masters
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
16 out of 16 (100%) passed their recital jury on the first try.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
24 of 27 (88%) received a 3 or 4 on the project. Scale: 1. Not adequate. 2. Adequate, but below expectations. 3. Meets expectations. 4. Exceeds expectations.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Review Research Objectives and Measures
Review the Research Objective and Measures for appropriateness.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies/Area Coordinators of Music History and Music Theory

Revise Rubrics
Revise current rubrics for recital jury.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
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

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 2014-2015 academic year, the instructor for MUS 8000: Provided time and opportunity for students to resubmit their assignment in order to earn the minimum criteria of 3. Meets Expectations This allowed the School of Music to meet its goal, following its own recommendations for improvement from last year’s WEAVE report.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

This information will shared with faculty and administration at the next School of Music faculty meeting. Faculty will be invited to further analyze findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Neuroscience PhD
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the neuroscience doctoral program in the Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State University is to promote research and education in the set of disciplines that have a common interest in understanding the structure and function of the nervous systems of animals, including humans. 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.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students write and orally defend a comprehensive plan of future research that details the rationale, methods, and procedures for the proposed dissertation research. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

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.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

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.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

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

#### No actions planned due to infancy of the graduate program
This program was approved by the Board of Regents in November, 2009 and the first cohort of students was admitted in January, 2010. As this program is still new, no actions are planned at this time.

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

#### New program with action plan in development
This program is still new and the first cohort of students were admitted in January 2010 with two additional cohorts admitted in August 2010 and 2011. Due to the infancy of this program we are still developing our action plan. In addition to reviewing student performance on their Qualifying exams, and dissertation defense we are working on the following action items: 1. Continued enhanced Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR) training. RCR training is required by the National Institutes of Health and may soon be required by the National Science Foundation as part of graduate student training. This training is designed to expose students to best ethical practices for conducting research. We are teaching our first “official” graduate RCR course (Intro to Graduate Studies) and data collected from this course will verify that we are in compliance with RCR guidelines and can used if we decide to apply for graduate training grants in the future. 2. We have had two cohorts of students take the new Neuroscience PhD qualifying exam. After reviewing the Milestone Evaluation forms we have determined that we will better be able to assess student performance if we separate out the oral exam scores from the written exam scores. We will revise this document in Fall 2011. 3. Using the revised Milestone Evaluation form we will be able to delve deeper into specific indicators of student performance instead of just focusing on overall global scores. Using a more in-depth analysis of data from the Milestone Evaluation forms we will be able to better determine if our students are adequately prepared for the exam as well as determine if assessments used in our Core courses are sufficient in training our students in the scientific process. 4. We propose to implement Professional Development courses and workshops for our students to better prepare them for conference presentations, job interviews, enhancing teaching performance etc. 5. As part of the interdisciplinary nature of our PhD program we worked with the Philosophy Dept. to develop a “Concentration in Neuroethics” that our students can voluntarily participate as a way of enhancing their graduate training.

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

#### 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

#### Quality in Exam Action Plan consists of taking one class earlier in the program and increased mentoring.
To better prepare students for the Qualifying Exam we have moved the requirement to take the “Survival Skills” Scientific Thinking and Proposal Writing Course (Neur 6600) from the second semester of year two in the program to the second semester of year one in the program. Students need to be exposed to grant writing and scientific thinking earlier in the program and more often. We have also incorporated additional proposal writing and scientific methodology more consistently into our introductory curriculum. The student who did not complete the qualifying exam in Spring 2013 after the first attempt received additional writing and experimental design guidance from her graduate mentor.
Students will take proposal writing class in second semester of program.

To better prepare students for the Qualifying Exam we have moved the requirement to take the "Survival Skills" Scientific Thinking and Proposal Writing Course (Neur 6600) from the second semester of year two in the program to the second semester of year one in the program. Students need to be exposed to grant writing and scientific thinking earlier in the program and more often. We have also incorporated additional proposal writing and scientific methodology more consistently into our introductory curriculum. The student who did not complete the qualifying exam in Spring 2013 after the first attempt received additional writing and experimental design guidance from her graduate mentor.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies
Additional Resources: None

Time 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 medical issues. The other student had problems handling the increased expectations of balancing classes and research. Both students received additional mentoring and time-management advice and will continue in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Annual Review | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Additional Resources: None

---
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---

**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 Research will complete a literature search activity paper on a topic related to nursing. Students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points on the rubric.


**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 evidenced 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).

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O7: Exit Survey**
85% of the graduating seniors who complete the exit survey will indicate that they felt satisfactorily to excellently prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).

**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" (program outcome).

The Assistant Director for External Affairs will continue to develop a reliable data base for BFLSON graduates. Once a reliable data base is obtained and the question is reviewed for clarity, a repeat survey can be addressed. The graduates will be encouraged to become and stay engaged with the BFLSON. This will be accomplished by the continued publication of the bi-annual newsletter, and a potential social activity. New graduates will be encouraged to become and stay active with the BFLSON alumni group. For this to happen, an up-to-date reliable data base must be developed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is the end of the academic year. This will give the Assistant Director for External Affairs time to develop a reliable data base.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The Assistant Director for External Affairs
- **Additional Resources:** A graduate assistant is requested to assist with the development and upkeep of the data base. We request a graduate assistant for the fall, spring, and summer semesters.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $5,000.00 (recurring)

**Critical Thinking Exam**
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will evaluate the characteristics of the class of Fall 2008 to determine if they were significantly different from the class of Summer 2008 and Spring 2009 in aspects of GPA, number of course failures during the program, and success on the exit exam. The committee will determine if students need to continue to take a separate critical thinking exam, as the exit exam is an assessment of critical thinking. Perhaps the students are not motivated to achieve maximum success on a separate critical thinking exam.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam
  - Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam
- **Implementation Description:** This is the end of the next academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
Additional Resources: None at this time

CTW NURS 2080
NURS 2080 will develop clearer objectives related to this writing project. Consistent graders for each student's paper will be initiated Fall 2009. All graders will meet in the beginning of the semester to discuss issues noted the previous semester. One instructor will review all papers for a consistent numeric grade.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: By the end of Fall 2009 semester, these changes will be in place.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
Additional Resources: None at this time

CTW NURS 4600
We will continue to monitor the CTW assignment in NURS 4600 for continued achievement of target goal.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: CTW NURS 4600 | Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor for this academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty assigned to NURS 4600
Additional Resources: None at this time

Evidence Based Practice
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON with guidance from the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) will continue to monitor this measure. Course instructors in NURS 3610 and NURS 3710 will be instructed to continue to require this writing assignment. Bases on the reasons the course instructor gave for student's failure the following areas will be studied:
1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment
2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment
3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly
4. Students do not comply with the APA format
5. English is not the student's primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing.

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

Implementation Description: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee along with input from the UPC
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The UPC
Additional Resources: None at this time

Exit Survey
This question on the exit survey will be reworded when the survey is revised the next time. It is the opinion of The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON that the graduates may not understand the intent of this question on the current survey. The committee will evaluate if the question(s) need clarification, or if there are too many variables, and the graduates may not understand what is being asked. Additionally by grouping the variables, if a student feels lacking on one variable, but not the others, they may answer negatively because of the one area lacking, and the other areas may not be lacking. The The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will assess the questionnaire.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Exit Survey | Outcome/Objective: Exit Survey

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program
Additional Resources: None at this time

Literature Search Committee
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the literature search activity.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Literature Search Activity Paper | Outcome/Objective: Literature Search Activity

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The course administrator for NURS
**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 and the Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program
- **Additional Resources:** None at this time

**Research Article Critique**
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the article critique.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Research Article Critique | Outcome/Objective: Research Article Critique
- **Implementation Description:** This is the end of the next academic year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Course administrators of NURS 3500
- **Additional Resources:** None at this time

**Clinical narrative papers generated from NURS2080**
It is commendable that the target was exceeded for Spring 2011. However the target was not met for the Fall 2010 class. This years overall score was significantly improved from the last cycle. for this reason the UG program coordinator has met with the faculty involved in this course and reviewed practices. Continued surveillance will result and

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW
- **Implementation Description:** Course faculty will continue to stress the importance of critical thinking through writing.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course administrator of NURS2080 in conjunction with the UG program coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None at this time

**Critical thinking exit activity**
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee along with the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) will determine a method to ensure students take this exit activity seriously. This standardized test is currently associated with NURS4610.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam
- **Implementation Description:** A grade associated with NURS4610 will encourage students to seriously consider this exam.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010

**Evidence Based Paper Success**
The faculty member responsible for this target identified the following reasons why students are not successful achieving the minimum score on this assignment. 1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment. 2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment. 3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly. 4. Students do not comply with the APA format. 5. English is not the student’s primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing. The faculty member will consult with the Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee and the Undergraduate Program Committee to identify a mechanism to achieve this target.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course Administrator NURS3610 and NURS3710 The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee Undergraduate Program Committee

**NCLEX pass rate assessment**
While the target of 85% was achieved, 89.29% was a drop from the previous year. The undergraduate program committee along with the undergraduate program coordinator, will explore the characteristics of those students who were unsuccessful to determine if any
curriculum or advisement changes need to occur.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

Implementation Description: see above
Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate program committee undergraduate program coordinator
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add weight to the Exit test
The course administrator has added consequences to this test. The students did improve on this measure, yet the goal of 85% has not been reached. The students will continue to have consequences related to this standarized test. The course administrator will continue to make sure the students are aware of the consequences and make sure the consequences are significant enough to warrant attention to this exit activity.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam

Implementation Description: Added weight and attention to the exit activity will be imploemented by the course administrator.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator along with consultation from the UG program coordinator.
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continued observation of 2080 writing assignment
It is commendable that the target was exceeded for Spring 2011. However the target was not met for the Fall 2010 class. This year 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 asisgnment 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
**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 Credentialing Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health); National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners; National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
At the end-of-program, 96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated that they exceeded/met the program objective.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated they are able to do this very well/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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

93% (28/30) of masters and certificate students indicated that they exceeded/met this goal. 1 student was neutral and 1 student did not meet.

### M2: 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 clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated they are able to do this very well/well. 4% indicated moderated.

### Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice

See measure 1, target/finding 5.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

93% (28/30) of masters and certificate students indicated that they exceeded/met this goal. 1 student was neutral and 1 student did not meet.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

93% (28/30) of masters and certificate students indicated that they exceeded/met this goal. 1 student was neutral and 1 student did not meet.

### 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated exceeded/met this objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice according to end-of-program evaluation.

### M3: 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.

### M4: 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

#### 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.

### M6: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
96% (29/30) of masters and certificates students indicated that they exceeded/met this program objective.

Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice
See Measure 6, target/objective 9

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated exceeded/met this objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice according to end-of-program evaluation.

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.

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.

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

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.

M 9: Practice in Specialty Area (O: 1, 9, 9)
We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target for O1: Professional Commitment
At end-of-program, 80% of the masters students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment as reported on the end-of-program survey

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
At the end-of-program, 96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated that they exceeded/met the program objective

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated exceeded/met this objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice according to end-of-program evaluation.

Target for O9: Practice in Specialty Area
Graduates (90%) of the master's program and post master's certificate students will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
For year 2014/2015 21 alumni were surveyed; 19 responded. 90% are practicing in their area of specialization and 2 students are not.

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.

**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.

**M 11: Professional Membership (O: 1, 11)**

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Professional Commitment**

At end-of-program, 80% of the masters students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment as reported on the end-of program survey.

**Target for O11: Professional Membership**

Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will report membership in professional nursing organizations (80%).

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

96% (29/30) of masters and certificate students indicated they are able to do this very well/well. 4% indicated moderately well.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

93% (28/30) indicated that they exceeded/met this objective. 2 students were neutral.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

90% (2730) of masters graduates and certificate students indicates that they exceeded/met this objective. 2 students were neutral and 1 student did not meet this 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 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 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 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 for 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 2014-15): 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 worked on changing our goals and objectives for the upcoming assessment year. This is to be in line with the changes in program essentials at the professional level nationally. Please see attached curriculum map for new goals that will be addressed in the new cycle.

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 have a very strong, rigorous program as evidenced by graduation and completion rates. National exam certification rates across all programs range from 90-100%. Of the five major goals, all objectives were met and remain consistent for the past 3 years. There have been no recent changes in the educational program. Strengths: assessment methods and data are easy to obtain while students are in the program. Weaknesses: it is very difficult to obtain alumni data. Even using all tools at our disposal, i.e., internet survey, mail out, and telephone, it's difficult to reach students at 3 and 5 years. They have either moved, changed email or phone number, or are too busy to fill out a survey.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 all assessments are shared individually with faculty, staff, and students. The Master's Program committee is the primary...
Goals

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.

Annual Report Section Responses

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

Obtaining CCNE for the post-master's certificate program. No compliance issues identified.

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.

Relooking and revising learning outcomes for the program to comply with the most current essentials of Master's education.

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

Senate committee: Paula Gordon Dawn Aycock Joann Bacon

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


Service to the External Community--Note here any initiatives or activities of your department that impact the external community (e.g., providing assistance to needy populations).

Nursing Collaboration Back to school physical exams to children in homeless shelters Physical exams to children in Head Start Programs in the Atlanta metro area Community Health Nursing Basic nursing care to homeless shelters and transition homes for women
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Research Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of graduates will complete and defend the dissertation. 100% of dissertation topics will focus on health or health care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Research Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% of students will apply and receive funding for their research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Research Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% of students will disseminate research findings at state, regional, national or international conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Leaders of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of graduates will accept positions as leaders of change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Leaders of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of graduates will accept positions as leaders of change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of graduates will accept leadership positions as leaders in health care organizations, universities and health policy positions regionally and nationally.

**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:** Ptiene 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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Nutrition BS**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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**
1. Students are able to demonstrate how to locate, interpret, evaluate and use professional literature to make ethical evidence-based practice decisions. 2. Students are able to use current information technologies to locate and apply evidence-based guidelines and protocols, such as Evidence Analysis Library of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, National Guideline Clearinghouse Web sites. 3. Students are able to locate, understand and apply established guidelines to a professional practice.

Relevant Associations: Goal 1 and 2

**SLO 2: Professional Practice Expectations: beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviors for the professional dietitian level of practice**

1. Students are able to demonstrate effective and professional oral and written communication and documentation and use of current information technologies when communicating with individuals, groups and the public. 2. Students are able to demonstrate assertiveness, advocacy and negotiation skills appropriate to the situation.

Relevant Associations: Goal 2

**SLO 3: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and popula (M: 2)**

Students are able to use the nutrition care process to make decisions, to identify nutrition-related problem and determine and evaluate nutrition interventions, including medical nutrition therapy, disease prevention and health promotion.

**SLO 4: Practice Management and Use of Resources**

Students are able to apply management and business theories and principles to the development, marketing and delivery of programs or services.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate science understanding (M: 2)**

Students are able to demonstrate an understanding of the influence of chemical, microbiological, and physiological disciplines as they affect food and nutrition.

**SLO 6: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle (M: 2, 3)**

1. Students are able to apply knowledge of the role of environment, and food and lifestyle choices to develop interventions to affect change and enhance wellness in diverse individuals and groups. 2. Students are able to develop an educational session or program educational strategy for a target population. 3. Students are able to demonstrate counseling techniques to facilitate behavior change.

**SLO 7: Integrate social sciences (M: 3)**

1. Students are able to explain the impact of a public policy position on dietetics practice. 2. Students are able to explain the impact of health care policy and administration, different health care delivery systems and current reimbursement issues, policies and regulations on food and nutrition services.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Paper (O: 1)**

This paper is a component of the capstone Critical Thinking through Writing course (NUTR 4950). It is completed in stages, with two revision cycles. The paper had one revision prior to formulation of the final paper. Two components of the evaluation rubric are used for this evaluation: rationale and content. Each of these is evaluated on a scale of basic (0-2), proficient (4), and mastery (6). Ninety percent of students should receive a proficient score on rubric for final draft of the research paper. Rubric is located in depository.

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

**Target for O1: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice**

The target for organization is all students meet or exceed proficiency (4) with a mean class score of 80% or above.

The target for content is all students meet or exceed proficiency (4) with a mean class score of 80% or above.

These targets are set without benefit of baseline data because this is the first year of implementation.

**M 2: Discipline-specific Critical Thinking (O: 1, 3, 5, 6)**

Critical thinking is essential for dietetic practitioners. This ACEND-accredited program focuses on preparing dietetic practitioners. The measure used for this assessment is direct measures of student performance on specific, critical thinking assignments. Assessment Method for 2012-2013 1. Ninety percent of the junior students in NUTR 3600 (Life Cycle Nutrition) receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments. 2. Ninety percent of the junior students in NUTR 4600 (FoodService Systems) receive at least 80% or better on the Human Resources case study. 3. Ninety percent of the senior students in NUTR 4200 (Medical Nutrition Therapy) receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 (Food Service Systems) receive at least 80% or better on the Human Resources case study.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate science understanding**

b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Public Policy (O: 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. There is not good documentation of strong participation by each group member and/or some 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 incomplete 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle**

Ninety percent of the students receive at least 80% on their group project.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Operations Management MS**

(Does not include those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

Operations Management (OM) focuses on the management of resources, capabilities and processes that produce and deliver the goods and services for customers. OM can play a critical role in enhancing a company’s competitive position by providing superior products and services. The Operations Management MS program is offered for the purpose of developing an in-depth knowledge base regarding operations, logistics and supply chain management.

**Goals**

G 1: Depth of OM study

The primary goal of the MS Concentration in Operations Management program is to develop students who have an in-depth knowledge relative to operations, logistics and supply chain management. Secondarily, an understanding of the use of the tools and techniques available for correcting and measuring key performance indicators. Examples are inventory turns, days of inventory available, working capital measures, Operating efficiency, Productivity, ROI, TQM and Six sigma.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Develop a Strategic View of OM (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The ability to analyze and evaluate alternative operations tactics and strategies for a given business environment and to identify the appropriate capacity, facility capabilities & locations, product, service and process design, organizational design and process technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.

**SLO 2: Develop Decision Making Abilities (M: 4)**

Normal 0 false false 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.

**SLO 3: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint (M: 5)**

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.

**SLO 4: Become a Strong Team Member (M: 6)**
### Student Objective

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.

### 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.

<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.

<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>

**Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM**

- 80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Learning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 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 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 excels at identifying critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to easily assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students excel at analyzing or understanding how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment.

<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>

**Target for O2: Develop Decision Making Abilities**

- Student should pass each outcome/objective as indicated by satisfactory work on course exams.

<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>

**Target for O3: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint**
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Leaning Objective 3: Develop a Environmental/Substantiality Viewpoint Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceeds standards=3 Measure 5 Environmental Impact Evaluation The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an excellent understanding of the environment impact of OM or are easily able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.

### M 6: Team Skills (O: 4)

The student should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress.

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

**Target for O4: Become a Strong Team Member**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Objective 4: Become a Strong Team Member Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceeds standards=3 Measure 6 Team Skills The student did not develop team skills by indicated by poor returns on peer evaluations. The student develops team skills by indicated by average returns on peer evaluations. The student develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations.

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

#### A strategic view of OM

With respect to the first learning outcome, to develop a strategic view of OM, two actions will be taken: · In MGS 8710, add a homework assignment to ask students aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering. · In MGS 8710, add a case about operations making significant difference for a company' long term growth. Evaluate after next offering.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management Faculty Members
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Decision Making Abilities

With respect to the second learning outcome, to develop decision-making abilities, two actions will be taken: · In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8770 we will add several new measures in supply chain and revenue management analysis in accordance with the business environment: increased globalization. Evaluate after next offering. · In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8770 we will add several new measures in supply chain and revenue management analysis in accordance with the business environment: increased globalization. Evaluate after next offering.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management Faculty Members
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Team Membership

With respect to the third learning outcome, to become a strong team member, two actions will be taken: · Incorporate into teaching material for In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8760 lessons on effective teams. · Require team members in the group project of In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8760 to create a team charter indicating an emphasis on the importance of cooperation and fairly distributed individual contributions. Evaluate after next offering.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management Faculty Members
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Changes to course syllabi

We will meet in the summer 2012 to discuss appropriate changes to course syllabi and ensure that all instructors are using the same rubric measuring device.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Meeting scheduled July 2012 with all instructors involved in teaching In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740, 8760 and 8770 for the purpose of making necessary changes to course syllabi.
**Responsible Person/Group:** Yusen Xia and Walter Wallace

---

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

- **Budget Amount Requested:** None
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Target Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Divided Value in Capstone Negotiation (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Measures the value to the buyer or seller of the final deal negotiated in the capstone one-on-one negotiation.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Measures the combined total value obtained by the buyer and the seller in the capstone one-on-one negotiation.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Leadership Self-Assessment (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Describes their own leadership strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Leadership Development Plan (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Prepare leadership development plans that will enhance their leadership capabilities.</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Coaching Scenario Assignment (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Ability to write up a coaching scenario that clearly demonstrates a managerial coaching moment.</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria.</td>
<td>Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Ability to respond to think reflectively about their own effectiveness as a coach in the role of coaching others.</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: OD Recommendations (O: 6)</strong></td>
<td>Inclusion of and appropriateness of recommendations and the rationale behind them.</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Reflect on Own OD Effectiveness (O: 7)</strong></td>
<td>Ability to respond to think reflectively about their own effectiveness and the effectiveness of others employed in the role of (internal or external) OD Consultant.</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

**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.

**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 8430 course 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
Implementation Description: Continuing implementation.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Add coaching debrief activity
Add a team based activity requiring students to do a debrief on all of the five coaching sessions conducted during the semester.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment
Implementation Description: This activity will take place immediately following each coaching session.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Add lecture on OD intervention
Add a lecture to include examples of an effective OD intervention

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: OD Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

Focus class opening on project
Focus the course opening (first day of class) more on the primary class projects.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Organizational Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Apply OD Consulting Skills
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8450 instructors

Revise instructions for creating value class activity
In the previous cycle, we added an activity designed to provide more practice on planning for the creation of value in negotiation. We implemented the activity, but are not yet content with the precise instructions. In the current cycle, we will adjust the instructions while continuing with the activity.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Create Value in Negotiation
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8430 instructors

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Personal Financial Planning MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
MS-PFP PROGRAM MISSION: The MS in Personal Financial Planning is designed to prepare students to: (1) Enter the field of financial planning at the planner level; (2) Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam; and; (3) Serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm. It will do so by developing students' technical expertise in the topics of financial planning and their ability to integrate that expertise to help individuals plan their financial lives. The MS-PFP provides a more concentrated and in-depth consideration of financial planning topics than is offered by the MBA-PFP and thus better serves the needs of the those
who are certain of their intent to pursue a financial planning career and assume a leadership position in a financial planning firm.

**Goals**

G 1: Enter the PFP field as a planner  
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to enter the field of financial planning at the planner level.

G 2: Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam  
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to pass the Certified Financial Planner exam.

G 3: Prepare for leadership role  
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Technical expertise - overall (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3)  
The MS-PFP graduate will have the overall technical financial planning expertise of at least an entry-level planner. The MS-PFP graduate will understand the 89 topics of the 2004 CFP Job Analysis at or above the level of an entry-level financial planner. This standard is set by the Certified Financial Planner exam administered by the CFP Board. A passing score on the exam is at least 60%.

SLO 2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)  
The MS-PFP graduate will have the technical financial planning expertise of at least an entry-level planner in each of the six major technical areas of personal financial planning (i.e., Planning Fundamentals, Income Tax Planning, Insurance Planning, Investment Planning, Retirement Planning, and Estate Planning) at or above the level of a beginning financial planner. This standard is set by the related questions in the Certified Financial Planner exam administered by the CFP Board. A passing score on the exam is at least 60%.

SLO 3: Identify a good client-planner fit (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)  
The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to identify a good client-planner fit, and then gather and organize pertinent personal and financial client data to support an effective analysis of and plan for meeting the client's financial needs. The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to evaluate critically his/her own financial planning strengths and weaknesses and, based thereon, be able to identify those clients and circumstances with which he/she will be most effective in providing advice and guidance.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

O/O 4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)  
The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to effectively integrate technical financial planning concepts to assist individuals with meeting their financial needs. The MS-PFP graduate will be able to integrate each of the major technical areas of PFP (Planning Fundamentals, Income Tax Planning, Insurance Planning, Investment Planning, Retirement Planning, and Estate Planning) by properly analyzing pertinent data, identifying financial needs, and developing objectives, strategies, and an appropriate action plan for meeting those needs.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M 1: Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course) (O: 1, 2)  
In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student takes a mock CFP exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the course work in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself.

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

**Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall**  
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to all mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

**Target for O2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas**  
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to all mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

M 2: Financial Plan prepared in PFP 8520 (capstone) (O: 4)  
In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a financial plan, acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts**  
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to all Financial Plans submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.
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.

Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall
CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.

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 improvement strategy in PFP 8520. Role play exercises will be focused on implementation issues.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Financial Plan prepared in PFP 8520 (capstone)
- Outcome/Objective: Integrate technical financial planning concepts

Implementation Description: This implementation plan remains ongoing.
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
- Responsible Person/Group: MSPFP Program Director

Reinforce CFP exam style questions
We will reinforce CFP exam style questions in Fundamentals, Insurance, retirement, and Estate Planning classes.
Reinforce CFP Exam style questions
We will reinforce CFP exam style questions in Fundamentals, Insurance, retirement, and Estate Planning classes.

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.

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.

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course) | Outcome/Objective: Technical expertise - overall
- Technical expertise-major financial planning areas

Projected Completion Date: 01/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MSPFP Program Director

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Philosophy Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

Goals
G 1: Phil 1010
Phil 1010, Critical Thinking (in Area B), contributes significantly to GSU's General Education program by helping students hone critical thinking skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Students learn to effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. Outcomes 1 and 2 and Measures 1 and 2 are relevant to Phil 1010.

G 2: Phil 2010
Phil 2010, Introduction to Philosophy (Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history's most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being. This contributes significantly to GSU's...
General Education program by helping students hone critical thinking skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Students learn to effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. Students also learn to effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them. Outcomes 3 and 4 and Measures 3 and 4 are relevant to Phil 1010.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: 1010 Objective 1: IDing Premises &amp; Conclusions (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students who take Phil 1010 should be able to identify the premises and conclusions of arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: 1010 Objective 2: Argument Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students who take Phil 1010 should be able to critically evaluate the arguments of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who take Phil 2010 should be able to think critically and effectively as evidenced by a basic ability to present clear and sound arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: 2010 Objective 2: Content (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who take Phil 2010 should have mastery of some standard content knowledge, including the following: (i) a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?) (ii) a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology (What do we know?) (iii) a basic understanding of central problems in ethics (What should we do?) (iv) a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. (v) a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. (We do not separate these out in the Measures and Findings.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 4: 2010 Measure 2: Content (O: 4)**

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 2010 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 O4: 2010 Objective 4: Content**

New in 2014: We expect the 2010 assignments to be scored somewhere 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 Sophomore 6: High performing rising College Senior 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

**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 student's ability to analyze critical thinking and reasoning.

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

**Target for O3: 2010 Objective 3: Critical Thinking**

New in 2014: We expect the 2010 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 Sophomore 6: High performing rising College Senior 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

**M 2: 2010 Measure 2: Argument Evaluation (O: 2)**

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 2010 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 students 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: 2010 Objective 2: Argument Evaluation**

New in 2014: We expect the 2010 assignments to be scored somewhere between 0 and 1 with a target of 0.5. This is using our new scale, which is as follows: 0: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 1: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 2: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 3: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 4: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 5: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 6: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 7: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 8: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 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 new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 12: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 13: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 14: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 15: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 16: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 17: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student 18: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student

**M 1: 1010 Measure 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions (O: 1)**

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 1010 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 students 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 (iii) 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 Sophomore 6: High performing rising College Senior 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

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)
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

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 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 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 6 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
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: 1010 Measure 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions | Outcome/Objective: 1010 Objective 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions
Measure: 2010 Measure 1: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking
Measure: 2010 Measure 2: Content | Outcome/Objective: 2010 Objective 2: Content
Implementation Description: Assessment Coordinator will make changes to the official Department Assessment Policy and implement the changes to data collection in the Fall of 2014.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Assessment Committee
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.

**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**

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

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

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 2: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate a knowledge of representative philosophers and movements in historical and contemporary philosophy as well as the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in the following concentrations: ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology. (These concentrations are to be defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy.)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**SLO 3: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and critically.

**G 1: Philosophy BA**

Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and critically.
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

Target for O1: B.A. Objective 1: Critical Thinking
New in 2014: We expect the 3000 assignments to be scored between 5 and 8 with a target of 7.25. We expect the 4990 assignments to be scored between 7 and 10 with a target of 9.25. 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

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 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

Target for O2: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge
New in 2014: We expect the 3000 assignments to be scored between 5 and 8 with a target of 7.25. We expect the 4990 assignments to be scored between 7 and 10 with a target of 9.25. 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

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 papers and the average score of the Phil 4990 papers.

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

Target for O3: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication
New in 2014: We expect the 3000 assignments to be scored between 5 and 8 with a target of 7.25. We expect the 4990 assignments to be scored between 7 and 10 with a target of 9.25. 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

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

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

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

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

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.

Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Philosophy has a central role in any university. Its central role was recognized by the Department of Philosophy in the fall of 2014, with the establishment of an official Philosophy Assessment Policy and process.

#include <philosophy.h>

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

Target for 03: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication

New in 2014: We expect the 3000 assignments to be scored between 5 and 8 with a target of 7.25. We expect the 4990 assignments to be scored between 7 and 10 with a target of 9.25. 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

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

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 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 6 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

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: BA Measure 1: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 1: Critical Thinking
Measure: BA Measure 2: Content | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge
Measure: BA Measure 3: Written Communication | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication

Implementation Description: Assessment Coordinator will make changes to the official Department Assessment Policy and implement the changes to data collection in the Fall of 2014.

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Assessment Committee

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 language and of metaphysics, philosophy of mind, and of the good life. At Georgia State University, philosophy is an important and influential field of study.

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. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.
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.

**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 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; 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

**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 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, 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

**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, 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

**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
Goals

1. Prepare a competent physical therapist that is ready to work autonomously.  
   1.1. Provide culturally competent physical therapy services for prevention, health promotion, fitness, and wellness, to individuals, groups and communities.  
   1.2. Provide a variety of clinical educational opportunities to allow students to perform competently across the healthcare continuum.

2. Prepare a competent physical therapist who has obtained a sufficient level of knowledge.  
   2.1. Deliver and manage a plan of care that is safe, effective and patient/client centered and incorporates all elements of the physical therapy management model as described in the Guide to Physical Therapist Practice.  
   2.2. Monitor and adjust the plan of care in response to patient/client status.  
   2.3. Provide physical therapy interventions to achieve patient/client goals and outcomes.  
   2.4. Consistently and critically evaluate sources of information related to physical therapy practice, research, and education and apply knowledge from these sources in a scientific manner and to appropriate populations.  
   2.5. Consistently integrate the best evidence for practice from sources of information with clinical judgment and patient/client values to determine the best care for a patient/client.  
   2.6. Use clinical judgment and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning in order to minimize errors and enhance patient/client outcomes.  

3. Prepare a competent physical therapist that recognizes the limits of current knowledge, clinical skill, and experience.  
   3.1. Demonstrate the commitment to acquire new knowledge and skill through lifelong learning.  
   3.2. Acquire new knowledge and skill: writing and presenting evidence based practice paper/research project, attend conferences and consult with colleagues.  
   3.3. Facilitate reflective thinking using reflective journals, small group discussions.  
   3.4. Utilize technology to access information.  
   3.5. Formulate clinical patterns based on best available evidence for various patient populations.  
   3.6. Read literature, attend conferences, and consult with doctors of physical therapy who 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 2010 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
   - Measure: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills

Implementation Description: Assessment Coordinator will make changes to the official Department Assessment Policy and implement the changes to data collection in the Fall of 2014.

Responsible Person Group: Assessment Coordinator and Assessment Committee

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Physical Therapy DPT**

As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

In accordance with, and in support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Brydine F. Lewis School of Nursing and Health Professions, the mission of the Department of Physical Therapy is to prepare, teach and graduate doctors of physical therapy who are knowledgeable in the practice of physical therapy, committed to clinical excellence, demonstrate professional distinction, and are passionate in their pursuit of scholarly activities that contribute to the body of scientific and clinical knowledge.

**Goals**

G 1: Prepare a competent physical therapist that is ready to work autonomously.

1. Prepare a competent physical therapist that is ready to work autonomously in a variety of settings throughout the continuum of healthcare.  
   - Provide culturally competent physical therapy services for prevention, health promotion, fitness, and wellness, to individuals, groups and communities.
   - Provide a variety of clinical educational opportunities to allow students to perform competently across the healthcare continuum.

G 2: Prepare a competent physical therapist who has obtained a sufficient level of knowledge.

2. Prepare a competent physical therapist who has obtained a sufficient level of knowledge in the foundational (basic, applied and social) and clinical sciences to understand the facts, concepts, and principles essential to competent evidence based practice.  
   - Deliver and manage a plan of care that is safe, effective and patient/client centered and incorporates all elements of the physical therapy management model as described in the Guide to Physical Therapist Practice.  
   - Monitor and adjust the plan of care in response to patient/client status.  
   - Provide physical therapy interventions to achieve patient/client goals and outcomes.  
   - Consistently and critically evaluate sources of information related to physical therapy practice, research, and education and apply knowledge from these sources in a scientific manner and to appropriate populations.  
   - Consistently integrate the best evidence for practice from sources of information with clinical judgment and patient/client values to determine the best care for a patient/client.  
   - Use clinical judgment and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning in order to minimize errors and enhance patient/client outcomes.  
   - Consistently apply current knowledge, theory, and professional judgment while considering the patient/client perspective in patient/client management.

G 3: Prepare a competent physical therapist that recognizes the limits of current knowledge, clinical skill, and experience.

3. Prepare a competent physical therapist that recognizes the limits of current knowledge, clinical skill, and experience and demonstrate the commitment to acquire new knowledge and skill through lifelong learning.  
   - Acquire new knowledge and skill: writing and presenting evidence based practice paper/research project, attend conferences and consult with colleagues.  
   - Facilitate reflective thinking using reflective journals, small group discussions.  
   - Utilize technology to access information.  
   - Formulate clinical patterns based on best available evidence for various patient populations.  
   - Read literature, attend conferences, and consult with doctors of physical therapy who 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 2010 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
   - Measure: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills

Implementation Description: Assessment Coordinator will make changes to the official Department Assessment Policy and implement the changes to data collection in the Fall of 2014.

Responsible Person Group: Assessment Coordinator and Assessment Committee
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.
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.

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.

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.

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)
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior. Professional Practice-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - 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-Grading Key: Expected scores shaded in blue. Beginner=1 Adv. Beginner= 5 Intermediate= 9 Adv. Inter.= 13 Entry Level=17 Class of 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruisim
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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

M 2: Licensure Exam Pass Rate (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)
The National Physical Therapy Examination pass rate for the program (first time and ultimate)
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of '2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%, mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

**Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 31/32 graduates of the 2013 class scored 97% for ultimate pass rate for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 661.2. For the class of 2014, Ultimate pass rate was 100% (33/33) as compared to national average of 97.7%; mean score was 682.7 as compared to national average of 677.6. Ultimate pass rate for our program over the past three years is currently at 99%. For the class of 2015, our first time pass rate is 27/28, 96%.

**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 Cardiовascular/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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially 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 Score Scale Score Scale Area Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 688.1 46.4 688.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 672.3 42.6 685.3 65.5 III.
Interventions 28.50% 57 678.3 47.8 684.2 64.8 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 653.9 68.4 655.2 80.7 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 701.1 67.5 682.4 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 660.5 43.1 686.3 68.5 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 692.5 71.2 Other Systems 15.50% 31 675.4 57.7 685.2 70.1. This is a partial report from DPT ’2015.

**Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially 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 Score Scale Score Scale Area Score Score Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 688.1 46.4 688.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 672.3 42.6 685.3 65.5 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 678.3 47.8 684.2 64.8 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 653.9 68.4 655.2 80.7 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 701.1 67.5 682.4 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 660.5 43.1 686.3 68.5 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 692.5 71.2 Other Systems 15.50% 31 675.4 57.7 685.2 70.1. This is a partial report from DPT ’2015.

**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially 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 Score Scale Score Scale Area Score Score Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 688.1 46.4 688.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 672.3 42.6 685.3 65.5 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 678.3 47.8 684.2 64.8 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 653.9 68.4 655.2 80.7 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 701.1 67.5 682.4 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 660.5 43.1 686.3 68.5 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 692.5 71.2 Other Systems 15.50% 31 675.4 57.7 685.2 70.1. This is a partial report from DPT ’2015.

**Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially 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 Score Scale Score Scale Area Score Score Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 688.1 46.4 688.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 672.3 42.6 685.3 65.5 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 678.3 47.8 684.2 64.8 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 653.9 68.4 655.2 80.7 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 701.1 67.5 682.4 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 660.5 43.1 686.3 68.5 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 692.5 71.2 Other Systems 15.50% 31 675.4 57.7 685.2 70.1. This is a partial report from DPT ’2015.

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

Graduating students will perform at or above national median score for all content sections.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially 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 Score Scale Score Scale Area Score Score Score Score I. Physical Therapy Examination 26.50% 53 688.1 46.4 688.8 II. Foundations for Evaluation, Differential Diagnosis, and Prognosis 32.50% 65 672.3 42.6 685.3 65.5 III. Interventions 28.50% 57 678.3 47.8 684.2 64.8 A. IV. Non-system domains 12.5% 25 653.9 68.4 655.2 80.7 System Specifications Cardiac, Vascular, and Pulmonary Systems 16.50% 33 701.1 67.5 682.4 76.6 Musculoskeletal System 30.5% 61 660.5 43.1 686.3 68.5 Neuromuscular and Nervous Systems 25.00% 50 692.5 71.2 Other Systems 15.50% 31 675.4 57.7 685.2 70.1. This is a partial report from DPT ’2015.

*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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2015 Score Of ≥ 17 Class of 2016 Score of ≥ 9 Class of 2017 Score of ≥ 5

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.
### Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

**DPT Class 2015 - Title of Project Student Authors Faculty Authors (all faculty involved) Effect of Virtual Reality Intervention on Upper-Extremity Function In A Child With Cerebral Palsy: A Case Study**
- Brian Denmark, Amy Harrod, Brittany Steele, Taylor Weekley, Yu-Ping Chen, Sergio Garcia Vergara (GT), Ayanna Howard (GT), Gordon Warren, Blake Buchanan, Michael Theobald, Thomas McLeod, Blake Butler, Kim Richards

### 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met

**DPT Class 2015 - Title of Project Student Authors Faculty Authors (all faculty involved) Effect of Virtual Reality Intervention on Upper-Extremity Function In A Child With Cerebral Palsy: A Case Study**
- Brian Denmark, Amy Harrod, Brittany Steele, Taylor Weekley, Yu-Ping Chen, Sergio Garcia Vergara (GT), Ayanna Howard (GT) Motor Skill Learning During a Sequential Visual Isometric Pinch Task Hannah Redd, Patrick Monaghan Andrew Butler, Kim Richards

### Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

**DPT Class 2015 - Title of Project Student Authors Faculty Authors (all faculty involved) Effect of Virtual Reality Intervention on Upper-Extremity Function In A Child With Cerebral Palsy: A Case Study**
- Brian Denmark, Amy Harrod, Brittany Steele, Taylor Weekley, Yu-Ping Chen, Sergio Garcia Vergara (GT), Ayanna Howard (GT) Motor Skill Learning During a Sequential Visual Isometric Pinch Task Hannah Redd, Patrick Monaghan Andrew Butler, Kim Richards
Evoked Potentials Erin Crossland, Jessica Hester (Sethman), Austin Posey Dr. Bradley Farrell, Dr. John Kramer (Shepherd)
Effects of Tai Chi Exercise on Sleep Quality Among College Females Jessica Hendry, Alex Daley, Krassamir Todorov, Brandon Ward Dr. Tai Wang The Effects of Lumbo-Pelvic Manipulation on Knee Extensor Activation: A Pilot Study Blake Buchanan, Michael Theobald, Thomas McLeod Gordon Warren, Kimberly Morelli, Jodan Garcia Improved Upper Extremity Function in Stroke Patients Using the Tongue Drive System and Hand Mentor: A Preliminary Study Maria Garcia Rodriguez Lindsey Warthen Crystal Yarbrough Andrew Butler Kimberly Richards

Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education
Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
DPT Class 2015 - Title of Project Student Authors (all students involved, including 2nd and 1st year students) Faculty Authors (all faculty involved) Effect of Virtual Reality Intervention on Upper-Extremity Function In A Child With Cerebral Palsy: A Case Study Brian Denmark, Amy Harrod, Brittany Steele, Taylor Weekley Yu-Ping Chen, Sergio Garcia Vergara (GT), Ayanna Howard (GT) Motor Skill Learning During a Sequential Visual Isometric Pinch Task Hannah Redd, Patrick Monaghan Andrew Butler, Kim Richards Pilot Study Assessing the Reliability and Validity of Two Accelerometers for the Measurement of Physical Activity Clare Page, Landon Pangburn, Youquon Luo Yu-ping Chen Physical Therapy Following Motor Vehicle Trauma: A Retrospective Study at Grady Memorial Hospital Beth Kochin, Emily Lloyd, Patrick Canlas, Sam Cassell, Thomas Gandas, Justin Howe Gordon Warren, Pamela Chitika (Grady) The Influence of Orthotic Phalangeal Lifts on Plantar Pressures During Walking – A Pilot Study Allison Stowers, Amy Bell Gordon Warren, Geza Kogler The Effects of Tai Chi on Static and Dynamic Balance Katie Hope, Winslow Rumph, Andre Bell, Tejal Patel Dr. Tai Wang Spinal Cord Stimulation to Modulate Contact Heat Evoked Potentials Erin Crossland, Jessica Hester (Sethman), Austin Posey Dr. Bradley Farrell, Dr. John Kramer (Shepherd)
Effects of Tai Chi Exercise on Sleep Quality Among College Females Jessica Hendry, Alex Daley, Krassamir Todorov, Brandon Ward Dr. Tai Wang The Effects of Lumbo-Pelvic Manipulation on Knee Extensor Activation: A Pilot Study Blake Buchanan, Michael Theobald, Thomas McLeod Gordon Warren, Kimberly Morelli, Jodan Garcia Improved Upper Extremity Function in Stroke Patients Using the Tongue Drive System and Hand Mentor: A Preliminary Study Maria Garcia Rodriguez Lindsey Warthen Crystal Yarbrough Andrew Butler Kimberly Richards

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
DPT Class 2015 - Title of Project Student Authors (all students involved, including 2nd and 1st year students) Faculty Authors (all faculty involved) Effect of Virtual Reality Intervention on Upper-Extremity Function In A Child With Cerebral Palsy: A Case Study Brian Denmark, Amy Harrod, Brittany Steele, Taylor Weekley Yu-Ping Chen, Sergio Garcia Vergara (GT), Ayanna Howard (GT) Motor Skill Learning During a Sequential Visual Isometric Pinch Task Hannah Redd, Patrick Monaghan Andrew Butler, Kim Richards Pilot Study Assessing the Reliability and Validity of Two Accelerometers for the Measurement of Physical Activity Clare Page, Landon Pangburn, Youquon Luo Yu-ping Chen Physical Therapy Following Motor Vehicle Trauma: A Retrospective Study at Grady Memorial Hospital Beth Kochin, Emily Lloyd, Patrick Canlas, Sam Cassell, Thomas Gandas, Justin Howe Gordon Warren, Pamela Chitika (Grady) The Influence of Orthotic Phalangeal Lifts on Plantar Pressures During Walking – A Pilot Study Allison Stowers, Amy Bell Gordon Warren, Geza Kogler The Effects of Tai Chi on Static and Dynamic Balance Katie Hope, Winslow Rumph, Andre Bell, Tejal Patel Dr. Tai Wang Spinal Cord Stimulation to Modulate Contact Heat Evoked Potentials Erin Crossland, Jessica Hester (Sethman), Austin Posey Dr. Bradley Farrell, Dr. John Kramer (Shepherd)
Effects of Tai Chi Exercise on Sleep Quality Among College Females Jessica Hendry, Alex Daley, Krassamir Todorov, Brandon Ward Dr. Tai Wang The Effects of Lumbo-Pelvic Manipulation on Knee Extensor Activation: A Pilot Study Blake Buchanan, Michael Theobald, Thomas McLeod Gordon Warren, Kimberly Morelli, Jodan Garcia Improved Upper Extremity Function in Stroke Patients Using the Tongue Drive System and Hand Mentor: A Preliminary Study Maria Garcia Rodriguez Lindsey Warthen Crystal Yarbrough Andrew Butler Kimberly Richards

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations
Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
DPT Class 2015 - Title of Project Student Authors (all students involved, including 2nd and 1st year students) Faculty Authors (all faculty involved) Effect of Virtual Reality Intervention on Upper-Extremity Function In A Child With Cerebral Palsy: A Case Study Brian Denmark, Amy Harrod, Brittany Steele, Taylor Weekley Yu-Ping Chen, Sergio Garcia Vergara (GT), Ayanna Howard (GT) Motor Skill Learning During a Sequential Visual Isometric Pinch Task Hannah Redd, Patrick Monaghan Andrew Butler, Kim Richards Pilot Study Assessing the Reliability and Validity of Two Accelerometers for the Measurement of Physical Activity Clare Page, Landon Pangburn, Youquon Luo Yu-ping Chen Physical Therapy Following Motor Vehicle Trauma: A Retrospective Study at Grady Memorial Hospital Beth Kochin, Emily Lloyd, Patrick Canlas, Sam Cassell, Thomas Gandas, Justin Howe Gordon Warren, Pamela Chitika (Grady) The Influence of Orthotic Phalangeal Lifts on Plantar Pressures During Walking – A Pilot Study Allison Stowers, Amy Bell Gordon Warren, Geza Kogler The Effects of Tai Chi on Static and Dynamic Balance Katie Hope, Winslow Rumph, Andre Bell, Tejal Patel Dr. Tai Wang Spinal Cord Stimulation to Modulate Contact Heat Evoked Potentials Erin Crossland, Jessica Hester (Sethman), Austin Posey Dr. Bradley Farrell, Dr. John Kramer (Shepherd)
Effects of Tai Chi Exercise on Sleep Quality Among College Females Jessica Hendry, Alex Daley, Krassamir Todorov, Brandon Ward Dr. Tai Wang The Effects of Lumbo-Pelvic Manipulation on Knee Extensor Activation: A Pilot Study Blake Buchanan, Michael Theobald, Thomas McLeod Gordon Warren, Kimberly Morelli, Jodan Garcia Improved Upper Extremity Function in Stroke Patients Using the Tongue Drive System and Hand Mentor: A Preliminary Study Maria Garcia Rodriguez Lindsey Warthen Crystal Yarbrough Andrew Butler Kimberly Richards

M 6: Comprehensive Exams (O: 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)
A comprehensive examination will be administered at the completion of each year for each class.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

**Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectations: 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
For the school year 2014-2015 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2015: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 82 Class of 2016: 94% pass first time testing, mean score of 81 Class of 2017: 100% pass first time testing, mean score of 81. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

**Target for O3: Profesional 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

**Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruisim**
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97.5%. 2015 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 95%.

M 8: **Employer Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**

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

**Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability**

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.
Target for **O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O10: Professional Praction Expectation: Education**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.

Target for **O12: Practice Management Expectations**
Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Employer survey revealed 6 responses with an average score of 4.1 on all criteria. 67% scored graduates in the top 10%.
## 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 2014-2015 - Target: Not 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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
Develop an advanced student evaluation tool to monitor each students progress as it related to required accreditation criteria and expected outcomes which will be linked with each class and established objective.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduate Survey | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation
| Practice Management Expectations | Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity | Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability
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):
Measure: Licensure Exam Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability
Implementation Description: Discuss with core faculty and develop a plan of action to address this deficit.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Depart Head
Additional Resources: None

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 PTIs 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
DPT Joint Programs

Our department is currently 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 in specialty areas. Programs under consideration include MHA and MPH.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: In early stages with dialogue currently in place between programs
- Responsible Person/Group: Department Head: Dr. Andrew Butler
- Additional Resources: Pending

Electronic Documentation Curriculum Addition

During annual program assessment it has been determined the DPT program is in need of electronic document training to be used throughout the program curriculum. This same need has been discussed and relayed from both the nursing and respiratory therapy programs. Electronic documentation is now currently a consistent part of all clinical environments and at this time our students only get exposure during their clinical rotations. Exposing our students in the BFLSNHP to this documentation format serves to better prepare them for their clinical education as well as to enhance their documentation skills as required by all federal and private payer sources.

- Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: $37,000 grant approved by the University to implement program for entire school. Currently in planning stage and expecting partial 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 is 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: 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?

Our students are still meeting the goals from their clinical rotation benchmark from the clinician’s overall rating in their CPI from Clinic II, III, IV and V. Our graduating class ‘2014 have an ultimate 100% pass rate from the national physical therapy board examination. Both our students and core faculty are actively engage in research dissemination based on the total number of abstract presentation on the national level and the publication of the scholarly papers. And the department is still actively engage with community service within the Atlanta community.

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.

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. The department just hired Dr. Brad Farrell this Fall 2015 semester as one of our core faculty in the department for Exercise Physiology and Pathophysiology teaching content. The search for the department chair is ongoing. 100% ultimate pass rate action plan- Over the past 3 years we have had one student who has not passed the FSBPPT 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 fail the national PT test. This change will be handled by the Curriculum Committee. We have an ultimate pass rate of 100% from our Class ‘2014 for the national board exam. Curriculum Change- Last year faculty voted and approved recommended curriculum change by the Curriculum Committee change the beginning of the Summer of 2014. Faculty will start the process of the 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 PTs 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. We are only one year away for being transitioned to the new curriculum. 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. This is still under progress. 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. The second funding was received for this HRSA grant. 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. This is still under progress.

Annual Report Section Responses

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

Our DPT Class ‘2014 have an ultimate pass rate of 100% in the National Physical Therapy Board Examination.

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

N/A

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

Dr. Gordon Warren - Physical Therapy Department and BFLSNHP representative for Internal Research Grant Review Committee and University P&T Manual Review Committee.

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

 factorial GLM to test the main and interaction effects of the treatments with post-hoc analysis tests if the F-test is significant. - The program combines interventional and educational treatments to achieve the best possible outcomes.

**References**


FWFHP requires a year round program planning effort. It involves faculty and staff from many Colleges/Universities around Georgia along with the sustained efforts of the Ellenton Clinic. The dynamic nature of the community and the participating partners causes us to adapt each year. The list below is not comprehensive in that it is impossible to document all the “behind the scenes” efforts of our partners and participants. Please use this list as a resource. - Students and faculty of: o Nursing (BSN and MSN from Emory University) o Physical therapy (Georgia State University) o Psychology (Georgia State University)—not participating in 2011 o Public Health (Emory University) o Pharmacy (University of Georgia) o Dental hygiene (Clayton State University, Darton College and West Georgia Technical Institute) *MSN Students from Emory University School of Nursing are Graduate nurse practitioner students from family practice, family nurse midwifery, women's health, and pediatrics - Multiple state and local community partners: o Colquitt County Health Department and Board of Education o Southern Pine Migrant Education Agency o Owners of farms and packing houses in Colquitt, Tift, Brooks and Cook counties o Atlanta (SPCC) & Southwest Georgia Area Health Education Centers (SOWEGA) o Georgia Department of Labor, Moultrie o MedShare - Additional support comes from local churches, businesses and community organizations in the area: - Physical Therapy services and resources: o Developmental screening of fine and gross motor control for children o Posture evaluation and education o Neuro-musculoskeletal evaluation for specific complaints (Treatment with referral) § Orthopedic complaints including muscle and joint pain or dysfunction, repetitive use injuries, traumatic injuries § Movement disorders § Wound care/ off-loading § Bracing as appropriate for treatment o Exercise prescription and education o "Back School" - Group education classes in the fields

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Physics & Astronomy Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Physics and Astronomy teaches a number of courses in the University Core. Introductory physics and astronomy courses may be either terminal sequences or preparation for additional courses or professional degree programs. The mission of the department in introductory science courses is to provide the students with the ability to understand and analyze their world by making use of the theoretical and practical tools of science, in particular physics and astronomy. The mission of these courses is to a) provide foundational knowledge of the workings of the physical world, b) allow students to develop the ability to perform reasoning and analysis from a scientific perspective, c) teach both conceptual and practical knowledge of physical processes, and d) enhance the students abilities in applying mathematical or technological tools in their analysis. Where these courses serve as prerequisites to upper division courses or professional degree programs the department also seeks to give the students the content knowledge and skills required to succeed in those courses or programs.

Goals
G 2: Area D GenEd Learning Goal
Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Understanding of Mechanics Concepts (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students in Phys1111 and Phys2211 will demonstrate a competent understanding of mechanics, in particular, forces and Newton's Laws.

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

SLO 3: Understanding of Electricity & Magnetism Concepts (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students in Phys1112 and Phys2212 will demonstrate a competent understanding of electricity & magnetism, in particular, charges, electric fields and forces, electric potential and potential energy, currents, magnetic fields and forces and electromagnetic induction.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 2: Multiple Choice Questions on Astronomy Final Exams
A set of core questions is included on final exams in every section. These questions stressed physical, spatial, and quantitative reasoning. A sample of the multiple choice questions used can be found at Astr1010.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

M 3: Mechanics Diagnostic Test (O: 2)
Within the lab portion of the courses, students in Phys1111K and Phys2211K take a widely-used multiple choice mechanics diagnostic test at the beginning of the course and again near the end of the course. This test has been developed using the most widely held misconceptions.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O2: Understanding of Mechanics Concepts**

For the diagnostic test used, published literature in the field gives a score of 60% as a competent understanding of mechanics concepts and 80% as mastery. We have therefore set a goal of 60% for the post test for both Phys1111K and Phys2211K. In addition, physics education researchers often use normalized gain to gauge the success of introductory mechanics courses. Normalized gain for each student is the increase in score from pre-test to post-test divided by the largest gain that student could have achieved. A student who gets the same post-test score as pre-test score has a normalized gain of 0.00. A student who scores a perfect post-test will have a gain of 1.00. A student who increases their score from 30% to 65% will have a normalized gain of 0.50 since their increase was half of their maximum possible increase. Most introductory physics courses show average normalized gains of about 0.25. Courses which integrate interactive engagement techniques often do better. Average normalized gains of 0.40 or higher are labeled in the literature as moderately successful and gains of 0.70 are extremely successful (and rare). The target set for our courses is to improve to moderately successful range of 0.40 or higher.

**M 4: Electricity & Magnetism Diagnostic Test (O: 3)**

Within the lab portion of the courses, students in Phys1112K and Phys2212K take a multiple choice diagnostic test of electricity & magnetism conceptual understanding. Since the language is often unfamiliar to the students at the beginning of the course and published research indicates there is no value in giving it as a pre-instruction test, it is given only once near the end of the course.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: Understanding of Electricity & Magnetism Concepts**

Only limited data has been published for performance on this diagnostic. In that work at an institution comparable to GSU, post-instruction scores were reported of 44% for a Phys1112 equivalent course and 47% for a Phys2212 equivalent course. We have adopted these values as our initial targets for this measure.

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

**Phys1111/Phys1112 Redesign**

The first year of data using the new Area D learning outcome and using the diagnostic tests has shown that both the initial scores and the learning outcomes are lower than many scores reported in the literature. We have therefore embarked on some curricular and pedagogical review of one of our course sequences, Phys1111 and Phys1112, the algebra-based introductory physics. Over the course of this process we will standardize the course content over all sections. In addition, we are moving some content to be taught in the laboratory only so that the lecture will be able to concentrate on a smaller core of material. The laboratory portion will then be redesigned to accommodate this material in a stand-alone fashion. This course redesign is expected to take all of the 2011-2012 academic year and be implemented in the 2012-2013 academic year. The department is considering a similar re-examination of the Phys2211/Phys2212 sequence beginning in Fall of 2012.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Revisions and redesign will be worked out over the course of the 2011/2012 academic year. Revised course content and new laboratory portion will be implemented in the 2012/2013 academic year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

**Astr1010/1020 New Assessment**

A assessment for the new Area D outcome for the Astr1010/1020 courses will be completed and implemented. First assessment data was delayed and should be available for Fall 2013.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** John Wilson

**Lab/lecture changes in Phys2211/2212**

In 2012-2013 we will plan changes to Phys2211/2212 classes to improve student learning. We will seek funding for significant changes. In 2013-2014, redesign of the laboratories to include inquiry-based labs and tutorials led by undergraduate learning assistants will be developed and implementation will be begun. Pilot use of learning assistants was begun in spring 2012. Pilot versions of the redesigned Phys2211 labs and tutorials will occur in Spring 2014. All redesigned labs will be operational by fall 2014.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Physics BS**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Classical Mechanics (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Electricity &amp; Magnetism (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in electricity &amp; magnetism and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Statistical &amp; Thermal Physics (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in statistical &amp; thermal physics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Quantum Physics (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Scientific Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students collaborate effectively with other students in a laboratory setting as they perform physics experiments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Research Implications (G: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology and express them in laboratory reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Scientific Critical Thinking (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Scientific Communication (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Scientific &amp; Research Technology (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Critical thinking through writing (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Evaluations in Content Courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Target for O7: Scientific Critical Thinking**
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Target for O8: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Target for O9: Scientific & Research Technology**
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**M 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.

**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.

**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
**Mission / Purpose**
Coming Soon

**Goals**

**G 1: Coming Soon**
Coming Soon

**G 2: Research Skills**
Students receiving a M.S. in physics should demonstrate the skills and abilities needed to use their scientific knowledge and problem-solving skills in a collaborative, technological environment.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2, 3)**
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

**SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

**SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report their research. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

**SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

**SLO 5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 4, 6, 7)**
Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, and quantum mechanics. Astronomy concentration students will instead demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in at least two of the above areas, as well as in the fundamentals of astrophysics.

**SLO 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2, 3, 5)**
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I (O: 5)**
As part of the astronomy concentration, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Astronomy Qualifying Exam I Assessment Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for OS5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Astronomy Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Scientific Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Scientific &amp; Research Technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Physics Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Scientific Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Scientific &amp; Research Technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Physics Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Scientific Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Astronomy Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Astronomy MS Committee Evaluation Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:** Scientific & Research Technology | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration in Scientific Research
- **Measure:** Astronomy Committee Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Scientific & Research Technology | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Astronomy Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- **Measure:** Physics Advisor | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration in Scientific Research
- **Measure:** Scientific & Research Technology | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration in Scientific Research
- **Measure:** Physics Committee Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Physics Presentation and General Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
Georgia State University
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose
Coming Soon

### Goals
G 1: Coming Soon

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. Students in the applied physics or biophysics options shall be able to demonstrate and apply knowledge in certain alternative areas appropriate to their specialties. Students demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Scientific &amp; Research Technology (M: 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Physics Qualifying Exam (O: 5)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students take a number of required courses during their first three semesters that cover the physics and math content for their particular area of research. Following their third semester they take a Qualifying Examination (Q-exam) in the areas applicable to their area of research. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 PhD in Astronomy program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Physics 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**

**2014-2015 Political Science Assessment of Core**

As of 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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 a stable and effective civil society

**G 3: Analytic skills**
The department seeks to improve basic analytic skills through the core curriculum courses by developing critical thinking skills especially as they relate to the discipline of politics.

**G 4: Communication Skills**
The department seeks student learning in oral and written communications skills.

**G 2: Substantive Knowledge in Global Issues**
The department seeks student learning outcomes of enhancing substantive knowledge of global issues and developing 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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 in the state of Georgia and the United States.

**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 international 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.
- 3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
- 6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
- 7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.
- 9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

### SLO 3: Analytic Skills in Introductory Political Science (G: 3) (M: 3)

Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior and develop basic ability to evaluate sources of information.

**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, evaluate the quality of information 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 20 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 on foundations of the American political system. Behavior questions and questions on institutions. 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 combined mean correct rate of 70% for the set of 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. These have been in use since the 2013-14 academic year

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

4465 students completed POLS 1101 in the Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 semesters. This year again the department offered this course in two formats Traditional and Online (Class offered completely online). The number of common questions were also increased to 29 from 25. Of these 29 questions were used in this years assessment. Please see attached report of learning outcomes in substantive knowledge in POLS 1101 FY 2014-2015

**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.

**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 18common 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.

**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

**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
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Political Science BA
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Political Science is committed to preparing undergraduate majors to think critically, to communicate ideas and arguments effectively, to make informed choices, and to engage in creative problem-solving. The Department's mission also includes grounding its students in the methodology of social science as well as preparing students for the practical and professional application of their course of study. Moreover, the Department strives to create an important experiential component to the BA program in Political Science, encouraging study abroad, discipline-oriented internships, and participation in competitive academic teams (Mock Trial, Model United Nations, Model Arab League). The Department of Political Science seeks to fulfill the above mission by offering undergraduate students education in the five major sub-fields of the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Administration/Policy. 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. We offer specific concentrations within the major in pre-law and in International Relations. The Department seeks to enhance student participation outside the classroom, to stimulate and award academic excellence, and to stimulate general awareness throughout the University community of the nature and impact of the field of Political Science.

Goals
G 1: Understanding of US and global political institutions and behavior
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate basic understanding of political institutions and behavior both in the United States and globally.

G 3: Developing critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline.

G 4: Effective written and oral communications
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate effective writing and oral presentation skills.

G 2: Methodological and analytical skills
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate a competence in methodological and analytical skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Appropriate methodological and analytical skills (G: 2) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate methodological skills appropriate to the Major. Specifically students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the use of social statistics. Students will demonstrate an ability to understand data reported in various forms. Students will demonstrate an ability to conduct research using traditional and new technological resources. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the scientific method, including the formulation of hypotheses and the role of independent, control and dependent variables.

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

SLO 2: Critical thinking (G: 3) (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate competence in six critical thinking skills identified as central to the discipline of political science - identification of question or issue, consideration of assumptions and/or context, formulation of a testable hypothesis, collection and
presentation of facts/data, analysis of facts and data, and integration and synthesis of other perspectives.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 3: Effective Communication (G: 4) (M: 3)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to write a paper or make an oral presentation with a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner, and draw logical conclusions from findings.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 4: Substantive Knowledge- US structures and processes (G: 1) (M: 4)**

Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of the institutions of government and the behavior of governmental and non-governmental actors in the United States. Specifically, students will demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of constitutionalism, federalism, knowledge of the key institutions of government and the key actors as well as separation of powers, civil liberties, and the electoral process for American government.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 5: Substantive knowledge -Global structures and processes (G: 1) (M: 5)**

Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of international institutions and the government and the behavior of governmental and non-governmental actors in the international system. Students will demonstrate 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

263 students completed POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2014-2015. 11 sections of the course were taught during the period. Three assessment scores were used to assess outcomes for this objective. The department used assessments from POLS 3800 Rubric. On the Identification of Research Question assignment 64% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 30.1% scored a 1 (Developing) 6% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 62% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 35.8% scored a 1 (Developing) 2.2% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 60.8% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 38.2% scored a 1 (Developing) 1.0% scored a 0 (Absent).

**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 (see attached rubric). The first three items of the POLS 4900 Assessment rubric are used to assess learning outcomes for critical thinking. Three variations of the rubric are used for quantitative, normative and theory focused sections of POLS 4900.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

143 students completed POLS 4900 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2014-2015. 6 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 - 46.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 45.9% scored 3-4 (Competent) 6.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 46.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 40.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 13.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 46.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 40.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 12.5% 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 - 45.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 46.9% scored 3-4 (Competent) 7.5% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 41.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 46% scored 3-4 (Competent) 12.8% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the Effective communication of results portion of the rubric (items 6-7) the scores were as follows: 6. Analysis of facts/data - 46.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 40.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 13% scored 1-2 (Developing).
follows. Integration and synthesis of other perspectives - 40% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 49.3% scored 3-4 (Competent) 10.7% 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 skill was carried out using two courses (Both of them CTW courses and required of all majors) POLS 3800 and POLS 4900. Both these courses use rubrics to assess learning (Please see attached rubrics). The last items on each of these rubrics deal with communication skills and are used to assess learning for this objective.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Effective Communication**

On the POLS 3800 assessment Rubric we expect 80% of our students to score 1 or higher out of a possible score of 2 on Item four (4) of the rubric On the POLS 4900 assessment rubric we expect 80% of our students to score 3 or higher out of a possible score of 5 on item seven (7) of the rubric

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In the period Fall 2014 to Spring 2015 202 students took POLS 3140. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge for this course during the period was 3.03 [Preview Formatting] Last Updated by S. R. Naim on 10/15/2014 Established by S. R. Naim on 10/15/2014

**M 5: Measure substantive knowlege 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

In the period Fall 2013 to Spring 2014 208 students took POLS 3200. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 3.81. 225 students took POLS 3400. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 4.13

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

**Development of assessment tools**

The department plans to devote resources to development of more sophisticated and nuanced assessment tools to be used to assess learning outcomes for this objective.

**Established in Cycle: 2010-2011**

**Implementation Status:** On-Hold

**Priority:** High

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure of substantive knowledge US structures and processes</td>
<td>Substantive Knowledge- US structures and processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors in American Politics and pre-law

**Additional Resources:** Summer Money 2011

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

**Development of Assessment tools**

The department plans to devote resources for assessment tools to allow for a more comprehensive assessment program for this outcome

**Established in Cycle: 2010-2011**

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure of substantive knowledge global structures and processes</td>
<td>Substantive knowledge -Global structures and processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** No action due to lack of funding
Mission / Purpose
The Department of Political Science offers a series of comprehensive programs leading to the Master of Arts degree. Covering all of the discipline's major fields - American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Law - these programs are designed to produce scholars and practitioners who are experts in their substantive field of study and who are able to combine theoretical sophistication with methodological rigor. MA students can pursue a general program in Political Science or specialize in American Politics, Comparative Politics/International Relations, Public Law, or Professional Political Practices. The purpose of our MA program is to simultaneously (1) fill a much-needed niche in the Atlanta area and in the region for a strong terminal Master's program and (2) provide the proper research foundation for those excellent students who wish to continue on for a PhD.

Goals
G 1: Strong Analytical Skills
MA candidates are skilled at analysis and possess analytical skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

G 2: Deepening of Substantive Knowledge
MA candidates are informed scholars with advanced substantive knowledge of the research literature in political science.

G 3: Deepening of Method Skills
MA students are knowledgeable researchers with demonstrable social scientific methods skills, both quantitative and qualitative.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
MA students demonstrate research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

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.

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.

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 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.
### 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
- **Implementation Description:** Curricular changes have been proposed and adopted; necessary changes to the Graduate Catalog for 2013-2014 have been submitted and are pending approval.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Political Science Department; instructors for courses within required sequence
- **Additional Resources:** None

### Expanded required methods sequence

Beginning in Fall of 2013, we have revised and expanded our research methods requirement to better train our students in research design and data analysis. We have already began offering on an elective basis a new advanced quantitative methods course, as well as a qualitative research methods course, to better aid our students in learning the tools and methods necessary to answer their proposed research questions. Beginning in Fall 2013, all MA students will have to complete a three-course sequence: (a) a stand-alone research design course; (b) an introductory course on basic quantitative analysis; and (c) either an intermediate quantitative analysis course or a qualitative research methods course. By now offering a full semester of research design, we can better train our students to understand how to design a research project and identify and assess the relevant literature.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | Objective: Effective Reporting of Research Findings
  - **Measure:** 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
Implementation Description: The necessary changes to the curriculum have already been adopted and the necessary changes for the 2013-2014 Graduate Catalog have been submitted and are awaiting approval. Syllabi for the revised research design course have already been created.

Responsible Person/Group: Political Science Department; instructors for POLS 8800

Additional Resources: None

Expanded required methods sequence

Beginning in Fall of 2013, we have revised and expanded our research methods requirement to better train our students in research design and data analysis. We have already begun offering on an elective basis a new advanced quantitative methods course, as well as a qualitative research methods course, to better aid our students in learning the tools and methods necessary to answer their proposed research questions. Beginning in Fall 2013, all MA students will have to complete a three-course sequence: (a) a stand-alone research design course; (b) an introductory course on basic quantitative analysis; and (c) either an intermediate quantitative analysis course or a qualitative research methods course. We believe implementing this new sequence of courses will ensure that all of our students are able to demonstrate a high degree of mastery of the research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: The catalog changes were approved and included in the 2013-2014 Graduate Catalog. Faculty spent the summer designing the new introductory quantitative analysis course and stand-alone research design course and began teaching them in August.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: The Department of Political Science
Additional Resources: None; faculty capable of teaching these courses are already currently on the faculty.
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Mission / Purpose

The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

Goals

G 5: Teaching Effectiveness
Doctoral candidates are effective teachers with the ability to teach courses in their primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

G 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization
Doctoral candidates are effective researchers with a full understanding of the research enterprise, including the ability to critique others’ work and to be a contributing scholar by producing original research.

G 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
Doctoral candidates are effective researchers with a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to their research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.

G 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
Doctoral candidates are knowledge scholars with demonstrable competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

G 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
Doctoral candidates are knowledge scholars with demonstrable familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student’s major field of expertise.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The student demonstrates familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student’s major field of expertise.

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students must demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)**
Students have a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to their research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (G: 4) (M: 2, 3)**
Students have a full understanding of the research enterprise, including the ability to critique others' work and to be a contributing scholar by producing original research.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (G: 5) (M: 4)**
Students possess the ability to effectively teach courses in their primary fields and sub-fields of the discipline.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive exam assessments (O: 1, 2)**
Based on the program's learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the outcomes.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**
The Department's performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting. Comprehensive exams test students' knowledge of, at minimum, two fields in the discipline.

**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

**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
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.

"C" Grade Limit

The department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change.

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 could be taken at the same time as 8810. Students entering the program in the year it is not offered could take it the following fall. Those entering in the year it is offered would have to wait until the first semester of their third year to take the course. For this reason it would be better to offer the course every year, but if resources (or enrollment concerns) make that impossible, we can allow students in this position to go forward with comps at the end of their second year even without having taken the course. That way, their progress would not be slowed.
4. "Advanced Quantitative Methods" would cover the most commonly used statistical methods not fully discussed in 8800 or 8810, as determined by the instructor. These could include, for example, maximum likelihood estimation, duration models, panel models, and hierarchical models. The focus of the course would be on giving students a practical, applied knowledge of these techniques.
5. "Advanced Qualitative Methods” would cover the most used qualitative techniques not fully discussed in 8800 and 8810, as determined by the instructor. These could include, for example, maximum likelihood estimation, duration models, panel models, and hierarchical models.
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>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** This course was introduced in May 2010.

**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>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>In-Progress</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>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</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>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive exam preparation

Methods teaching & lab assistants

Beginning in 2011-2012, we allocated at least one advanced graduate student with superior methods skills to serve as a methods teaching and lab assistant. These students hold weekly office hours in the Political Science graduate computer lab, and their job is to answer student questions about research methods, including data management, data analysis and the proper estimation techniques. By providing additional support for students taking the required research methods sequence, our aim is to ensure all of our graduates have a very high degree of competency in utilizing the proper research methods.

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

Revision comprehensive exam process

In the middle of the academic year, the department changed how comprehensive exams were administered and graded. Previously, students took a written exam, received a grade on that exam, and if the exam was rated as at least a “pass,” sat for an oral exam conducted by one member of each exam committee. The oral exam committee would then decide whether the student passed in total. The Department revised the process such that students, beginning in February, only sit for an oral exam if requested by a specific exam committee. In other words, students take a written exam and receive a grade of either high pass, pass, request an oral exam, or inadequate. This change means that rather than oral exams performing a rather perfunctory function (and faculty finding it rather difficult to rate a student as “inadequate” when they successfully passed their written examinations), they now are used when students’ written exams are on the border between pass and fail, and provide an opportunity for the student to demonstrate orally their mastery of the literature as well as for the exam committee to closely question the student on this literature. Initial reports are that this system is working well.

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

Revision of required methods sequence

Beginning in Fall 2013, the Department has revised and expanded its required methods sequence to address concerns about the level of preparation and competency shown by our students with regards to research methods. Previously, all students were required to take a two-course sequence. Now, all doctoral students will be required to take a required four-course sequence: (1) a stand-alone research design course; (2) an introductory course on quantitative analysis; (3) an intermediate quantitative analysis course; and (4) either an advanced quantitative analysis course or a qualitative methods course. The expectation is that increasing students’ training in basic research design and data analysis will lead to better quality dissertations.

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

Comprehensive exam preparation

The department has further increased its efforts to prepare students for comprehensive exams. In particular, we started holding twice-yearly workshops on preparing and studying for comprehensive exams as well as having faculty include assignments in graduate seminars that aid in comp preparations.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive exam assessments | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
| Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: graduate faculty
Additional Resources: none

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
For students to develop and integrate: (1) skills for analyzing organizational performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions, (2) skills in developing financial reporting systems, (3) skills in interpreting and predicting choices in financial reporting systems, (4) assurance skills, (5) skills for collaborative work in teams, (6) communication skills and, (7) technology skills.

Goals
G 1: Develop financial reporting systems
Develop financial reporting systems.

G 2: Interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems
Interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems.

G 3: Apply taxation law to business entities
Apply taxation law to business entities.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Financial reporting skills: Develop (G: 1) (M: 1)
To develop financial reporting systems for decision-making by applying professional standards, financial information tools, and professional judgment.

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

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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met

The 2014 - 2015 scores were below the set goals for 2014-2015. On question 1, related to inter company transaction concepts in the equity method of accounting, students scored on average 73%; on question 2 related to reporting of subsidiary income in consolidated financial statements, the students scored on average 43%, and 73% for question 3.

#### M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Interpret & Predict

Performance on exam questions in 8420/8410.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### 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

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

The targets were met in both questions related to this assessment. Students scored on average 83% on the question related to interpreting valuation implications from asset impairments, and 89% on the question related to analyzing profit margins and asset turnover.

#### M 4: Assurance Skills (O: 3)

Performance on assignments in Acct 8610

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**

The students performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as expected.

#### M 5: Communication Skills (O: 6)

At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Communication Skills**

At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Not reported this cycle.

#### 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

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Not reported this cycle.

#### 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**

xxx

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Not reported this cycle.
Target is mean of 85% on exam questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not reported this cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 8: Apply tax law: Apply tax law to individuals and entities

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

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
- **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 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 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
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):
Measure: Financial reporting skills: Develop | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills: Develop
Implementation Description: The concepts under assessment are challenging and significant practice is required to master the concepts. Beginning fall 2013, questions will be assigned for homework and will be collected and reviewed in class for class participation credit.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran
Additional Resources: Faculty Time

Collaboration - FASB Team Project
ACCT 8420 will include a FASB team project based on assigned teams and FASB comment letters.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Collaboration Skills | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration Skills
Projected Completion Date: 01/2015
Use socrative app to assess homework for CP

In a large class with over 50 graduate students, use the socrative app to assess if students are (1) doing the homework problems, and (2) how many are getting it right, for class participation credit.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Financial reporting skills | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills

Implementation Description: All students have downloaded socrative app prior to first day of class.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran

Faculty change

There is a change in faculty for this course in 2015-2016, which will result in new action plans as necessary.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Financial reporting skills | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Psychology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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
2014-2015 Psychology BA, BS

(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, specifically. Five specific objectives are associated with this broad goal.

**G 2: Knowledge, Skills, and Values Consistent with Liberal Arts Education that are Further Enhanced by Psychology**

This broad goal describes specific outcomes that are usually a part of a general education program or liberal arts education, and which are enhanced by the discipline of Psychology. Conversely, liberal arts training in these areas contributes to a better understanding of the scientific study of behavior.

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Knowledge Base of Psychology (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Research Methods in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Information and Technological Literacy (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: PSYC1100 Learning Survey (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Knowledge Base of Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our target for this measure is significant improvement in the average, total score on the survey, with a moderate or better effect size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: PSYC1101 - Mastery Test (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Knowledge Base of Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of students should pass the mastery test (70% or better).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: PSYC3530 Quantitative Methods Questions (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Research Methods in Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventy percent of students should score 70% or better on the 14 question test.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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.

**PSYC3530 - PORT Quiz (O: 4)**
The Psychology Online Research Tools tutorial was developed by Kim Darnell, Lyn Thaxton and Chris Goode as an online tutorial to introduce students to the computer-based library research tools available for psychology. Students taking PSYC3530 - Advanced Research Design and Analysis take the tutorial near the beginning of the semester. A 20 point quiz is given to assess the effectiveness of the tutorial. A copy of the quiz can be found in the document repository.

**Target for O4: Information and Technological Literacy**
- Seventy-five percent passing with a grade of 75% or better.

**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
experts in specific areas of concentration (e.g., clinical, child clinical, specific research program).

**G 3: Applied Skills in Psychology**  
To train graduate students to be able to apply their skills across settings (e.g., research, instruction, applied) and within specific areas of individualized interest and concentration (e.g., community center for disadvantaged populations).

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Theory and Content (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16)

Students will develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in the field of Psychology, the program area, and the research specialty area.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

### SLO 2: Research Methods (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16)

Students will understand and appropriately apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

**Standard Associations**

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

4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

### SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)

Students will communicate and collaborate effectively in a variety of formats and settings.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

**Standard Associations**

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

**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
1.0 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.
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
1.0 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.

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

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 3: MA Thesis (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**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.

#### M 4: General Exam (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8)
Doctoral examination scored by committee of faculty
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O4: Application**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

#### M 5: General Exam GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)
During the oral defense of the General Exam, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations)
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
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").

### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### M 7: PhD Dissertation Defense GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)
During the oral presentation of the PhD. defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations) Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

### Target for O1: Theory and Content
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O2: Research Methods
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: PhD Dissertation (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Theory and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Performance in the ethics course (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses knowledge of scientific and professional ethical issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Performance in diversity courses (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8050 or Psyc 8060: Diversity issues in clinical practice and psychological research, or Issues of human diversity in psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with issues of human diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Performance in methods courses (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8010: Psychological Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Research Methods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on the selected assignments designated to assess expertise with data analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Performance in the history course (O: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8500: History of Psychology - written assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Theory and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Research Methods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psy c 9900T: Teaching seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</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 meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.</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 meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.</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 meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Teaching performance (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of student-instruction course evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Publications and presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O9</strong>: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O10</strong>: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
</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 <strong>O1</strong>: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Discuss with Graduate Program Committee**

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Sociocultural and International Awareness

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

**Discuss with Graduate Program Committee**

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

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: Research Methods
Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Evaluate Communication and Collaboration Skills training as evaluated with the General Exam
The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in communication and collaboration skills, especially training related to the skills assessed on the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Evaluate Communication and Critical Thinking Skills training as evaluated with the General Exam
The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in critical thinking, especially these skills as they are demonstrated on the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Evaluate Research Methods training as evaluated with the General Exam
The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in research methods, especially the skills that are assessed with the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Information and Technology Literacy

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Values in Psychology


Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Application

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Values in Psychology

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Personal Development

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate Theory and Content training as evaluated with the General Exam
Findings will be discussed by the Graduate Program Committee (Chairs of the 5 Psychology program) to identify whether training in theory and content should be improved, especially around the skills assessed by the General Exam.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
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 public or 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students analyze the nature and function of the public service in the US, including the importance of public sector in modern societies or demonstrate an understanding of the scope and significance of the nonprofit sector in the U.S and abroad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public and nonprofit managers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public and nonprofit administration and policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Ability to demonstrate graduate-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (G: 3) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate graduate-level writing skills in policy-relevant research using real-world context. Students must be able to emphasize interpretation and application of statistics in reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles (G: 4) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public and nonprofit policy issues (G: 4) (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to policy issues affecting the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Demonstrate understanding of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors (G: 4) (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Describe the technical nature and process of public and nonprofit budgeting (G: 5) (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students describe and explain the technical nature of public or nonprofit budgeting in the U.S., including the timetable and rules of the process that are typical of the three levels of government or typical of the nonprofit sector. Students should be able to conduct a budget analysis and demonstrate an understanding of key indicators of financial health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 15: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or nonprofit organizations (G: 5) (M: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to assess, explain, and compare the political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in the U.S or explain how organizational characteristics and external sources of regulation and funding affect nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (G: 6) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks as they apply in the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design (G: 6) (M: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand the advantages and disadvantages of various models of organizational structure and design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law (G: 7) (M: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 the objective. In an ethics memo and on the final exam students will be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in public or nonprofit organizations.

**M 3: Describe the nature and function of the public or nonprofit sector (O: 3)**

On papers, policy memos, and the final exam students will describe the nature and function of the public sector or demonstrate an understanding of the scope and significance of the nonprofit sector in the U.S. and abroad (PMAP 8111 or PMAP 8210)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of
**M 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and using data sets (O: 4)**

Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

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

**Target for O4: Apply basic concepts of measures and using data sets**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 and PMAP 8210 will at least partially meet this objective. Students do problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

**M 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 5)**

Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

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

**Target for O5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

**M 6: Demonstrate ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 6)**

The students’ final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

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

**Target for O6: Demonstrate ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students’ final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

**M 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)**

The students’ final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

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

**Target for O7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students’ final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

**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...
M 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)

Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14:</th>
<th>Demonstrated ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (O: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O14: Describe the technical nature and process of public and nonprofit budgeting**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8161, Public Budgeting and Finance, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate the ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting on assignments 1-4, the midterm and final examinations, and the final project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15:</th>
<th>Demonstrated ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (O: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of the course requirements consisting of four written assignments, a midterm exam, a final exam, and a final project will document the students' ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16:</th>
<th>Demonstrated ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (O: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. Students demonstrate the ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks on assignments 1-4, the midterm and final examinations, and the final project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17:</th>
<th>Demonstrated understanding of models of organizational structure and design (O: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18:</th>
<th>Demonstrated knowledge of contract and administrative law or nonprofit law (O: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research proposal and research paper will allow 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8411 or PMAP 8203 will at least partially meet this objective. The research proposal and paper will allow students to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking, adjudication of administrative action, and judicial review of administrative action, or demonstrated knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising and employee compensation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19:</th>
<th>Evaluated the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.

**Target for O19: Evaluate the legal rights and responsibilities of public or nonprofit managers and employees**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet the objectives. The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.

**M 20: Demonstrated understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (O: 20)**

On the homework assignments and the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.

**Target for O20: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8411 will at least partially meet this objective. On the homework assignments and the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.

**M 21: Demonstrated ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (O: 21)**

On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**Target for O21: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8431, Leadership and Organizational Behavior, will at least partially meet the objective. On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**M 22: Demonstrated how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (O: 22)**

On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**Target for O22: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet this objective. On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**M 23: Demonstrated how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (O: 23)**

On the midterm essay, the final essay, and the case study students demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies.

**Target for O23: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet this objective. On the midterm essay, the final essay, and the case study students demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies.
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.
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

---

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 literary 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).

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).

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).

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 application of critical thinking skills to problems relevant to Public Health." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

Target for O5: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
75% of student sample will score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the following Thesis/Capstone Assessment rubric item: "Writing demonstrates application of critical thinking skills to problems relevant to Public Health." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Status: Planned</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*(Includes 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.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Public Policy BS**

*(As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM 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.

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
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 enrolled in the Course 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.

M 3: Demonstrate writing skills appropriate to public policy (O: 3)

Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy. This is demonstrated through weekly policy memos and a final paper that meet the CTW requirements of the course.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in the Citizenship course will at least partially meet the objective. Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy. This is demonstrated through weekly policy memos and a final paper that meet the CTW requirements of the course.

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 the objective. On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations.

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.

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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation as well as the examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation and examinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will exhibit critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Application of statistical techniques to analyze public issues (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze public policy issues. This is measured by performance on examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS. This is demonstrated using examinations and class assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 4041, Policy Data Analysis, will at least partially meet this objective. Students develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS. This is demonstrated using examinations and class assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: demonstrate ability to apply scientific method to policy issues (O: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Apply scientific method to policy issues**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in PMAP 4051, Evaluating Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research (O: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research. These techniques include experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, and others. This will be measured using examinations and the major policy evaluation writing assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core sequence: 4041-4061</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Chair will appoint committee to discuss options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Greg Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Target for O13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate ability to use 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.

**Target for O14: 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 O15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy**

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 O16: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention**

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

---

**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

**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

**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

---

**Assessment Data by Section**

**Georgia State University**
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
SLO 1: Understand different ways of categorizing policies (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies.

SLO 2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students consider the influence of formal and informal actors on public policy.

SLO 3: Understand different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 3)
Students understand different models of policy making such as the policy process model, as well as other models drawn from the public policy literature.

SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.

SLO 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.

SLO 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)
Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

SLO 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts (G: 3) (M: 7)
Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing policy analysts.

SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)
Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)
Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.

**SLO 10: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 10)**
Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.

**SLO 11: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 11)**
Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues.

**SLO 12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (G: 4) (M: 12)**
Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public sector decision-making.

**SLO 13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (G: 5) (M: 13)**
Students will be able to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.

**SLO 14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (G: 5) (M: 14)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies.

**SLO 15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain (G: 5) (M: 15)**
Students will be able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.

**SLO 16: To understand how to identify policy problems (G: 6) (M: 16)**
Students understand how to identify attributes of problems that may be addressed through public policy.

**SLO 17: To understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives (G: 6) (M: 17)**
Students learn to understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives and in which circumstances it may be appropriate to use them.

**SLO 18: To understand how to construct a policy memo (G: 6) (M: 18)**
Students understand how to construct a policy memo for a potential client.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies (O: 1)**
Students demonstrate understanding of different ways of categorizing public policies. This is measured on the students’ examinations in PMAP 8011, Politics and Policy.

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

**Target for O1: Understand different ways of categorizing policies**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students will at least partially meet this objective.

**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
M 4: Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (O: 4)

Students in PMAP 8121 complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

M 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 5)

Students in PMAP 8121 do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

M 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 6)

The students' final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students' final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

M 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)

The students' final paper and the midterm and final examinations in PMAP 8121 measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students' final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M10: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm and final examination and written assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm and final examination and written assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M11: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the final examination and course paper in PMAP 8141 students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (O: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled in PMAP 8521, Evaluation Research, will demonstrate the ability to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (O: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. On the two examinations, homework assignments and presentations students will demonstrate their understanding of the causes of bias in regression analysis.
**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.
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory (M: 1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Students apply analytical methods to public policy (M: 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to apply analytical methods to the study of public policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field (M: 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate their understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Produce Original Public Policy Research (M: 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will produce original public policy research to demonstrate understanding of theories and analytical methods of the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive Examination (O: 1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical framework section of the public policy section of the core comprehensive examination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Analytical Methods Section of Comprehensive Exam (O: 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of analytical methods on the methods section of the core comprehensive examination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Major Field Comprehensive Examination (O: 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of a major field on the comprehensive examination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Dissertation and Original Research (O: 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will produce and defend a dissertation proposal, produce conference papers and journal manuscripts, and produce a doctoral dissertation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Reading Specialist (p-12) MEd
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST

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

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.

**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.

**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.

#### M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations (O: 1, 2)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards one, two, and three.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes**
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*

**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.

#### 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

#### 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.

**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.

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

Redesigned Portfolio
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
The M.A.T. teacher education program for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) is one of the five distance learning programs and two non-degree endorsements offered by the College of Education at Georgia State University through Georgia OnmyLine (GOML). Georgia ONmyLINE provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. This M.A.T. in Reading, Language and Literacy Education (ESOL) at Georgia State University ("GSU") is a collaborative program between GSU, Valdosta State University ("VSU"), and North Georgia College and State University ("NGCSU"), institutions of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. In this online program, we strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

**G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions**
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

**G 3: Impact on student learning**
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 7)**
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum).

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (G: 1, 3) (M: 2, 3)**
Candidates create learning environments which support ESOL students' cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families (Goal 2). (Key Assessment- Planning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction); Key Assessment- Clinical Practice: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions (G: 1, 2) (M: 5)**
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision (Goal 2). (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

**SLO 4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students (G: 3) (M: 4, 6)**
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)**
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**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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**Strengthening Professional Standard**
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility" has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

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

**improving clinical practice**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Midpoint | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
Implementation Description: Candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty
improving clinical practice at endpoint
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Endpoint | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

Implementation Description: Candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving content knowledge
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in this content knowledge. This means that we set our expectations from the outset clearly and we maintain closer monitoring of candidates' obtaining content knowledge.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge via Coursework | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: As we were successful in attaining this target, we will continue with our implementation plan of effective monitoring of our students and effective teaching.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & MSIT Faculty

Improving content knowledge, GACE
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their GACE scores. This means that candidates' content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Candidates' content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Additional Resources: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving dispositions
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and their work is consistently monitored throughout the program.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

Implementation Description: Expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and candidates' work is consistently monitored throughout the program by the program coordinator.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving effects on P-12 student learning
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners' learning. This means that candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

Implementation Description: Candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving planning
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving planning. This means that candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teachers.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Planning Performance | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

Implementation Description: Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teachers.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

more rigorous lesson planning and implementation

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving planning. This means that candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator and course instructors who teach practicum courses.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice at Endpoint | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

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 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)
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Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Embed Standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Embed Standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Embed Standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards for portfolio
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

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

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
improving content knowledge in Reading

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in Reading. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): Content knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading  

**Implementation Description:** Expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving dispositions

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions  

**Implementation Description:** Expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving effects on P-12 student learning

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners' learning in P-12. This means that candidates will successfully learn content knowledge, on which they plan and implement rigorous lessons, which are followed by critical reflection on their teaching.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students  

**Implementation Description:** Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving planning

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving planning. This means that candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): Planning Performance | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills  

**Implementation Description:** Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

closely monitoring students' progress in the EDRD 7600 course in terms of dispositions

In the course work, EDRD 7600, 88% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 53% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their EDRD 7600 course work. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 53% received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their dispositions as teachers and leaders. This means that expectations for them to develop positive dispositions are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work as well as in the program level.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions
In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and monitoring students' progress in the classroom. 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.

### 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 monitoring students' progress in the classroom. 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Key Assessment)</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content knowledge in Reading</td>
<td>Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on P-12 Student Learning</td>
<td>Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Completion Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Program Coordinator &amp; EDRD reading faculty for GOML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Program Coordinator &amp; EDRD reading faculty for GOML</td>
<td>06/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 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 throughout the program and their learning will be closely monitored throughout the program and course work.

### 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.

### Closely monitoring students' progress in the ERD 7600 course

In the course work, ERD 7600, 88% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 59% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (Score 4) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their ERD 7600 course work. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 59% received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Also, 100% students in the final exit portfolio on the reading content received a score of 3. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in Reading. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout the course work.

### Closely monitoring students' progress in the TSLE 7260 course

In the course work, TSLE 7260, 82% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 70% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning in regards to ESOL. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 70% students received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their effects on K-12 students and advocacy work for ELLs. This means that expectations for them to develop positive dispositions as teachers and leaders are high in the courses and throughout the program and their learning will be closely monitored throughout the program and course work.

---
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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.

**M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)**
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)
Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

M 3: Planning Performance (O: 2)

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).

Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

M 4: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 2)

Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)

Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation 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)

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

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 7: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 4)

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning (EDCI 7680).

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.

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 research and practice readings and in-depth discussions about the role and use of multimodality and technology to classes. In TSLE 7250, a group of students (a cooperative learning team) are asked to make a presentation about weekly readings in a multimodal and creative manner (e.g., critiquing readings and presenting discussion questions for the class, showing video clips that are related to weekly readings, and preparing activities to learn abstract and difficult theoretical concepts). In addition, TSLE classes plan to hold a mini-conference about students’ final projects or papers at the last class. By doing so, our candidates will have an opportunity to share their academic interests and experiences with the entire classmates, increase theoretical and practical knowledge about the learning and teaching of ESOL, and will be more likely to become an active member in an academic community. (2) 100 % of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) in professional and pedagogical skills through the “Clinical Practice at Midpoint”; however, a minimum of 19% and a maximum of 38% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4 or higher). Thus, in order to help our candidate increase their professional and pedagogical skills, ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in discussions and reflections about four areas, (a) knowledge of students and learning, (b) learning environments, (c) assessment, and (d) planning and instruction. More specifically, in TSLE courses, 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
Measure (Key Assessment): Planning Performance | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty
**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.

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.

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.

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

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.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Real Estate MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Real Estate degree is designed for individuals who are principally interested in careers in the real estate industry and those who will use real property in business decision making. It provides the student with both general and specialized real estate knowledge and analytical skills. The MSRE program is based on a synthesis of legal, physical, market and financial considerations that affect the real property decision process.

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.

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.

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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Application to real estate investment problems | Outcome/Objective: 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Rehabilitation Counseling MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:47 AM EST
(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
### 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Certification tests and major exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Certification and licensing ethical code practice

**Implementation Description:** Continued accreditation by CORE and participation by board of advisors. This is an on-going process.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed

#### Ethics class/DSM Training

The program evaluation from the past year has detected that the ethics training in infused in several classes and areas of overlap exist. We have also noted that diagnostic training (DSM) could be enhanced. This issue was discussed with the rehabilitation advisory board and over the next year there are plans to enhance ethics training in the introductory class (6050), eliminate the "stand alone" ethics class and require the DSM training class.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct | **Outcome/Objective:** Certification and licensing ethical code practice

**Implementation Description:** Initiate the application to academic affairs.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed, Lindy Parker, Debbie Berens

#### Reviews of student competence

The coordinator of the program will solicit information from faculty of classes designed for demonstration of competence and site supervisors for internships.

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

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed

#### Reviews of student competence with clients

The assessment project and internship evaluations will be reviewed for adequacy of practical application of educational outcomes.

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

- **Implementation Description:** "Real" clients for assessment project and internship sites.

- **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed and Joe Hill

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 course build and are directly related to the competencies required by our external accrediting body (CORE) First Session (Fall 2015) total hours = 15 CPS 6050 Introduction to Professional Identity, Practice, and Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (3) CPS 6410 Basic Counseling Skills (3) CPS 7260 Counseling Systems and Interventions (3) CPS 8410 Medical and Psychological Aspects of Disability I (3) CPS 7300 Career Theory, Assessment, & Intervention (3) Second Session (Spring 2016) total hours = 15 CPS 6450 Group Counseling Systems (3) CPS 8430 Advanced Counseling Skills (3) CPS 7450 Educational and Psychological Appraisal (3) CPS 9000 Methods of Research in Education (on-line) Fourth Session (Fall 2016) total hours = 9-12 CPS 7663 Applied Practice I: Rehab Couns (3) Mini Mester I CPS 7683 Internship: Rehab Counseling (3) Mini Mester II CPS 8460 Psychological Aspects of Addictive Disorders (3) ---may pick up elective here or EPRS 7900 Professional Identity and Ethics in Mental Health Counseling (3) ---may pick up elective here or EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)

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 excellent results. All of our students graduated, passed the national Certified Rehabilitation Counseling exam and obtained professional employment.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Program faculty meet regularly to share outcome data on our students. After every exam, and at the end of each semester we review the progress of every student. We have a program advisory board composed of community stakeholders, that meets 1-2x a year in which outcome data is shared and program issues 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 an excellent program that is fully accredited by CORE. Our new curriculum meets all standards and results in very positive student outcomes.

Annual Report Section Responses

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

During this past year we received a $1,000,000 grant to support the training of 8 students a year. All of our students passed the CRC exam (national average pass rate is around 68%) All of our graduates obtained appropriate jobs in their field of training.

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

We are continuing to work on transition from a CORE accredited program to a CACREP accredited clinical rehabilitation counseling program. We will be updating our curriculum, and fine-tuning our courses and assignments to align with CACREP standards.

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

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
We had 100% retention last year.

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 program coordinator is on the editorial board of the most important research journal in the field. He also conducted an accreditation report of another university for CORE

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Religious Studies BA
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
In the aftermath of September 11th, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline has become strikingly evident. Educated students need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate setting, and they need to gain this knowledge not from those who already are committed to a particular set of beliefs but from scholars who are trained in the histories, languages, and practices of religions. Religious Studies uses methods from a wide range of fields including philosophy, ethics, history, anthropology, archaeology, comparative literature, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. The primary concern is to understand different religious practices, beliefs, texts, and communities from a scholarly perspective. Students who study religion learn skills such as effective communication, teamwork, and the ability to understand and appreciate multiple points of view. Graduates use these skills in a wide variety of professions including but not limited to: education, law, non-profit administration, media, counseling and social work, humanitarian aid, ministry, healthcare and medicine, business.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate knowledge in the following areas: 1) Religious Traditions of the World (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam) 2) Foundational Thinkers in the World Religions (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) 3) Major Religious Thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.) 4) Major Theorists in the Study of Religion (Elaine, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ Smith, etc.) 5) Representative Critical Theories and Methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological, religious, feminist, etc.) 6) Fundamental Technical Categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.) 7) Common Comparative Themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.) 8) Historical Role in Religion in Culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, syncretism, art and music, etc.)

G 2: Technical Skills in the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate technical skills in the following areas: 1) Reading Critically (outlining arguments, identifying conclusions, contextualizing author and text, detecting vagueness/ambiguity, etc.) 2) Thinking and Writing Critically (establishing premises and reaching conclusion, avoiding fallacies, utilizing proper grammar/diction/usage, etc.) 3) Conducting Effective Research in Religious Studies (using libraries and on-line resources, evaluating scholarship, synthesizing, etc.)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Knowledge of General Religious History (M: 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluating RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies papers (Research) | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion

Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

More Targeted Submissions
The Assessment Committee will explore ways to enable closer to 100% compliance with submission requests, and the Curriculum Committee will examine ways in which students may be encouraged to situate every thinker and/or theoretical approach in its historical context.

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

Better training of instructor
Many sections of the course are taught by Teaching Assistants. Better training of the TAs will improve student performance.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluating final exam for RELS 3270 (Historical) | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of General Religious History

Inclusion of revision process
In order to address the low scores, the RELS 4750 instructor will incorporate a revision step in the writing process for the capstone paper in order to offer the students input on their writing.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluating RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies papers (Research) | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion
Measure: Evaluation of RELS 4750 CTW Seminar in Religious Studies (Critical Thinking and Writing) | Outcome/Objective: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: RELS 4750 instructor

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, JJ 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

Target for O1: Knowledge of the history of religions
75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies
75% of faculty evaluations of historical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

M 2: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 2)
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a numerical grade (4.0 scale) on mastery of theoretical content. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of this content.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Knowledge of theories of Religion**

75% of faculty evaluations of theoretical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 3: Critical Reading/Writing Evaluation of M.A. Thesis (O: 5, 7)**

For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee produces written comments detailing the extent to which the thesis demonstrates the student’s ability to engage in critical reading, thinking, and writing in the academic study of religion. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of these skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts**

75% of faculty evaluations on critical skills scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression**

75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 4: Methodological Evaluation of M.A. Thesis (O: 3)**

For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a numerical grade (4.0 scale) on the ability to apply different methodological approaches to the study of religion. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of these skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Methodological approaches to Religion**

75% of faculty evaluations on methodological issues scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**M 5: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Each graduating MA student is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies masters degree with regard to specific learning outcomes, i.e., understanding the nature and varieties of religion, familiarity with critical theory and major theorists, ability to conduct research and write critically, etc. Students ranked goals on a five-point scale, with 1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest ranking. Moreover, students were asked to offer comments specifically addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the program, advise for future graduate students, and so forth.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O1: Knowledge of the history of religions**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of theories of Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Target for O3: Methodological approaches to Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Target for O4: Comparative Approaches to Religion**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies**

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

**Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression**
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Monitoring Thesis Research
The Graduate Committee will implement changes in the process by which students conceptualize and research their theses, mandating more familiarity with research techniques, library resources, and alternative methodologies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

#### New Assessment Criteria
The Assessment Committee will modify the existing Assessment procedure so that individual measures match more precisely with specific learning objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jonathan Herman, Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

#### Scheduling Graduate Seminars
The Department will develop a long-range plan for developing and staffing a diverse range of appropriately configured graduate-only seminars.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond, Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

#### Theory and Method
Continue integrating theoretical and methodological components into graduate-only seminars, in addition to the required course in advance theory and method.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of theories of Religion
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

#### Theory and Method
Implementation of more theory-methodology oriented courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Historical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses | Outcome/Objective: Research in Religious Studies
  - Measure: Methodological Evaluation of M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Methodological approaches to Religion
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Molly Bassett

#### Thesis Timeline
Establish a prospectus/thesis timeline, with specific benchmarks, clarification of methodology, research plan, etc.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Critical Reading/Writing Evaluation of M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Reading Scholarly Texts
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Molly Bassett

#### Pro-Seminar Test
Currently, data is collected from the MA thesis or a final research paper which is a requirement for the MA degree. These two sources of data are unable to provide measures for all the learning outcomes. One possible solution under consideration would be to administer a test to the students in the graduate pro-seminar at the beginning and then at the end of the semester. This test would ask students to link names of religious scholars with key elements of their contributions to the field. By comparing their responses at the beginning of the semester with their responses at the end of the semester, it would be possible to assess the extent to which the students' knowledge of key religious scholars and concepts improved over the course of the semester. This test would provide measures for the first two learning outcomes. The Department will discuss ways to measure the other outcomes, ensure that each outcome is linked to a single measure, as well as which outcomes are redundant.
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 (M: 1)

Be able to write a review literature related to their field of study and the various methodological approaches.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: LOA Assessment Results (O: 2)

Educational research involves the study of quantitative and qualitative research methods as they are applied to the systematic study of education. A major in educational research allows students to have a concentration in statistics, measurement, program evaluation, survey research, computer applications, qualitative research, institutional research or policy research. The assessment of students who were enrolled in the program, during the 2014 – 2015 academic year, took place at the final project/thesis stage. The survey instrument provided an opportunity to score and comment on the students' performance. Two students reached the Project/Thesis Stage. The assessment instrument, which was addressed to the evaluators, consisted of five questions that could reveal a student's knowledge, ability, and judgement. The student's performances were rated on a scale of 1 – 3 (with 1 = Does Not Meet, 2 = Meets, and 3 = Exceeds) there was also a Not Applicable rating. An opportunity for evaluator comment was also provided.

The Learning Outcome Assessment questions follow:

Q1: Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology(ies)
Q2: Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field.
Q3: Document adheres to the standards of quality writing.
Q4: Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience.
Q5: Potential for contribution to the discipline.

* Attachment "A" - Excel sheet containing the raw data.

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

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.
Redesigning measures
There has been a change in leadership and subsequent changes in reporting officers in the unit. The unit has begun creating measures-rubrics and analytic guidelines to evaluate the learning outcomes and objectives of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Data will be collected at the end of the academic year 2012-2013 using the new measures designed.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

Locate a measure
Because of the option students have to not do a thesis we should identify courses or be sure there are courses in which this is a requirement and use the outcomes of those courses as the measure to evaluate this objective

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

Rubric and assessment
Design use and reporting of the outcomes using a rubric

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The faculty is still in the process of finalizing and becoming acquainted with the use of the rubric. It was decided that someone in the administrative section of the unit will be responsible for collecting the rubric data from the faculty and recording them to make for ease of retrieval if and when the officers are no longer in service or reporting officer changes.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

   Q1: Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology(ies) Educational Research Courses provide broad and extensive instruction in the choice and use of investigative approaches: EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education Introduction to qualitative and quantitative methods. EPRS 8600 Computer Use in Education Students use advanced software to analysis data and simulations EPRS 8640 Case Study Methods: Students will analyze multiple popular cultural forms utilizing various methods of textual analyses. Students will become familiar with different theoretical frameworks that can be applied in the study of popular culture. Students will understand the history of popular culture and how it is used as a tool of producing and reproducing ideology. Students will learn and apply various analysis techniques to popular culture texts. Q2: Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. The program courses in general encourage that students become comfortable with the critical consumption and practical application of published research. They develop familiarity with the terms and concepts important to the field. Q3: Document adheres to the standards of quality writing. In the majority of EPRS courses students are encouraged to create and submit a manuscript to a journal in one of the following fields: quantitative methodology, qualitative methodology, cultural studies, education, literacy, sociology, or humanities. Q4: Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. [Note: Students completing the “Project Track” would not give an oral presentation, consequently this question would be recorded as Not Applicable “NA.” Most EPRS courses request that students present their work at the end of the semester. Often it is a visual representation (poster, power point, Web 2.0 tools, etc.) of their final paper. The setting is a professional conference where one shares work with an academic audience. Q5: Potential for contribution to the discipline. Most EPRS courses request that students present their work at the end of the semester. Often it is a visual representation (poster, power point, Web 2.0 tools, etc.) of their final paper. The setting is a professional conference where one shares work with an academic audience.

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?

An average score of 2.5 for the first three SLOs indicates that student performances on substantive aspects of scholarship are near the Exceeds mark. The “Not Applicable” mark for the two students on Q4 indicates that the students submitted a final project. The 2.0 average for the Q5 suggest that their projects were of interests in the field of educational research. Because the Assessment scale is minimal (1 – 3) the instrument does not discern different levels of student performance. In the future more emphasis will be place on the comment section, so that we may get a better idea of how students are meeting the five assessment categories.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 PHD RMS program coordinator will present a summary of the MS EDR WEAVE report to faculty at the upcoming faculty meeting.

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 MS EDR program is reviewed annually in conjunction with course offerings and course enrollment. The Student Learning Outcomes represent vital feedback and will contribute to the assessment of the program. The current SLO findings will be a feature of the debate that addresses program strengths and weaknesses. The administrative coordinator, at the October faculty meeting, will present a report on our action item to create a yearly review of student progress.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Research, Measurement, Statistics (GOML) MS
(As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Goals
G 1: Doctoral students
Graduates of the RMS online master's program will be doctoral students in Georgia State University or other programs in the field.

G 2: Employed in research related fields
Graduates of the RMS master's program will be employed in research related jobs in their field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
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, 2)
Students will be able to: (1) select an appropriate design for addressing a research query; (2) to choose an appropriate population from which to sample; (3) choose an appropriate sampling technique for the intended level of generalizability; (4) operationalize all variables of interest, including, as applicable, the selection of measurement instruments intended to gather data on said variable(s); (5) craft an appropriate procedure for data collection; (6) write a professional-level Method section of a research report, describing the above aspects of a design.[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, 2)
Students will be able to: (1) recognize an appropriate technique for analyzing data, given the research query and the design used to collect the data; (2) conduct the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data; (3) interpret and to report on the results of the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data . [see pdfs: EPS LOA Guide; LOA Form Degree Programs (Indicators 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.
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.

M 2: LOA Assessment Results (O: 2, 3, 4)
Educational research involves the study of quantitative and qualitative research methods as they are applied to the systematic study of education. A major in educational research allows students to have a concentration in statistics, measurement, program evaluation, survey research, computer applications, qualitative research, institutional research or policy research. The assessment of students who were enrolled in the program, during the 2014 – 2015 academic year, took place at the final project/thesis stage. The
survey instrument provided an opportunity to score and comment on the students' performance. One student reached the Project/Thesis Stage. The assessment instrument, which was addressed to the evaluators, consisted of five questions that could reveal a student's knowledge, ability, and judgement. The student's performance was rated on a scale of 1 – 3 (with 3 = Exceeds, 2 = Meets, and 1 = Does Not Meet, there was also a Not Applicable rating. An opportunity for evaluator comment was also provided. The Learning Outcome Assessment questions follow: Q1: Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology(ies) Q2: Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Q3: Document adheres to the standards of quality writing. Q4: Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. Q5: Potential for contribution to the discipline. Please note that the ratings presented are averages of the scores awarded to the participants. The Project/Thesis Stage (1 student) For the four questions that received a score the individual's rating was 3.00, which was recorded for all four of the assessment questions; “appropriate methodology,” “knowledge of literature in the field,” “quality of writing,” and “potential for contribution to the discipline.” In summary, the assessment indicates that the participant presented his/her project paper (because there is no rating for Q4) at the 3.00 level – “Exceeds.” *Attachment “A” - Excel sheet containing the raw data.

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

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

Plans for data collection
This program will officially begin its implementation process in Spring 2013. Plans for its evaluation are being put in place for this the first cohort of students who have enrolled in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The members of the department are coming together to create and design rubric and analytical frameworks that can be used to evaluate the outcomes of the program.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chris O'Shima

Reviewing of the GOML

The unit is reviewing the data collection process and the program itself because of the low numbers. Last year a decision was made to include non GOML MS students in the online courses associated with the RMS GOMS (MS) to increase the numbers and make the courses more feasible in terms of faculty time. None of the students have completed the degree which only began one year ago. No data are available for measurement of outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2014

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Q1: Addresses the research question(s) with appropriate methodology(ies) Educational Research Courses provide broad and extensive instruction in the choice and use of investigative approaches: EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education Introduction to qualitative and quantitative methods. EPRS 8600 Computer Use in Education Students use advanced software to analysis data and simulations EPRS 8640 Case Study Methods: Students will analyze multiple popular cultural forms utilizing various methods of textual analyses. Students will become familiar with different theoretical frameworks that can be applied in the study of popular culture. Students will understand the history of popular culture and how it is used as a tool of producing and reproducing ideology. Students will learn and apply various analysis techniques to popular culture texts. Q2: Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. The program courses in general encourage that students become comfortable with the critical consumption and practical application of published research. They develop familiarity with the terms and concepts important to the field. Q3: Document adheres to the standards of quality writing. In the majority of EPRS courses students are encouraged to create and submit a manuscript to a journal in one of the following fields: quantitative methodology, qualitative methodology, cultural studies, education, literacy, sociology, or humanities. Q4: Oral presentation communicates research in a manner appropriate for the material and audience. [Note: Students completing the "Project Track" would not give an oral presentation, consequently this question would be recorded as Not Applicable "NA." Q5: Potential for contribution to the discipline. Most EPRS courses request that students present their work at the end of the semester. Often it is a visual representation (poster, power point, Web 2.0 tools, etc.) of their final paper. The setting is a professional conference where students are encouraged to submit a manuscript to a journal. For the four questions that received a score the individual's rating was 3.00, which was recorded for all four of the assessment questions; “appropriate methodology,” “knowledge of literature in the field,” “quality of writing,” and “potential for contribution to the discipline.” In summary, the assessment indicates that the participants presented his/her project paper (because there is no rating for Q4) at the 3.00 level – “Exceeds.”

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 student graduated from the MS EDR Online program. A score of 3.0 for the first three SLOs indicates that student performance on substantive aspects of scholarship are at the Exceeds mark. The “Not Applicable” mark on Q4 indicates that the student submitted a final project and did not defend a thesis. The 3.0 score for Q5 suggest that the student’s project was of interests in the field of educational research. Because the Assessment scale is minimal (1 – 3) the instrument does not discern different levels of student performance. The future more emphasis will be place on the comment section, so that we may get a better idea of how students are meeting the five assessment categories.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 PHD RMS program coordinator will present a summary of the MS EDR (GOML) WEAVE report to faculty at the upcoming faculty meeting.

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 MS EDR (GOML) program is reviewed annually in conjunction with course offerings and course enrollment. The Student Learning Outcomes represent vital feedback and will contribute to the assessment of the program. The current SLO findings will be a feature of the debate that addresses program strengths and weaknesses. The administrative coordinator, at the October faculty meeting, will present a report on our action item to create a yearly review of student progress.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2014-2015 Respiratory Therapy BS

As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST

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

Mission / Purpose

The Bachelor of Science Program in Respiratory Therapy major is designed for students entering the respiratory therapy profession. Our mission is to provide a rigorous and comprehensive undergraduate education in the science of respiratory care that results in graduates who have the knowledge and 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**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Case Presentation (O: 1)**

Case presentations allow students to actively learn in their discipline while solving problems similar to ones they will encounter in the real world when they graduate. This requires students to draw upon their abilities to manage time while synthesizing information by organizing relevant information and discarding information that is not useful. To demonstrate mastery of this goal, all students will successfully write and orally present a case study to the faculty and students during the student clinical seminar as part of their clinical practice.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Communication Skills**

90% of students will achieve a minimum grade of 80% on their assigned oral case study presentation based on a standard rubric used by the faculty.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

During fall semester 2014, 24 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 81% to 100%. 70 is the highest score based on rubric used by faculty but is calibrated to 0 to 100% score for grading purposes. 24 out of 24 (100%) met the target score. For spring semester 2015, 25 students were evaluated during clinical seminar with grades ranging form 80% to 100%. Using the same grading system 25 out of 25 (100%) achieved 80% or higher.
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 assignments of a professional issue during RT 4085 based on approved rubric by CTW.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

23 students were given 3 in class writing assignments worth 50 points each. The average score was 96% on these activities. 23 students were given 4 take home writing assignments worth 50 points each. The average score was 90% on these activities. Overall 5 B grades and 18 A grades as final grades for the course.

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 2014-2015 - 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 72%.

M 4: NBRC Written Registry Exam (O: 2)

All students must successfully pass the National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC) Written Registry Exam to demonstrate cognitive mastery of advanced-level skills. Provided in web-based format. For this assessment, evidence will focus on one competency from the exam which on the test matrix is: Maintain Records and Communicate Information. This competency includes the following: record therapy and results using conventional terminology as required by the health care setting and/or regulatory agency; specify therapy administered which includes date, time, frequency of therapy, medication, and ventilatory data; note and interpret patient’s response to therapy, effects of therapy, adverse reactions, patient’s subjective and objective response to therapy; verify computations and note erroneous data, auscultatory findings, cough and sputum production and characteristics, vital signs, and pulse oximetry, heart rhythm, capnography readings.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

90% of students will score 80% or higher on the WRRT by the National Board of Respiratory Care.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

23 of 23 students (100%) passed the WRRT on first attempt. From review of the score report, national first-time new candidate passing rate is 72%.

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

Capstone course
Will continue to monitor.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Course | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor for RT 4085
Additional Resources: GTA as a CTW assistant for office hours and other assistance for students.
Budget Amount Requested: $2,000.00 (recurring)

Case presentation
Will continue to refine standards. Rubric added for review. RT Seminar Oral Presentation of Case Study

Student __________________________ Disease __________________________ Semester __________________________

GOOD 9 Points Fair 8 Points POOR 7 Points Power Point Presentation Score __________________________ Presentation is clear, concise and easily follows oral presentation. Does not deviate from content. Follows PowerPoint presentation majority of the time with minimal deviation from content. Follows PowerPoint presentation most of the time with some deviations from content. Fails to follow
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Additional Resources: No

NBRC CRT Exam
Will continue to refine analysis of competency. Since this is the first time we have been this specific with an item on the exam matrix, will follow for another year to determine any trends.

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

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Additional Resources: No

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 Illa.

**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

---

**Update Action Plan**

We will continue the 2011-2012 action plan. Resubmitting the case study was not used because of the time commitment of doing resubmissions. Faculty did meet with the students to review the grading rubric and to review areas of weaknesses. No increase in grade was issued. In some cases the student did not meet with the faculty member to review the case thus resulting in a lower score as identified by the rubric and had nothing to do with the quality of the material or presentation. We will continue to stress the student meets with the faculty to review the case study and stress presentation skills that will improve student outcome. It is difficult for students to attain a grade of 90% or better when this is the first time they have presented a patient case study as this is the first semester the student is doing clinical rotations in the hospital. We will revisit the rubric and also discuss the passing score.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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:** During the first semester students enroll in SNHP 3010 Advanced Medical Terminology. In this course they
learn to communicate as a medical professional. Students are given the opportunity to learn practice and master basic RT care skills in RT 3050 Clinical Practice I during the first semester of the professional program. This allows the student to simulate with a live patient actor what he/she will experience once in clinical. Communication is key in this learning opportunity as we apply skills learned from SNHP 3010, RT 3025, and RT 3111. Students write a case study and present the case to students and faculty during the second, third and fourth semesters of the professional program. This allows the student to express a written and oral project to peers and faculty. The seminar section of RT 3051, RT 3052, and RT 4051, respectively provide these opportunities. Students will write and report on patient care plans in understanding disease and treatment in RT 3027 during the second semester of the professional program. 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 simulations 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 simulations 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 national board exams. End of year clinical exams test the students’ clinical knowledge and require passing in order to continue in the program. Second year courses focus on developing practitioner content to prepare students for the national board exam. Courses such as RT 4111, 4112, RT 4060, 4075, 4070, 4050, 4051 utilize simulations, advanced computer testing, oral and written components to ensure the student is as prepared as possible to successfully complete the national board exam. Our passing rates are always well above the national average 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. Strengths: Overall our greatest strength in the program is the established assessment findings that have excellent outcomes of in students passing the national board exam. Weakness: No weakness noted as all metrics were met. 2. New leadership has been instituted with the retirement of the Department Chair. The new leadership has been able to hire high performing faculty. 3. There have been no recent changes in the assessment process. However, with new faculty and leadership all processes will be examined.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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. Annual survey assessment is conducted on this board. Suggestions from the survey and in person at annual advisory meeting are analyzed and implemented. 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 the public at large.

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 academic changes are being considered at this time. However, due to changes in national board exam eligibility the advisory board and faculty are exploring ways to better prepare students for job placement.

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 All students were advanced practitioners earning advanced credential (RRT) before graduation. 100% student employment within 6 months of graduation Credentialing award from our accrediting agency (CoARC) for passing rate on the advanced practitioner exam (RRT) for RT students, third year in a row.

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 continue to be a challenge. We will not be able to hire as many PTIs to teach clinical or GTA’s for lab assistants without a change to the budget. We have one vacant 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. We are working with students this year to attempt the licensure exam before the expiration December 21, 2015.

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

90% of students will achieve a minimum grade of 80% on their assigned oral case study presentation based on a standard rubric used by the faculty 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 made.

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees
2 faculty members serve on consolidation committees with Perimeter College. 2 faculty members serve on university senate committees.

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

5 Completed Master’s Theses 2 Completed Master’s project 3 Abstracts 1 Awards 30 Presentations 1 Board of Directors 6 Editorial Board membership 6 Poster presentations 3 Book Chapter 3 Program offering 1 External Funding Awards Chip Zimmerman-core faculty on HRSA Grant $344,100 for 3 years ($14,881.00)

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

Department has international students in program and communicates and advise students during the admission process, write letters of recommendation for funding for tuition at out-of-state rate. Discussion of international agreement with multiple Saudi Arabian RT programs. Discussion of international agreement with Taipei Medical University.

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

Mentoring students to prepare case study presentation at annual state respiratory society meeting. 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 be inducted into Lambda Beta Honor Society. Department purchases board exams, clinical simulation problems to enhance the students critical thinking process. Developed student mentor-mentee program.

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 fairs to perform pulmonary function testing for attendees. Participation at National Smoke Out Day by handing our stop smoking literature and doing pulmonary function tests. Participation with Trinity House doing smoking cessation education to residents.

Mission / Purpose

In support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Brydine F. Lewis School of Nursing and Health Professions, the purpose of the Master of Science degree in Health Sciences with a concentration in Respiratory Therapy is to expand the knowledge of current and future respiratory therapists who will be the leaders and educators in the profession of respiratory care.

Goals

G 1: Critical and ethical thinkers
To develop a deep and broad understanding of respiratory care content based on sound clinical decision making.

G 2: Knowledge of professional issues in respiratory care
To be aware of and concerned about being well-informed regarding the issues and factors affecting the professional practice of respiratory care.

G 3: Leadership and educational positions
Students are prepared for leadership positions in health care settings or for educational positions in academic institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Communication in respiratory care (M: 1, 2)
In order to discern that our students are critical and ethical thinkers, our students will be able to: 1) communicate orally by presenting a patient case study to the faculty and their peers at least once while in the program which is logically organized and based on data found in medical records and/or oral interviews OR through debates on issues affecting the practice of respiratory care. 2) communicate in writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline through problem solving by addressing issues affecting the practice of respiratory care.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

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

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

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

**Standard Associations**
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
2. 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
All 5 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Five 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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
All five students completed advance credentials to complete their project hour requirement.

**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 taking SNHP 8000 will complete the final exam, which is a comprehensive assessment of Health Policy in the US with at least a score of 80% or higher.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
4 students successfully completed SNHP 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
  - Measure: Critical thinking in the application of research
- Responsible Person/Group: Robert Harwood

Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care
Oral and written communication will continue to be a high priority. Faculty assigned to core curriculum courses will continue to assign patient case studies, literature reviews, and debates that require a higher level of problem solving and discernment of ideas.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Demonstrate appreciation for critical thinking and research process | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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—During the first semester students enroll in SNHP 6010 Graduate Medical Terminology. In this course they learn to communicate as a medical professional. Students are given the opportunity to learn practice and master basic RT care skills in RT 6050 Clinical Practice I during the first semester of the professional program. This allows the student to simulate with a live patient actor what he/she will experience once in clinical. Communication is key in this learning opportunity as we apply skills learned from SNHP 6010, RT 6025, and RT 6111. Students write a case study and present the case to students and faculty during the second, third, and fourth semesters of the professional programs. This allows the student to express a written and oral project to peers and faculty. The seminar section of RT 6051, RT 6052, and RT 7051, respectively provide these opportunities. Students will write and report on patient care plans in understanding disease and treatment in RT 6027 during the second semester of the professional program. Students also present an oral and 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 during the second semester of the professional program.

SNHP 8000

Currently will keep this course in the curriculum.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Understanding Health Policy in the US | Outcome/Objective: Understanding Health Policy in the United States

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016

Evaluation 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: 12/2012

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 continue to meet the desired results in each outcome. Strengths: Outcomes have been achieved and findings are...
consistent as in past years. Weakness of the program: Since the incorporation of the advanced practice option over the last year we have seen a reduction in students choosing a research project or thesis. This focus may be a loss of understanding for the research process. Impact on student learning: Students taking the advanced practice option have specific learning outcomes depending on the exam chosen. 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 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 provides 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 2014-15): 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. Annual survey assessment is conducted on this board. Suggestions from the survey and in person at annual advisory meeting are analyzed and implemented. 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 the public at large.

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 academic changes are being considered at this time. However, due to changes in national board exam eligibility the advisory board and faculty are exploring ways to better prepare students for job placement.
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 fairs to perform pulmonary function testing for attendees. Participation at National Smoke Out Day by handing out stop smoking literature and doing pulmonary function tests. Participation with Trinity House doing smoking cessation education to residents.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Risk Management & Insurance (Mathematical Risk Management) MS

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

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: Probability and Statistical Expertise
Probability and Statistical Expertise. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will have the technical expertise in probability theory, statistical theory, and the theory of stochastic processes. This will allow the student to quantify a given risk exposure based on a (given) probabilistic/statistical model.

G 2: Model Building Expertise
Model Building Expertise. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will have the technical expertise in statistics/econometrics to build a statistical model and predict future outcomes.

G 3: Ability to Apply and Adapt Advanced Financial/Economic Models
Ability to Apply and Adapt Advanced Financial/Economic Models. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will have the technical expertise in economic and financial theory to apply and adapt advanced financial economic models. These models can be used to determine the value of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities, for managing the financial risk exposures, and for documenting the residual risk.

G 4: Model Implementation Expertise
Model Implementation Expertise. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be well versed in computer programming, choosing different languages or environments for different problems. Relying on these skills, the graduate will be able to implement models for valuing and managing risk exposures.

G 5: Understanding of the Limitations of Models, and Awareness of Failings of Models
Understanding of the Limitations of Models, and Awareness of Failings of Models. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be familiar with failings and/or possible misuses of risk management models, and understand the limitation of models.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Expertise in Statistical/Probability Theory & Usage of Models to Quantify Risks (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Each student will demonstrate through responses to selected questions from course exams expertise in (1) statistical/probability theory; and (2) the use of a given probabilistic/statistical model to quantify stochastic risk exposures.

SLO 2: Demonstrate Ability to Build Statistical/Econometrical Models and Apply for Prediction ECON 8780 (G: 2) (M: 4, 7)
Model Building Expertise. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will have the technical expertise in statistics/econometrics to build a statistical model and predict future outcomes.

SLO 3: Apply and Adapt Advanced Financial/Economic Models (G: 3)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on project questions in MRM 8610 Financial Engineering the expertise to build and adapt advanced models for valuing and managing traded and non-traded assets.

SLO 4: Model Implementation Expertise MRM 8610 (G: 4) (M: 5)
Model Implementation Expertise. The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be well versed in computer programming, choosing different languages or environments for different problems. Relying on these skills, the graduate will be able to implement models for valuing and managing risk exposures.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Probability and Statistical Expertise Rubric 1 Criteria 1 Applied to 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. Criteria Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- Demonstrate Technical Expertise in Statistics and Probability Achieve a score below 60% on selected Questions Achieve a score between 60% and 80% on selected Questions Achieve a score above 80% on selected Questions

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

**Target for O1: Expertise in Statistical/Probability Theory & Usage of Models to Quantify Risks**

Average > 2.5

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Met (2.77 >= 2.5) The majority of the students meet the criteria. Insofar as MRM8320 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think action for the program is required. To appraise trends in the student cohorts, we will include similar problems on future exams to make sure that the quality remains at this high level (so-called “anchor items”). Future assessments will be compared to the Fall 2014 levels. In addition to these “anchor items,” we will also include one more advanced problem from the exam for each part of the measure. This way we are comparing students across cohorts but are also being more ambitious in our future assessments.

**M 2: Demonstrate Expertise to Analyze Stochastic Risk Exposure based on a Given Model Rubric 1 Criteria 2 (O: 1)**

Each student will demonstrate through responses to selected questions from course exams expertise in the use of a given probabilistic/statistical model to quantify stochastic risk exposures. We use so-called anchor items on the final MRM8320 exam that are very similar across years (numeric values and context may differ, but the required calculations are similar). This allows us to compare different generations of students. Criteria Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- Demonstrate Expertise to Analyze Stochastic Risk Exposure based on a Given Model Achieve a score below 60% on selected Analysis Questions Achieve a score between 60% and 80% on selected Analysis Questions Achieve a score above 80% on selected Analysis Questions

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

**Target for O1: Expertise in Statistical/Probability Theory & Usage of Models to Quantify Risks**

Average > 2.5

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Met (2.91 >= 2.5) The majority of the students meet the criteria. Insofar as MRM8320 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think action for the program is required. To appraise trends in the student cohorts, we will include similar problems on future exams to make sure that the quality remains at this high level (so-called “anchor items”). Future assessments will be compared to the Fall 2014 levels. In addition to these “anchor items,” we will also include one more advanced problem from the exam for each part of the measure. This way we are comparing students across cohorts but are also being more ambitious in our future assessments.

**M 3: Demonstrate Technical Expertise in Probability and Stochastic Processes MRM 8610 (O: 1)**

Each student will demonstrate through responses to selected questions from course exams expertise in probability theory and the theory of stochastic processes. We use so-called anchor items on the midterm exam in MRM 8610 that are very similar across years (numeric values and context may differ, but the required calculations are similar). This allows us to compare different generations of students. Criteria Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- Demonstrate Technical Expertise in Probability and Stochastic Processes Achieve a score below 60% on selected Questions Achieve a score between 60% and 80% on selected Questions Achieve a score above 80% on selected Questions

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

**Target for O1: Expertise in Statistical/Probability Theory & Usage of Models to Quantify Risks**

Average > 2.0

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**

Not Met (1.4375 < 2.0) The measure is below target level. However, it is not unusual that students have difficulty with the theoretical concepts, so that possibly the goal of getting more than 60% correct is ambitious on these questions. The instructor is aware of the shortfall. We will track the performance of the students through the program and will re-measure in the Spring of 2016 to analyze whether the levels improve. We do not believe that the results warrant fundamental changes in the program at this point.

**M 4: Build Statistical/Econometrical Models and Apply for Prediction ECON 8780 (O: 2)**

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 and apply for prediction Criteria Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

- Demonstrate Ability to Build Statistical/Econometrical Models and Apply for Prediction Achieve a score below 80% overall Achieve a score between 80% and 90% overall Achieve a above score 90% overall

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O2: Demonstrate Ability to Build Statistical/Econometrical Models and Apply for Prediction ECON 8780

Average >2.0

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met
Not Met (1.91 < 2.0) The measure is slightly below the target level. However, the difference is relatively small. The instructor is aware of the deficiencies and will address these the next time the class is taught. We will re-measure in the Fall of 2015 to analyze whether the levels improve. We do not believe that the results warrant fundamental changes in the program at this point.

M 5: Advanced Model Implementation MRM 8610 (O: 4)
Each student will demonstrate the ability to implement advanced models via computer programs. We measure the performance of all students in the class but also take into consideration the performance of MRM students relative to other students in the class, that do not take the same classes (particularly MRM8000). Criteria Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3
No. 2 – implement models Achieve a score below 50% score on relevant question Achieve a score between 50% and 75% on relevant question Achieve a score above 75% on relevant question
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: Model Implementation Expertise MRM 8610
Average > 2.0

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met
Not Met (1.36 < 2.0) The level is significantly below the acceptable level of 50% for the majority of students. This is concerning, and we continued to analyze whether this is a conceptual issue (i.e., the problems may have been difficult) or whether this has to do with a lack of know-how in view of implementation – which is the learning goal we are assessing. We checked whether students that participated in the “programming bootcamp” (MRM8000) in the Summer of 2014, which is required for MRM students but not for MAS students, performed significantly better. We found slightly better levels (a score of 1.42 for those that took MRM 8000 and an on average 3% better score). The difference seems too small to draw a strong conclusion. The instructor is aware and will try to adjust the difficulty of the problem. We will see if we can find a sustained difference between MRM students that took the bootcamp and MAS students that did not.

M 6: Understand limitations and failings of risk management models MRM 8370 (O: 5)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected project work in RMI 8370 Financial Risk Management the ability to understand the limitations and failings of risk management models. Criteria Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3
Understand limitations and failings of risk management models Achieve a score below 70% score on relevant questions Achieve a score between 70% and 90% on relevant questions Achieve a score above 90% on relevant questions
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O5: Understanding of the Limitations of Models, and Awareness of Failings of Models
Average > 2.0

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Met (2.3 >= 2.0) The majority of the students meet the criteria. Insofar as RMI8370 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think action for the program is required. To appraise trends in the student cohorts, we will measure based on similar case work in the future. Future assessments will be compared to the Fall 2014 levels.

M 7: DELETE (O: 2)
DELETE
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

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

Reconsideration of Model Implementation Questions
The results were not met for Learning Goal 4, and the underperformance is significant. This learning goal is related to the issue we are addressing through the introduction of MRM 8000 (model implementation), and we find that those students going through MRM 8000 perform better – although still not satisfactory according to the measure. The measure may be imperfect since it does not separate conceptual issues from implementation skills. We will respond by replacing the tested items by conceptually less difficult items that still require a substantial amount of programming. We will re-measure in the Fall of 2015 based on the revised items.

- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Replace MRM 8620 with MRM 8640
We decided to replace the required course MRM 8620 (Quantitative Financial Risk Modeling) with a new course in advanced credit risk modeling (MRM 8640, Advanced Credit Risk Models). The rationale is laid out in the previous assessment plan: In the current form, we did not think that MRM8620 is effectively contributing to the program. Moreover, we updated the econometrics sequence, mostly because of new classes that became available in RCB offered in the Master’s program of Analytics. For the next year, we will run both options – the former and the revised required courses – simultaneously before changing to the new sequence in 2016/2017.

- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Will re-measure Goal 1 Measure 3 in Spring
The results were not satisfactory for one of the measures for learning objective 1. Since the other two measures were met comfortably, we are not worried about this learning goal. We will re-measure in the Spring of 2016 and the instructor will respond to the deficiency.

- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Advanced Model Implementation MRM 8610 | Outcome/Objective: Model Implementation Expertise MRM 8610
- Measure: Demonstrate Technical Expertise in Probability and Stochastic Processes MRM 8610 | Outcome/Objective: Expertise in Statistical/Probability Theory & Usage of Models to Quantify Risks

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Risk Management & Insurance (Risk & Insurance) MS
As of: 12/13/2016 08:49 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
Mission / Purpose

A substantially revised version of this program is in the midst of the approval process. An appropriate assessment plan will be prepared and implemented once the program revisions have been approved and implemented.

Goals

G 1: See Mission/Purpose

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: See Mission/Purpose (M: 1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: See Mission/Purpose (O: 1)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: See Mission/Purpose

Complete approval of revisions to program. Revise assessment plan in light of revised program. Implement revised assessment plan.

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

Program Revision Approval

Achieve approval of program revisions. Revise assessment plan to match revised program. Begin implementation of revised plan.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: See Mission/Purpose | Outcome/Objective: See Mission/Purpose

Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Phillips and Marty Grace
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Risk Management & Insurance BBA
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Identification and structuring of risky situations (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Comprehension of the business risk management process (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process (G: 1, 5) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Performance on selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Evidence:</strong> Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Identification and structuring of risky situations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Selected Projects and identified exam questions in RMI 4300 (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Evidence:</strong> Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Comprehension of the business risk management process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Evidence:</strong> Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Assignments to include added focus on making recommendations and conclusions**

RMI 4350 is a CTW course. Course assignments will be revised to focus more on providing the student with practice and feedback on making recommendations and conclusions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 | Outcome/Objective: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Martin Grace and Harold Weston
Mission / Purpose

The Mission of the Bachelors of Business Administration (BBA) program is to provide broad general education and the core business knowledge and skills to prepare both traditional and non-traditional students for entry-level position in public, private, and not-for-profit organizations and to stimulate in students a desire for life-long learning.

This was actually established as the mission of the BBA program in the 2004-2005 cycle.

In the 2010-2011 AY the Robinson College undertook the development of a new strategic plan for the College that builds on the GSU strategic plan. In the Summer of 2011 a task force, building on the RCB strategic plan, began developing a set of recommendations to be made to the College Executive Committee that will significantly update the BBA program. It is anticipated that as a result of this larger process a new Mission Statement will emerge for the BBA program.

It is now expected that this process will be completed in the 2012-2013 Assessment cycle.

In the 2012-2013 cycle the Robinson College of Business established an Assistant Dean position for oversight of the undergraduate program. Consistent with the RCB strategic plan the undergraduate program will be significantly updated beginning in the 2013-2014 cycle. It is highly likely that this mission statement will be revised in the coming year.

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

SLO 1: Effective Analytical Skills (G: 1) (M: 6)
Students will demonstrate analytical skills in solving business problems.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

SLO 2: Effective Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 7)
Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.

Relevant Associations:

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

SLO 3: Effective Use of Computer Technology (G: 1, 2) (M: 7)
Students will show the ability to effectively use and manage technology of business related purposes.

Relevant Associations:
Strategic Plan Associations

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

SLO 4: Effective Team Membership (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)
Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.
Relevant Associations:

SLO 5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning (G: 4) (M: 1)
Students will exhibit a positive attitude toward continual learning upon completion of the BBA program.
Relevant Associations:

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Ethics and Social Responsibility (G: 1, 4) (M: 8)
Students will incorporate dimensions of ethics and social responsibility in their decision making. Ethics and social responsibility captures a values concept that may be defined differently by different people. However, it is always part of an overall system of values that work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member’s timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member’s attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

M 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 acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Consistently produces acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Consistently produces acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Produces work that is accurate and complete.

Target for O5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning
Over 60% of students show an interest in continuing their formal education in some form in the future. Measurement will be done by looking at self report data entered for the Educational Testing Service’s Business Test, which is administered to graduating seniors in their final semester.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Further Education – Self Report (O: 5)
This measure reports the number of students anticipating continuing formal education after completion of their BBA degree. .
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning
Over 60% of students show an interest in continuing their formal education in some form in the future. Measurement will be done by looking at self report data entered for the Educational Testing Service’s Business Test, which is administered to graduating seniors in their final semester.

Possible Scores
1 Quality of Work: Consistently 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: Considers 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: Considers the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Considers 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: Considers the student team member’s attendance at the group meetings. (This includes 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: Considers the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Considers the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Considers how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Considers the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

M 3: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)
Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Considers 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 acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Consistently produces acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Consistently produces acceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Produces work that is accurate and complete.

Target for O5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning
Over 60% of students show an interest in continuing their formal education in some form in the future. Measurement will be done by looking at self report data entered for the Educational Testing Service’s Business Test, which is administered to graduating seniors in their final semester.
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: Considers the amount of task support the student team member provides. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates poor team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements. Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

On the effective writing criterion we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the final oral student presentations done as part of the BBA program's capstone course, BUSA 4980.

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

**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

On all three sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the final oral student presentations done as part of the BBA program's capstone course, BUSA 4980.

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

**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

On the effective writing criterion we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric on Assessment Criteria for Written Communications to Critical Thinking through Writing assignments collected from the second (i.e. senior level) CTW designated class in each major in the Robinson College of Business. The results of that assessment with the names removed are included in the results matrix for the 2010 -2011 cycle and are linked here from the Document Repository.

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

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.
**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Target for O3: Effective Use of Computer Technology**

On both of these questions students should score above the mean for the classifications of Select Six Peer Institutions, Carnegie Class Institutions, and All Participating Institutions. On both of these questions student scores will improve year-on-year.

**M 8: Ethics and Social Responsibility (O: 6)**

The students’ use of ethical and social responsibility considerations in the analysis and recommendations associated with a business problem will be assessed on the dimensions of the Ethics and Social Responsibility rubric.

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

**Target for O6: Ethics and Social Responsibility**

80% of students will be at or above the "B" level on the rubric scoring of the case analysis. Grading Rubrics for Ethics and Social Responsibility Dimension of Citic Pacific case. A = 5 = Integrated, comprehensive, and dynamic analysis; one that is rationally supported and effective. B = 4 = Working toward "A," but incomplete, some inconsistencies or misunderstandings; analysis has gaps, could be more effective. C = 3 = Working toward "B," but with weaknesses in many areas, major inconsistencies, or failure to properly address items needed for assignment completion. D = 2 = Case Analysis turned in, little else; poor or no analysis of merit; lacking rationale or analysis; poor understanding of corporate governance mechanisms and little or no effective effort to remedy. F = 1 = Failure to do assignment at threshold level. This is the old rubric as of 2012. Please see the new rubric loaded in the Document Repository.

**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 items were implemented in a "one off" approach that was not well integrated with the undergraduate program as a whole. This action plan incorporates those initiatives in the light of any changes that are made in the Goals and Objectives of the BBA program. However, in this redesign prior Action Plan 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: Use of Effective Computer Technology
  - Measure: Ability to Work on Teams | Outcome/Objective: Effective Team Membership
  - Measure: Effective Analytical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Effective Analytical 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
- **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
2014-2015 Robinson College of Business MBA
As of: 12/13/2016 08:45 AM 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.
Students 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 assed as a whole as in years past. In addition the program was assessed based on location and on format. In this cycle all programs offered a capstone strategic management course. In all locations where a version of this class was offered the assessment was done with the exception of the Alpharetta location, which will be included in the 2012-2013 assessments.

For analysis, answers will be randomly selected from across sections and courses. 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 assed as a whole as in years past. In addition the program was assessed based on location and on format. In this cycle all programs offered a capstone strategic management course. In all locations where a version of this class was offered the assessment was done with the exception of the Alpharetta location, which will be included in the 2012-2013 assessments. A grid showing the sections included in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 assessment of student learning outcomes is linked here. All sections were given the same material, used very similar Harvard cases as exams and asked the same questions on the exam. The same instructor taught all the sections. One person in all cases did assessment. Exams analyzed were selected from each section. A total of twelve exams from each section were selected as follows: The section enrollment was divided by twelve. The resulting number was rounded down to find the ratio of students that need to be included in the sample from that section. A die was then thrown to determine where in the alphabetical roster selection should begin. From that starting point students were selected based on the ratio of exams needed.

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

Target for O1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions
On all three sub-parts’ criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.
section. A die was then thrown to determine where in the alphabetical roster selection should begin. From that starting point students were selected based on the ratio of exams needed.

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

**Target for O1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions**

On both sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

**M 3: Student Ability to Develop Corporate Strategies (O: 2)**

This measure contains four sub-parts that respectively look at the level of sophistication in a student's ability to develop viable corporate strategies that integrate functional, global, legal and ethical dimensions. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to common mid-term and final exam questions in the MBA program's final strategy courses, MBA 8820, PMBA 8820, GMBA 8990, and EMBA 8710. For analysis, answers will be randomly selected from across sections and courses. In this cycle a more detailed analysis was conducted as part of the College and University level monitoring of this program, which is being conducted at the request of SACS. The program was assed as a whole as in years past. In addition the program was assessed based on location and on format. In this cycle all programs offered a capstone strategic management course. In all locations where a version of this class was offered the assessment was done with the exception of the Alpharetta location, which will be included in the 2012-2013 assessments. A grid showing the sections included in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 assessment of student learning outcomes is linked here. All sections were given the same material, used very similar Harvard cases as exams and asked the same questions on the exam. The same instructor taught all the sections. One person in all cases did assessment. Exams analyzed were selected from each section. A total of twelve exams from each section were selected as follows: The section enrollment was divided by twelve. The resulting number was rounded down to find the ratio of students that need to be included in the sample from that section. A die was then thrown to determine where in the alphabetical roster selection should begin. From that starting point students were selected based on the ratio of exams needed.

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

**Target for O2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions**

On all four sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

### 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. For the 09-10 assessment cycle it would be preferable if the assessment instrument can be retained. The College will work with the faculty members in the Strategic Management class to try to improve participation quality in this class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Environmental Opportunity Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** RCB Assessment Committee; MBA Steering Committee
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** Offering course in Fall 2015.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dean's Office and Department of Managerial Sciences in consultation with MBA Steering Committee.
- **Additional Resources:** Qualified and available faculty

#### 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
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### 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.  
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**  
Average score of 5 for 2 students
### 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 2014-2015** - Target: Met
  - Average score of 5 for 2 students

### 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 2014-2015** - Target: Met
  - Average score of 5 for 2 students

### 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.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

- **Findings 2014-2015** - Target: Met
  - Average score of 5 for 2 students

### 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.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

- **Findings 2014-2015** - Target: Met
  - Average score of 4.5 for 2 students

### 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.

**Target for O4: Professional Engagement**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

- **Findings 2014-2015** - Target: Met
  - Average score of 4.5 for 2 students

### 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.

**Target for O2: Competency in research**
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

- **Findings 2014-2015** - Target: Met
  - Average score of 5 for 2 students

### 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 onset of their studies and should be actively mentored by a research-active faculty member. Students should attend conferences and present papers in order to gain recognition of faculty from other research universities. Students must produce a thoughtful and well-researched dissertation. Once placed, alumni should remain active researchers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D. unit coordinator, Ph.D. Program Office

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose over arching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents, to evaluate school counseling programs, and to coordinate the resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, program evaluation, advocacy and the curriculum of the school.

**Goals**

G 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 with and to gain valuable ideas from administrators, teachers, and other practicing school counselors.

G 1: P-12 Student Learning and Development
School counselors are committed to their students and to their students' learning, growth and development. To this end, school counselors use their skills to assist students in individual, small group, and classroom settings. School counselors also monitor and evaluate student learning and development to provide the most effective school counseling programs.

**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
Georgia School Counseling 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, small group counseling, school counseling core curriculum in the classroom, 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.

**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 a intervention, evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using the ASCA School Counseling Core Curriculum Results Report template, complete the School Counseling Core 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, Emotional/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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of 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. A self evaluation of the session is included in the supervision process.

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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of students earned a satisfactory grade on the feedback provided by their peers. Student self evaluation also earned a satisfactory grade.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Maintain and Monitor**
The School Counseling Faculty will monitor student’s grades on projects and other measures used to assess competence. In addition, this faculty will consider other ways to assess competence with regard to the outcomes and objectives.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & 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:** 09/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty

**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:** 09/2015
- **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

**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 continue to examine the outcomes/objectives.

- **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?

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 internships 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.

4. **Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement:** Describe any changes in (1) the educational program and/or (2) the assessment process that were 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.

**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.**

Approval was granted to implement a 60 credit program for School Counseling Masters students, which was a requirement to meet CACREP (2016) standards. This will impact the ability of our core faculty to teach the courses and require us to rely more on Part
Time: Instructors for our Ed.S program.

**University-wide Committee Participation**—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
Dr. Andrea Dixon, School Counseling Core Faculty member, is on the University Senate Committee.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The School Counseling program within the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University is dedicated to training professional school counselors who are prepared to use school data to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally appropriate school counseling programs that promote academic, career and social/emotional 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 school counseling core curriculum services, collaboration and consultation with parents and other educators, and the design, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program. Our model for school counselor preparation is based on the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model for School Counseling Programs and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards for School Counseling Programs.

**Goals**

**G 1: Foundations of School Counseling**

Foundations of school counseling include the history and philosophy of the school counseling profession, professional roles and credentialing, current models of school counseling programs (ASCA National Model) and ethical and legal standards related to the profession.

**G 2: Counseling Interventions**

Counseling interventions include individual, small and large group and school-wide approaches to intervention.

**G 3: Social Justice: Diversity, Leadership and Advocacy**

Diversity includes the cultural, ethical, economic, legal, and political issues surrounding community, environmental and institutional opportunities that enhance, as well as barriers that impede, the academic, career and personal/social development of all P-12 students. Diversity pertains to the effects of ability levels, stereotyping, family, socioeconomic status, gender and sexual identity and their effects on student achievement. Working as leaders, school counselors promote student success by closing existing achievement gaps, and influencing systemwide changes for school reform. School counselors advocate for students' educational needs and work proactively to remove barriers to learning.

**G 4: Assessment**

Assessment includes selecting appropriate assessment strategies that can be used to evaluate the academic, career and personal/social development of all P-12 students and analyzing assessment information to determine needs as well as the effectiveness of educational programs.

**G 5: Research and Evaluation**

Research and evaluation includes knowing basic strategies for evaluating counseling outcomes and methods of using data to inform decision making, use of interventions, 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 identify and close achievement gaps and use differentiated instructional strategies to teach counseling and core curriculum 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 social/emotional 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)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

**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
SLO 1: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills (G: 6) (M: 8)

Students demonstrate their knowledge of consultation and collaboration, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families, teachers, and communities to empower them and build partnerships, and conducting programs to enhance students' development needs.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

SLO 2: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity (G: 3) (M: 4)

Students must demonstrate their knowledge of consultation and collaboration, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families, teachers, and communities to empower them and build partnerships, and conducting programs to enhance students' development needs.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

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)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

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)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

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, social/emotional, and career development programs that meet the needs of diverse populations.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

SLO 6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal (G: 4) (M: 6)

In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and rationale for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

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 academic and 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 data driven and academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. Research based interventions are a major component of the plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts and student present the results to their fellow classmates, supervisors, and site school (when possible).

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

SLO 8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills (G: 6) (M: 8)

Students must demonstrate the following classroom core curriculum 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. A results report is submitted for each classroom core curriculum unit (three related lessons in the same domain) to determine effectiveness of the lessons.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

SLO 9: Knowledge of Consultation & Collaboration (G: 7) (M: 9)

Students must demonstrate their knowledge of consultation and collaboration, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families, teachers, and communities to empower them and build partnerships, and conducting programs to enhance students' development needs.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

SLO 10: Demonstrates Consultation & Collab. Skills (G: 7) (M: 10)

Students must demonstrate the following consultation and collaboration skills: establishing rapport, structuring the interview, responding empathetically, reflecting content, providing encouragement/support, identifying mistaken goal of behavior, defining and focusing on problem areas, helping to develop a plan of action or treatment strategy, helping the consultee learn to advocate for self...

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
as appropriate, planning for follow-up session, and using appropriate closure techniques.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)  
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

CPS 6202/6203 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Final Video Tape (O: 3)**

Students are evaluated on their effective use of counseling skills via a final video tape role play in CPS 6410. This tape should reflect skills learned during the semester, including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions and closure.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Interpersonal Skills used in Counseling**

At least 90% of the students will earn a score at or above the cut-off score of 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students earned a score above the cut-off score of 25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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.

**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 rationale 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.

**M 7: Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) (O: 7)**

Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Students analyze the demographic data from their schools and determine where gaps exist between demographic groups in achievement or in access to classes and other activities and services, formulate a plan that is academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts. The grade is assigned based on the appropriateness of the plan, the type of analysis used, the outcome and the discussion of the findings.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrshp, Action Research**

At least 90% of the students will earn 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.

**Findings 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

95% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% 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 2014-2015 - 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 NCC 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. The emphasis on Classroom Core Curriculum was recommended by the advisory committee and implemented in three 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.

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 - [CCRP]) and the 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.

We completed the construction of a 60 credit school counseling program that not only meets CACREP 2016 standards, but includes material (College and Career Readiness) under consideration for amendments to the 2016 standards. We also made adjustments to comply with the new ASCA student standards (Mindsets). We were able to hire two new faculty members (one clinical and one tenure track) that will be shared between the Mental Health and School Counseling programs.

**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 new 60 hour program in addition to our Ed.S program will provide challenges in the use of core faculty members. While the new hires (2014-2015) will help, we will need to use part time instructors to meet the needs of both programs. It will be a challenge to find qualified part time instructors and logistical considerations will need to be made.

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

Dr. Andrea Dixon (core school counseling faculty) is a member of the University Senate.

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

One of our students received a one year assignment to work in Japan.

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

100% of our students from the cohort graduated on time. 100% of our students were hired. 94% of the students were hired by local school systems and one student was hired to work in Japan for one year.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The goal of the Masters/Ed.S. program in School Psychology is to train school psychologists to become certified for work in the schools. By successfully completing the courses, practica and internships in this program, the graduating school psychologists are prepared to continue to provide and evaluate effective school psychological services that include consultation, preventive intervention, counseling as well as data-based decision making and psycho-educational diagnosis targeted to students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members affiliated with public schools. In addition, graduates develop advanced knowledge and skills in using research methodology and statistics, in planning, implementing, and evaluating school-based evaluation research, in understanding current trends in the field of school psychology, in ethical issues relevant to the practice of psychology in educational settings and in using technology to facilitate practice in school settings.

**Goals**

G 2: Understands School Psychology Practice
Students will understand the foundations and practice of school psychology.

G 3: Scientific and Research Foundations for Professional Practice
To ensure that our graduates are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology and that they can use research findings to properly conduct research, particularly in educational settings.

G 4: Professional Strategies Targeted to the Needs of Learners, Their Parents, and Their Schools
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing intervention, consultation, and psychoeducational assessments.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic skills in children.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

SLO 3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

SLO 4: Implements Data Based Decision Making (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Student will understand responsibilities related to professional, legal, and ethical duties.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 6: Effectively utilizes technological applications (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will understand and utilize technology effectively.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 7: Understand diversity, development, & learning (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Student will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children's mental health.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Student will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**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.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed. S. interns received a rubric rating of 3 or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed. S. interns received a rubric rating of 3 or higher for this area of competency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed. S. practicum students received a rubric rating of 3 or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of “3” or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**M 4: PEF Disposition Survey (O: 5)**

Students complete the Professional Education Faculty's unit-wide Student Disposition Survey at multiple points in the program (prior to practicum, at the conclusion of practicum, exit from the program, and 1 year post-graduation).

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for **O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities**

Student survey responses will demonstrate an understanding of their professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities as school psychologists.

---

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

**Administration of PEF Student Disposition Survey**

This survey is currently being finalized by the appropriate PEF committees.

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

**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 1: Diversity Awareness & Sensitive Service Delivery (G: 1) (M: 5)**

To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work as professional school psychologists in a pluralistic, diverse society.

**Relevant Associations:** APA & NASP
## General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets 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

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

### Standard Associations

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.
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are informed about and committed to legal and ethical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Understand the practice of psychology (G: 1) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates practices are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate knowledge of advanced principles of psychology and school psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Use and conduct research (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Intervention (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing preventative and remedial intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Consultation (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Psychoeducational Assessment (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing psychological assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures, Targets, and Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students must complete 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 students completed their pre-dissertation research in 2014-15- indicating they were able to use and conduct research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 2: Successful completion of dissertation research (O: 5)** |
| A doctoral dissertation that represents independent scholarly research is required. |
| Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project |
| **Target for O5: Use and conduct research** |
| 100% of students who defend their dissertation will be successful. |
| **Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met** |
| 5 students defended their dissertation research successfully in 2014-15- indicating they were able to use and conduct research |

| **M 3: Successful completion of comprehensive examination (O: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)** |
| A comprehensive examination that assesses knowledge of advanced principles of psychology, school psychology, ethics, and professional practice must be passed prior to graduation. |
| Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam |
| **Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice** |
| As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate the ability to follow tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice. |
| **Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met** |
| 3 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams in 2014-15- indicating they demonstrated the ability to follow tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice |
| **Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology** |
| As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of the principles of psychology and school psychology. |
| **Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met** |
| 3 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams in 2014-15- indicating they demonstrated an understanding of the principles of psychology and school psychology. |
| **Target for O5: Use and conduct research** |
| As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of the use and conduct of research. |
| **Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met** |
| 3 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams in 2014-15- indicating they demonstrated an understanding of the use and conduct of research. |
| **Target for O6: Intervention** |
| As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective intervention practices. |
| **Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met** |
| 3 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams in 2014-15- indicating they demonstrated an understanding of effective intervention practices |
| **Target for O7: Consultation** |
| As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective consultation practices. |
| **Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met** |
3 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams in 2014-15 indicating they demonstrated an understanding of effective consultation practices.

**Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment**

As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of psychoeducational assessment.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

3 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams in 2014-15 indicating they demonstrated an understanding of psychoeducational assessment.

**M 5: Readiness for Entry into Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Our graduates are assessed evaluating all program goals during his/her pre-doctoral internship. Licensed site supervisors are asked to evaluate each student utilizing a 5 point likert scale. 5= Student demonstrates outstanding and/or advanced performance on this objective and competency. 4= Student demonstrates satisfactory performance on this objective and competency. 3= Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing. 2= Student's performance on this objective needs improvement; remediation plan may be required. 1= Student's performance on this objective and competency is unsatisfactory; remediation required.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Diversity Awareness & Sensitive Service Delivery**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2/2 interns in 2014-15 obtained a rating of 4.5 of 5 on diversity awareness

**Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2/2 interns in 2014-15 obtained a rating of 5 of 5 on the ethics rating

**Target for O3: Understand the practice of psychology**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2/2 interns in 2014-15 obtained a rating of 5 of 5 on the item related to understanding the practice of psychology and being ready for independent practice

**Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of the 2 doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for understanding the principles of psychology and school psychology

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of the 2 doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "4" or higher for Readiness for Entry into Practice

**Target for O6: Intervention**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of the 2 2014-15 interns received a score of "4" or higher on supervisors rating for intervention skills

**Target for O7: Consultation**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

2/2 interns in 2014-15 obtained a rating of 4 or 5 of 5 on this item related to consultation.

**Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Both 2014-15 interns received a score of "4" or higher on supervisors rating for assessment

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

#### Consider modification of comprehensive examination process

The school psychology faculty will review student performance on previous and up-coming administrations of our doctoral comprehensive examination. Based on our review, revisions may be made to the examination structure and/or scoring process.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Review of comprehensive examination results; discuss and possible development of alternate comp procedures.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Psychology Faculty

#### continue emphasizing research completion

Faculty should continue emphasizing research completion and examining opportunities to decrease coursework requirements

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Review of comprehensive examination results; discuss and possible development of alternate comp procedures.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Psychology Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### modify program materials to reflect changes in course requirements

All materials need to be modified to reflect increased research and elimination of the core.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Handbooks and web-based materials
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Psychology Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** GA time

#### accreditation

We completed a massive self-study for external accreditation from APA during the 2014-15 school year. This included a 2 day site visit focused solely on our program. We were awarded 7 years re-accreditation- the highest and best possible outcome. We intend to continue the activities necessary to maintain our APA accreditation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Maintain APA accreditation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2022
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School Psychology Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none until next self-study

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 GSU school psychology PhD program is designed to be a 5-year sequence of courses, practicum placements, internships, and research projects (e.g., dissertation). It is APA accredited and National Association of School Psychologists approved. We just completed a massive self-study and reaccreditation review and were awarded 7 years reaccreditation- the longest possible. The program and handbook are available at [http://cps.education.gsu.edu/programs/school-psychology/school-psychology-doctor-of-philosophy-program/](http://cps.education.gsu.edu/programs/school-psychology/school-psychology-doctor-of-philosophy-program/)

    **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 program is very strong- ranked either 7th or 17th in the nation, depending on methodology. We continue to seek external funding and great students. We have placed 12 students in academic positions since 2007. We are challenged by declining applicant pool and have instituted efforts to increase recruitment- but this is a national trend.

    **3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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 meet monthly as a faculty to discuss student progress and programmatic issues. We meet annually to discuss student progress
formally- including assessment outcomes- and look for trends across the program. We have periodic external accreditation processes, annual reports to APA, and periodic internal (APACE) departmental reviews.

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 continuously work to improve the program based on formal and informal data. We will be instituting a formal curriculum review in Spring 2016.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the MEd. Online Program in Science Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity in science teaching by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices. Candidates develop knowledge, teaching expertise, and dispositions that will enable them to become educators who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Goals
G 1: Goal/Purpose Statement
Candidates who are admitted to this program have basic science knowledge; therefore the goals of the program divided into three areas: Planning, effects on P-12 learners and content. 1. Planning: Candidates will expand their content and pedagogical knowledge of the natural sciences by excelling in science courses that will enable them to plan and implement lessons that demonstrate their understanding of science concepts and principles. 2. Effects on P-12 Learners: Candidates will enlarge their content base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in the natural sciences and pedagogical practices that include teaching science as inquiry with emphasis on the nature of science, working with diverse student populations, developing assessment strategies that will target the academic development of the learner in the area of science. Candidates will engage in reflective practice to improve their instructional practices. 3. Content: Candidates will expand their content knowledge of the natural sciences by excelling in science courses that will enable them to plan and implement lessons that are interdisciplinary in which they teach learners how to show respect for science, each other, the school and the community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (M: 1)
Candidates will be able to: Utilize their content and pedagogical knowledge of science to develop a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement in their instructional plans.

SLO 2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (M: 2)
Candidates will be able to: Use a variety of contemporary and traditional assessment strategies to evaluate the academic, social, and personal development of the learner in all aspects of science, and engage in reflective practice by using outcome data to guide and change instruction.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 3: Content Knowledge (M: 3)
Candidates will be able to: Develop lessons that utilize concepts and processes in science in order to teach science as an interdisciplinary unit; as inquiry with the inclusion of the nature of science, and in relationship to the personal, historical, and social perspectives of life. Candidates will also incorporate the use of technology in their teaching.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings
M 1: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (O: 1)
Candidates will develop lesson plans using a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement in their instructional plans. Candidates must achieve a rating of at least "3" out of "5" for this measure.

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

**Target for O3: Content Knowledge**
Candidates will develop lessons that utilize concepts and processes in science in order to teach science as an interdisciplinary unit; as inquiry with the inclusion of the nature of science, and in relationship to the personal, historical, and social perspectives of life. Candidates will also incorporate the use of technology in their teaching. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

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

#### Clinical Practice
Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 33% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 33% scored at the exceeds level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

**Implementation Description:** 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.
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

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 faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Effects on P-12 Learning
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 12.5% at the exceeds level, and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

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

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

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)
these collaborations, the mission of the MAT Secondary Science program is to prepare educators who are informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**

1. Candidates will be competent in content knowledge which will be applied in their classrooms, in their schools, and in their communities with regard to their understandings of the content and ways of knowing within the disciplines of science.

**G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 6 - 12 science classrooms.

**G 3: Impact on student learning**

3. Candidates will be reflective professionals with the capacity to analyze the effect that their teaching practices have on the learning of the students in their grades 6 - 12 science classes.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.

**SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Candidates will be able use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.

**SLO 3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)**

Candidates will be able to coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.

**SLO 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 6)**

Candidates will be able to design and utilize a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners and support learners in engaging in the process of self-assessment.

**SLO 7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (G: 3) (M: 7)**

Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (G: 2) (M: 4)**

Candidates will be able to create engaging learning environments where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.

**O/O 5: Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)**

Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge (O: 1)**

There will be three sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. The candidates’ performance on the GACE Broadfield and/or discipline-specific content exams. 2. Supervisor ratings on the Standard 1: Content Knowledge on the Key Assessment. 3. Reviewer ratings on the content and curriculum standard in the final e-portfolio.

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

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**

1. For the GACE tests, the target is for 100% of the candidates to pass both sections of the Broad Field Science Exam (024 and 025). 2. For the Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Beginner level or below.

**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2)**

There will be three sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Learning Goals and Design for Instruction assignments in the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments, and 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
### M 3: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (O: 3)

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Design for Instruction assignment 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.

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

### Target for O3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences

1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 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 score of 3.5, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings 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 score of 3.5, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

### M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (O: 4)

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluations of the Contextual Factors assignment within the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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

### 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 score of 3.5, 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 score of 3.5, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

### M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions (O: 5)

The source of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective is ratings by the supervisor on the Dispositions Key Assessment.

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

### Target for O5: Professional Dispositions

1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the target is for the candidates to average a 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.

### M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (O: 6)

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments within the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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

### Target for O6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

1. For the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 4.00 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 score of 3.5, 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 score of 3.5, with no more than 15% of the candidates being rated at the Beginner level or below.

### M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (O: 7)

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of this section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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

### 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 score of 3.5, 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 score of 3.25, with no more than 15% of the candidates scoring at the Beginner level.
## 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 | Outcome):**
  - **Measure:** Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments
  - **Outcome:** Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

## Extended Practicum

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** 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 | Outcome):**
  - **Measure:** Objective 1 - Content Knowledge
  - **Outcome:** 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 | Outcome):**
  - **Measure:** Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment
  - **Outcome:** 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.
### Using Assessment Data

Impact on Student Learning and Assessment: Students showed acceptable performance on this standard; however, closer examination of the data revealed that there are some minor deficiencies with the interpretation of student assessment data. In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a class.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

**Implementation Description:** In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a class.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All science education faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Improvement of Assessment Strategies

The content of the courses and the nature of the assignments throughout the program are helping prepare our candidates to use a variety of assessment tools and to effectively develop these with instructional goals in mind, observational data and data obtained by supervisors through interactions with candidates hint that there is still room for improvement in this area. For instance, our candidates seem to use mostly traditional methods of formative assessment (e.g. whole-class discussion questions) in practice and seem unwilling or unable to integrate non-traditional summative assessments (e.g. performance-based problems) with more traditional strategies. Our plan to continue to evolve the program in this area is to use assessment more as a thread throughout the methods course so that whenever candidates engage in an activity designed to develop understanding of a particular pedagogical practice (e.g. using model-building to support conceptual understanding), there is an appropriate assessment tool tied to it. In addition, candidates will be asked to reflect on their assessment strategies and submit an assessment plan as a part of the Teacher Work Sample assignment. This process will be monitored and if necessary, a course in assessment may be offered in the future.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection

**Implementation Description:** Faculty will help students develop assessment tools for performance based objectives which will also include authentic assessment.

- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching methods courses.
- **Additional Resources:** None

### Improving Classroom Management

Related to the standard of Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments, the element on which candidates scored the lowest was related to learning environment. Faculty will place more emphasis on classroom management, particularly as it lays the foundation for other aspects of the classroom experience. Some format of classroom management will be included in the three methods classes.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments

**Implementation Description:** Faculty will identify areas of classroom management that should be addressed in all methods classes. 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.
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 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, understand, respect, and value the multicultural backgrounds and diverse educational needs of students in our schools, 3. understand and apply research to problems effectuating 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)
The student has completed a thesis or project advancing an original point of view as a result of Social Foundations research.

SLO 2: Thesis assessment
1. Addresses the research question with appropriate methodology(ies) Mean for three students is 2 on a scale of 1-3 2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Mean for three students is 2.33 on a scale of 1-3. 3. Document adheres to standard of quality writing. Mean for three students is 2.67 on a scale of 1-3. 4. Oral presentation presents research in a manner appropriate for material and audience. Mean for three students is 3.00 on a scale of 1-3. 5. Potential for contribution to the discipline. Mean for three students is 2.33 on a scale of 1-3.

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
The mean for the assessments are as below: 1. Addresses the research question with appropriate methodology(ies) Mean for three students is 2 on a scale of 1-3 2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Mean for three students is 2.33 on a scale of 1-3. 3. Document adheres to standard of quality writing. Mean for three students is 2.67 on a scale of 1-3. 4. Oral presentation presents research in a manner appropriate for material and audience. Mean for three students is 3.00 on a scale of 1-3. 5. Potential for contribution to the discipline. Mean for three students is 2.33 on a scale of 1-3.

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 #: S01 S02 S03 S04 S05 5 Comment 254 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 2 2 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 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

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

**action plan**

Add more detailed expectations about the student thesis or project to the student handbook and on the departmental website.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Measure (Outcome/Objective):** The student will complete a thesis or project

**Implementation Description:** Add more detailed expectations about the student thesis or project to the student handbook and on the departmental website.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Patricia Carter and appropriate departmental staff
- **Additional Resources:** Assistance from the College webmaster to upload documents

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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.

Address the research question with appropriate methodology(ies) appropriate courses: EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education, EPRS 7910 Action Research, EPRS 7920 Educational Measurement or other advanced courses. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field: appropriate courses: EPSF 7900 Critical Pedagogy, EPSF 7120 Social and Critical Foundations of Education, EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education and/or other advanced courses. Document adheres to standard of quality writing: Appropriate courses: EPSF 8340 History of American Education, EPSF 8330 Globalization & Education Policy, EPSF 8350 Comparative Educational Systems, EPSF 8040 Cultural Studies in Education: Gender, or other writing intensive courses. Oral presentation presents research in a manner appraise for material and audience. EPSF 8280 Anthropology of Education, EPSF 8270 Philosophy of Education, EPSF 8310 Sociology of Education or other course that requires intensive oral presentation.

**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 unit has made a stronger effort in the last two years to convey to the student expectations about the thesis/thesis project from the time they are admitted to the program. They are encouraged to use all their courses to investigate possible thesis topics and/or to start a review of the literature related to the topic. This allows each student to more thoroughly consider how to narrow their work to a reasonable and respectable project that can be completed in on or two semesters. We have a habit of comparing masters’ thesis work to that of our doctoral students who have far more time to complete satisfactory projects. We have also encouraged students to seek out faculty committee members early in their coursework. This is intended to increase the student’s understanding of each faculty member’s individual expectations for the student’s performance on the thesis. The results have been encouraging. Students are approaching faculty members earlier and gaining a better understanding of possible methodological approaches. The mean for the assessments are as below: 1. Addresses the research question with appropriate methodology(ies) Mean for three students is 2 on a scale of 1-3. 2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research and/or literature in the field. Mean for three students is 2.33 on a scale of 1-3. 3. Document adheres to standard of quality writing. Mean for three students is 2.67 on a scale of 1-3. 4. Oral presentation presents research in a manner appraise for material and audience. Mean for three students is 3.00 on a scale of 1-3. 5. Potential for contribution to the discipline. Mean for three students is 2.33 on a scale of 1-3.

**3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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.

Data is shared at the annual retreat and 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 plan to add more detail about project/thesis expectations in student handbook and on the department website by the end of the 2015-2016 academic year. All other action plans have been completed.

Annual Report Section Responses

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

In an effort to increase enrollment added website recruitment materials, including SlideShare Information Session, Email Campaign, Social Foundations Alumni Podcasts and CEHD Graduate Blog.
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.

No significant changes expected.

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

None.

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

No changes in intended outcomes.

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

Patricia Carter serving on University senate with assignments on Statutes and By-laws and Library subcommittees.

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.


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

Developed better accounting system to indicate yearly annual progress through our student records coordinator.

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).

Data not available to reporter.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Social Studies Education MEd
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education and Human Development, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools.

Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MED Social Studies program is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Goals
G 1: Goal: Leadership
1) Leaders in their Social Studies communities;

G 2: Goal: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
2) Creators of democratic, socioconstructivist learning environments for diverse students using appropriate pedagogical content knowledge and innovative technology; and,

G 3: Goal: Scholarship
3) Scholars of educational theory and research as applied to social studies education.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**
1) Content Knowledge Standards: Candidates demonstrate deep subject knowledge in a minimum of two social studies content areas: 1) multiculturalism (required) and 2) one of the following: history, world geography, economics, civics, sociology, and/or psychology (Goal 1, 2 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 2: Curriculum Standards (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)**
2) Curriculum Standards: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major concepts, issues, and processes of inquiry relevant to social studies as well as articulates major theories, debates, and issues in social studies education (Goal 1, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 3: Learning Environment (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)**
3) Learning Environment: Candidates establish a positive and engaging learning environment for all students within the field of social studies education (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 4: Knowledge of Students (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)**
4) Knowledge of Students: Candidates posses deep knowledge of students and adaptations to their individual situations to provide for optimal learning (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 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 MSE’s Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students’ portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No findings are reported for 2014-15 because this program did not have any graduates for this reporting period.

**Target for O2: Curriculum Standards**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No findings are reported for 2014-15 because this program did not have any graduates for this reporting period.

**Target for O3: Learning Environment**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No findings are reported for 2014-15 because this program did not have any graduates for this reporting period.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of Students**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No findings are reported for 2014-15 because this program did not have any graduates for this reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Assessment**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No findings are reported for 2014-15 because this program did not have any graduates for this reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No findings are reported for 2014-15 because this program did not have any graduates for this reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**M.Ed. Collaboration**
MSE is in the process of consolidating M.Ed. programs in the department to create an innovative master degree program highlighting the social studies as well as urban teaching.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2017
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2017
- **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, establishing a requirement for teaching experience will help ensure similar issues are resolved in the future.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Assessment
  - Content Knowledge | Curriculum Standards | Knowledge of Students | Learning Environment
- **Implementation Description:** Establishing a requirement for teaching experience.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2016
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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 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 MSE'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.

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 results and no changes as a result of no new graduates during this reporting period.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

Not applicable to this reporting period since we did not have any graduates for this reporting period.

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 were made as a result of no graduates for the current reporting period.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

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

We have two new students and expect a few more applications or transfer M.Ed. students this school year. Thus, new applications and graduates are expected in the next reporting period.

**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 is a priority and we plan to promote our programs in an aggressive manner. For example, we will distribute informational fliers and host a table at the state social studies conference. Unfortunately, recent changes in teacher certification and continued expected changes that do not reward teachers for additional education are limiting our applications.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Masters of Education in Teaching (MAT) in Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MAT Social Studies program is to prepare educators who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in their knowledge of the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.

**G 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to
develop an understanding of the purposes and history of the field of social studies.

**G 3: Student Learning**
Our candidates will be effective educators who create learning environments that have a positive impact on student learning.

**G 4: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in their knowledge of the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Content and Curriculum (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Planning (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plans and carries out instruction based on state and local performance standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explores teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assesses individual learners’ needs and seeks resources to improve instruction and increase student achievement; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Clinical Practice (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locates resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Impact on Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate will have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory; collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals; use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process; identify students’ learning needs and provide students with goals for learning; develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures; report student progress to students, families, and administrators; use required resources to keep accurate and up-to-date records and reports of student work and behavior; examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Content and Curriculum (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data for the objective of Content Knowledge are taken from the Final StudentTeaching Evaluation Instrument. The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum III (student teaching). Students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student’s mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Content and Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Planning (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 content, 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 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 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Maintain Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

### 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.

For the Practicum I assessment, 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. 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 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.
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
Additional Resources: n/a  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
Additional Resources: n/a  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
Additional Resources: n/a  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
Additional Resources: n/a  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement for 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)
preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Classroom Management
The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chantee Earl McBride
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 will 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: NA

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Social Work BSW
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
To prepare students for generalist social work practice in a range of roles and services that deal with the existing and developing challenges that confront individuals, families, groups, and communities.

Goals
G 1: Professional Identity
Students will identify as a professional social worker, and conduct themselves accordingly with the standards of practice

G 2: Social Work Ethics
Students will apply social work ethical principles to guide their professional practice.

G 3: Critical Thinking
Students will apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

G 4: Research
Students will engage in research informed practice.

G 5: Human Behavior & the Social Environment
Students will critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Professional Identity: Boundaries (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will attend to professional roles and boundaries.

**SLO 2: Ethics: Personal Values (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students will manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice.

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Students will appraise and integrate multiple sources of knowledge.

**SLO 4: Research (G: 4) (M: 4)**
Students will use research evidence to inform social work practice.

**SLO 5: Human Behavior & Social Environment (M: 5)**
Students will critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Student Log (O: 1)**
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
82% of students received a 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
88% of students received a 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
72% of students received a 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
74% of students earned a 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

77% of students received a B or better.

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

**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

**Lead Faculty**

With this significant drop from 98% the previous year, again lead faculty teaching the research course will need to assess what happened from one year to the next. The assignment and covered topics in the course will be addressed by the BSW Program Committee. Changes to the course, as needed, will be done by the lead faculty member.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Research-based Library Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Research
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lead faculty

**Lead Faculty Review**

Faculty teaching the social policy course will address the significant decrease in not meeting the 80% benchmark. The lead faculty member will report back to BSW Program Committee to present issues and changes to this assignment so that the benchmark can be reached.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Legislative Brief | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lead faculty for Social Policy course

**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?

Significance of findings: Goals 3 and 4 did not reach the 80% minimum, although both exceeded the minimum the previous two years. It is likely that a program weakness indicated by these declines is related to the critical thinking abilities of the BSW students, as evidenced by the assignment outcomes. The assessment indicates a need to reassess this aspect of our curriculum. Social Work is required to follow specific accreditation standards related to curriculum, which were changed a few years ago, and have recently been revised again. While implementing new standards is somewhat disruptive, over the next academic year, the BSW Program Committee and faculty will have the opportunity to assess and alter our overall approach to critical thinking.

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.
Social Work is implementing new accreditation standards for the second time in three years. These competencies require outcome measures that are periodically reported. Therefore, much of what is done related to assessment is driven by our accreditation requirements. Once the new accreditation competencies are in place (over the next academic year), the BSW Program Committee and faculty will need to review our goals and targets to reflect the new standards.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Social Work MSW
(As of 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
90% of students received a 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.
### Target for O2: Diversity & Difference

Community Analysis Paper (SW 7100) - sections VI A & B; 10 points. 80% will receive 8 or better.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

93% of students received a B or better.

### M 3: Reflection Paper (O3: Justice: Power & Privilege)

Students write a reflection paper that analyzes how concepts of power and privilege impact community social work practice, SW 8300, 15 points

**Target for O3: Justice: Power & Privilege**

Reflection paper - power & privilege (SW 8300), 15 points. 80% will receive 12 or better.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

89% of students received a B or better.

### M 4: Community Project (O4: Contexts: Leadership in Community Change)

Students do presentation and associated final paper about their experience working with a community partner on a service learning project.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

92% of students received a B or better.

### M 5: Skills Paper - Collaboration (O5: Intervention Skills)

Students will write a paper on collaboration skills to be applied in community social work practice.

**Target for O5: Intervention Skills**

Skills Paper (SW 8100), section A; 15 points. 80% will receive 12 or better.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

89% of students received a 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
### 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. Our accrediting body, Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), just issued new accreditation guidelines including modifications to collection of assessment data. Up until now, our assessment outcomes have include two measures - course outcome measure and student self-assessment measure. CSWE now requires programs to use an experiential (practice experience) measure. We will be transitioning away from the student self-assessment measure and incorporating the student's field education final evaluation from the agency-based field supervisor. [All social work students are in field education.] At the same time, MSW faculty will be modifying course outcomes due to CSWE changes to the student curriculum competencies and practice behaviors. We will be transitioning our curriculum and assessment during the 2015-2016 academic year and then implementing this updated curriculum and new assessment procedure in 2016-2017.

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 MSW program is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). As part of our accreditation process, we review outcome measures annually. 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. CSWE has put forth updated accreditation policies for 2015 and beyond. We are in the process of updating curriculum, which includes updated outcome measures based on new competencies and practice behaviors. This year (2015-2016) we will be transitioning and positioning ourselves to implement the updates for the 2016-2017 academic year.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Sociology Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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

M1: SOCI 1101 and SOCI 1160 embedded exam questions (O1: 1, 2)
SOCI 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions The goal assessment categories here are "Sociological Perspective," "Multicultural Issues," and "Global/International Issues." Five multiple-choice questions were designed to assess competence in each goal area. Instructors in all sections of Soci 1101 and Soci 1160 were requested to select at least one multiple choice in each of the three sections and to embed the questions in their final exams. Instructors were free to select more than one question as long there was at least one question to assess each of the three goals. The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 963 students from 9 sections of 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
For 2014-2015, 80 percent of students answered the embedded exam questions correctly. Goal met

Target for O2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems
80% of students should answer embedded questions correctly.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
Target goal was met

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
Priority: High
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Implementation Description: Continue as we have been doing.
Responsible Person/Group: Deirdre Oakley, Assessment Reporter/Director of Undergraduate Studies

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.
This summer we added a course, currently listed under SOCI 3390 (Special Topics), entitled the "Domestic Field School." Students in this course learned first hand to conduct a survey, as well as provide outreach to Atlanta's homeless youth. They also learned how to input data from this paper survey. This was a hands on learning experience for students on how to conduct research on a very vulnerable and largely hidden population. It was such a success that we have received a modest amount of endowed funds to make the course a permanent offering. The research topic and population changes with each new field school.

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 changes

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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, assess assessment findings and to use them to make improvements in the educational program and/or the assessment process.
As of July 1, 2015, we now have a new chair of the department. The previous year we had an interim chair so this was not discussed. However, we have a meeting about this in a few weeks, so I expect that we will have a new and innovative protocol in place to share and discuss the assessment findings and to utilize them to make improvements.

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 date we have made no changes to our assessment process.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Sociology BA**

(As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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 (SOCI 3030) Final Exam or Paper (O: 1)**

This measure is derived from professors’ evaluations of how well students articulated key sociological concepts or theories in their final exams or course papers. 200 students in five sections were evaluated (on a four-point scale). Professors judged that 29% of their students were doing work they considered excellent (a score of 4); that 27% were doing work they evaluated as very good (a score of 3); that 18% were doing work they saw as good (a score of 2), and that 19% were doing work they considered to be poor (a score of 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: SOCI 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment is based on professors' evaluations of: students' course papers (in which they develop research proposals) and/or final exams. Students' work is assessed based on their course papers or final exams. In terms of demonstrating &quot;analytic skills,&quot; professors assessed 24% of students' papers as excellent; 39% as very good; 22% as good; and 15% as poor. In terms of demonstration of &quot;critical thinking,&quot; the professor assessed 31% of students' papers as excellent; 36% as very good; 19% as good, and 14% as poor. In terms of &quot;communication skills,&quot; 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 &quot;acquisition of knowledge&quot;: 26% of these papers/exams as excellent (a score of 4); 36% were judged to be &quot;very good&quot; (a score of three) in this area; 23% were judged to be &quot;good&quot; (a score of 2) and 15% were judged to be poor (a score of 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>while we do not know the exact percentage of students who scored &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; due to department leadership transitions, we do not think this goal was met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their analysis of social problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target goal was met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target goal was met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target goal was met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance (O: 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of leadership transition, we do not have accurate data on this course. However, we believe based on grades, that this goal was once again partially met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of leadership transition, we do not have accurate data for 2014-2015, however, we believe this goal was partially met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper (O: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Partially met

**Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems**
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Partially met

**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:** 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 is any way to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not.

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
Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there is any way to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper | Outcome/Objective: Analysis of Social Problems

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 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam | Outcome/Objective: Data Collection and Data Analysis

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
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

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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 entries for sociology assessment of core

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 entry for sociology assessment of the core

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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.

See entry for sociology assessment of the core

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.

See entry for sociology assessment of the core
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Mission / Purpose
The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The 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."

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**
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."

**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
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

Target for O8: Writing Conventions
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.

Target for O11: Use of Data Sources
75% of students rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item.
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Mission / Purpose
The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Doctoral Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student's original Doctoral Dissertation and Dissertation Defense are used for assessment by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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

**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.

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

**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, Data Analysis

**Implementation Description:** The new exams go into effect next month, in August. The increased instruction in methods/statistics (and the increased emphasis on these topics in other courses) went into effect this past academic year, 2010-2011.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dawn Baunach

#### Theory Instruction

The department decided last year (to go into effect August 2011) to change its doctoral examinations from qualifying examinations in statistics, methods, and theory to a specialty examination. This past year (2010-2011) we offered the last two exams in the old, qualifying exam, format. The new, specialty exam, format will go into effect in August 2011; it represents a major change in our doctoral instruction that will bring our requirements more in-line with our peer institutions. Although there were five attempts at the qualifying exam in theory, that represents just three students. Three students took the exam in January 2011. Of those three, two failed and one passed. The two students who failed the exam in January retook the exam in May. Of those two students, one failed the theory exam for a second time (and is being scholastically terminated from the program, per College rules) and the other is rewriting a conditional pass answer in August. Although the department decided last year to change the doctoral examinations, we continue to take very seriously our instruction in sociological theory. Just this week a group of faculty has decided to hold a working, discussion group to discuss our two theory courses. The department has also agreed and affirmed to all instructors that theoretical content should be increased in all substantive graduate courses, and not leave theory instruction to just two specific courses. Thus, we are also taking steps to improve our theory instruction in the two theory courses and in all substantive courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Methods Component of Doctoral Exam
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Techniques, Data Analysis

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Theory Component of Doctoral Exam | Outcome/Objective: Concepts and Theories
- | Facts and Information | Global Questions | Social Problems

Implementation Description: The new exams are going into effect next month. The increased theoretical standards of all courses went into effect this past academic year. The working theory group will begin having meetings next month.

Responsible Person/Group: Dawn Baunach

---
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is, through the study of modern and classical languages, cultures and literatures, 1. to provide students the opportunity to improve their critical thinking skills; 2. to better appreciate universal humanistic values; 3. to encourage them to acquire an international perspective; 4. to equip them to function as global citizens; 5. to prepare them, through the various majors in modern languages, for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of Hispanic Literature
Student will understand the particularities of Hispanic literature in light of a general historical and cultural context.

G 2: Outcomes for the current period
After consultation with GSU's Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to Literature course, a requirement for all majors in Spanish. The new rubric for this goal was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment. It includes 4 weighted criteria of a literary text: Focus on Topic (35%), Literary Lens Use (35%), Organization (15%) and Accuracy of Grammar and Spelling (15%).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures (M: 1)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Paper (O: 6)
In Spanish 3307 (Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts), students wrote a paper whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

Target for O6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures
The student will achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

---

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

**Encourage Scholarship**
Supervise student work that can be presented at professional meetings.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Planned
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Spanish Faculty

**Mentoring**
Mentor M.A. candidates who express a desire to continue graduate work at the doctoral level.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Planned
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Spanish Faculty

**Professional Activities**
Encourage and oversee M.A. candidates’ initiatives (such as the graduate conference) that contribute to student growth and institution visibility.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Planned
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Spanish Faculty

---
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**Mission / Purpose**
Speech communication explores the construction, diffusion, analysis, and impact of messages as they occur among individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures in the media age. Students will learn major theories and concepts within this discipline that they will then use to create, perform, and critique the effectiveness of various types of communicative acts.

**Goals**

**G 1: Communication Scholars**

Students become scholars of human communication

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Communication Development/Strategy (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

36 Speech Majors took SPCH 4400 in the spring 2015 semester, and data was collected from six different measures to assess SLO #1: Communication Development/Strategy: Students understand the development and strategic aspects of human communication. Student Learning Objective #1 was then broken down further into three subsets for analysis: (1a) Students can identify competing models of human communication; (1b) Students can describe variations in communication across age, gender, culture, disability; (1c) Students can explain the use of power in various human communication situations.

**SLO 2: Communication Competence (M: 7, 8, 9, 10)**

22 Speech Majors took SPCH 4450 in the spring 2015 semester, and data was collected from four different measures to assess SLO #2: Communication Competence: Students utilize communication competence and critical thinking skills. Student Learning Objective #2 was then broken down further into two subsets for analysis: (2a) Students can critique the content, structure, and style of oral, written, and mediated messages; (2b) Students can write effectively.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: SPCH 4400 Assignment 01 (O: 1)**

Assignment 01 consists of an in-class exam.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
### Target for O1: Communication Development/Strategy

For each measure, students' skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4400 Assessment Data & Findings.

### M 2: SPCH 4400 Assignment 02 (O: 1)

Assignment 02 consists of an in-class exam.

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

#### Target for O1: Communication Development/Strategy

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4400 Assessment Data & Findings.

### M 3: SPCH 4400 Final Exam (O: 1)

Final Exam consists of an in-class exam.

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

#### Target for O1: Communication Development/Strategy

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4400 Assessment Data & Findings.

### M 4: SPCH 4400 Language Development Project (O: 1)

Language Development Project consists of an in-class presentation.

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

#### Target for O1: Communication Development/Strategy

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4400 Assessment Data & Findings.

### M 5: SPCH 4400 Language Prejudice debate (O: 1)

Language Prejudice debate consists of an in-class forum.

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

#### Target for O1: Communication Development/Strategy

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4400 Assessment Data & Findings.

### M 6: SPCH 4400 Bilingualism debate (O: 1)

Bilingualism debate consists of an in-class forum.

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

#### Target for O1: Communication Development/Strategy

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

#### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4450 Assessment Data & Findings.

**M 7: SPCH 4450 Exam #1 (O: 2)**

Exam #1 consists of an in-class exam.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Communication Competence**

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4450 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4450 Assessment Data & Findings.

**M 8: SPCH 4450 Exam #2 (O: 2)**

Exam #2 consists of an in-class exam.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Communication Competence**

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4450 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4450 Assessment Data & Findings.

**M 9: SPCH 4450 Rhetorical Essay & Analysis (O: 2)**

Rhetorical Essay & Analysis consists of a written assignment.

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

**Target for O2: Communication Competence**

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4450 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4450 Assessment Data & Findings.

**M 10: SPCH 4450 Discussion Leader Assignment (O: 2)**

Discussion Leader Assignment consists of a written assignment and in-class discussion.

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

**Target for O2: Communication Competence**

For each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4450 is an upper division course that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores, as represented in the attached chart, SPCH 4450 Assessment Data & Findings.

**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
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 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 Rotation for Measuring Objectives
This year, we completely revised our mission, goals, and learning objectives. So, this was our first effort at measuring our new goals and learning objectives. In this cycle, we measured 8 of the 11 objectives set forth in our new Assessment Plan. For the upcoming cycle, we need to measure the 3 objectives not measured in the cycle. Also, we need to develop a rotation for when objectives will be measured so that the 11 objectives are measured consistently over time.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will develop a rotation for objective measurement.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Gather additional data
One of the goals of the Speech Major is equip students to summarize scholarly research. The target was not met for this objective. To better understand whether this an ongoing and/or widespread issue with our students, we should gather more data from additional assignments

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Have discussion with faculty teaching upper division, especially research courses, which assignments best assess ability to summarize research and make a plan to gather student work to analyze for next year’s assessment. Also have discussion about assigning annotated bibliographies as first-round assignments in classes that require a term paper.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty

Writing Rubric Design
I would like to revise the writing rubric scale The current scale ranges from 1 to 3. Revising the scale will allow it to more accurately reflect the range of students’ current ability levels. Also, this will allow the assessor to understand in which areas students need further training. Further, the rubric should also assess the content of the paper to see that the content is accurately and thoroughly explained. The current rubric does not assess content.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Assessment Coordinator for Speech will research potential writing rubrics to use in writing courses and decide upon one to use for next year’s assessment data.
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator for Speech

Broader Data
The data for verbal and nonverbal presentation skills was collected for one class. Because our major is Speech Communication, several classes require formal presentations. Additional data should be collected from a variety of classes to determine whether the current data is reflective of a small sample size or a skill gap in our majors.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
Responsible Person/Group: Speech Assessment Contact Person

Speech Major Assessment Revision 2014-2015
In February 2015, the Communication Department revised the Speech Major curriculum (see attached “Speech Curriculum
In the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, we began a separate assessment for the two CTW courses (Persuasion, Communication & Diversity), which had previously been used to represent the Speech Major in the assessment process. These two changes required a complete overhaul of the assessment process for the Speech Major. The 2014-2015 assessment report for the Speech Major represents a first step in that overhaul (see attached “Speech Major Assessment SLO Revisions” for details). We aim to continue implementing and developing appropriate measures for each of the three Student Learning Objectives. During the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, we began assessing SLO #1: Communication Development/Strategy: Students understand the development and strategic aspects of human communication; and SLO #2: Communication Competence: Students utilize communication competence and critical thinking skills. During the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, we plan to implement measures for SLO #3: Communication Research: Students understand the communication research tradition. We also plan to target a larger data set, and design pre-test / post-test models for each SLO and measure.

Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Projected Completion Date: 10/2016

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 each measure, students’ skills were assessed using a Likert Scale: 1 = absent/beginning; 2 = developing/inadequate; 3 = competent/adequate; 4 = advanced/sophisticated; 5 = mastery. Because SPCH 4400 & SPCH 4450 are upper division courses that contained mostly Speech Majors, we anticipated a target score between 3.5 & 4 on the Likert Scale. For each measure, students achieved and often exceeded the expected target scores. Due to the revised curriculum to the Speech Major in February of 2015 and the recent overhaul of the Speech Major Assessment process, it is perhaps too early to draw any conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of these changes. We hope that the 2015-2016 assessment cycle will produce more conclusive data and enable a true measure of the program and its goals. For now, it is clear that the Speech Major successfully achieves the stated goals and learning objectives.

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 planning any significant changes to the Speech Major or assessment process in the 2015-2016 academic calendar year, as the Communication Department has recently made substantive changes in both areas.

---
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**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)
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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

**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.

**M 5: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Normal.dotm 0 0 1 18 106 Georgia State University 1 1 130 12.256 0 false 18 pt 18 pt 0 0 false false false Students will complete a culminating essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content.

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

**Target for O1: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization.**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

---

**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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Sports Medicine MS**

As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The purpose of the Graduate Sports Medicine Program is to educate post-professional athletic trainers in advanced techniques.
related to the practice of athletic training and provide opportunities to apply learned knowledge in a clinical setting.

**Goals**

**G 1:** Clinician that practices athletic training in a manner that integrates evidence and experience.

**G 2:** Clinician that uses advanced knowledge in clinical practice of examination, diagnosis, and treatment of injuries.

**G 3:** Clinician that is able to develop, conduct, analyze, and disseminate research related to the practice of athletic training.

**G 4:** Clinician that conducts themselves with the highest manner of professionalism.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1:** Demonstrate professionalism in their practice as an athletic trainer (G: 4) (M: 3)

Students will dress appropriately and act ethically while serving as a certified athletic trainer at their particular clinical site. Students will interact in a respectful manner with student athletes, peers, parents, coaches, physicians, and administrators.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

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

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

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

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

1 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

1.0 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

2.0 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

3.0 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

1.0 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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Research Presentations (O: 2)
All students will present twice annually to their peers on a research article related to an athletic training concept.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: Demonstrate the ability to search for and analyze peer-reviewed research.
All students will receive at least a score of 3 out of 4 on research article presentations.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All students received at least a score of 3 out of 4 on their research article presentations.

M 2: Thesis or Research Project (O: 2, 5)
Students must develop and write a thesis or research project prior to graduation
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Demonstrate the ability to search for and analyze peer-reviewed research.
All students receive a score of at least 3 out of 4 on literature review and discussion portions of their research project.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All students received a score of at least 3 out of 4 on the literature review and discussion portions of their research project.

Target for O5: Conduct scientific research study related to athletic training.
All students receive a score of at least 3 out of 4 on topic development, data collection, and data analysis sections of their research projects.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All students received a score of at least 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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.
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All students (23) received at least a 3 out of 4 on all exams in KH 7580. All students (17) 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 2014-15): 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 SLOs through classroom learning (which is detailed below in curriculum matrix), clinical experience, research endeavors, and professional shadowing. Below is the curriculum matrix.

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

Our students continue to be better prepared for the current job market and find employment upon graduation. We modified KH7530 to include lecture and cadaver dissection component. Better tests grades were found as a result. This class is now 4.0 credit hours instead of 3.0.

Challenges for Next Year--Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.

The program coordinator will be leaving after the fall semester. Planning for the change-over to an entry level master's program as a requirement; therefore, an undergraduate degree is athletic training will not be offered around the country.

University-wide Committee Participation--Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).

Program Coordinator currently serves on the University Senate and is assigned to the Research Committee and Athletics Committee.

Publications and Presentations--Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.


10. Goerger BM. The Association Between Quadriceps Strength and Lower Extremity Kinematics in Patients with ACLR. 2015 Southeast Athletic Trainers’ Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.

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).

Speakers—Athletic Training at GSU for students from The Westminster Schools (January 2015) Member-Search Committee for Head Athletic Trainer-Clayton State University (July-August 2014)

---

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2014-2015 Taxation MTX

As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**
Fall 2014 -- 72.72% average Spring 2015 -- 67.375% average

**M 2: Locating Tax Authority (O: 1)**
Students are given a take-home exam in Tx 8030 which requires them under time pressure to perform independent tax research focused on locating the correct authority to support their answers.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**
The target is a score of 85% on the final research exam in Tx 8030.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Fall 2014 -- 89% average on final research exam. Spring 2015 -- 90% 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Fall 2014 -- 86.95% average Spring 2015 -- 87.74% average

**M 4: Knowledge of Corporate Tax Law (O: 2)**
Performance is measured by the average correct scores on 16 targeted questions on both the mid-term exam and the final exam. The questions cover learning objectives for 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% for Fall 2014 Class combined average on targeted questions of 80% beginning in Spring 2015.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**
Spring 2015 -- Combined average of 79% on targeted questions.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Not Met**
Spring 2015 -- Average of 73% on 10 targeted exam questions.

**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

**Target for O3: Demonstrate professional communications skills.**
85% average score on writing assignments packet.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Fall 2014 -- 92% class average Spring 2015 -- 92% class average

**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*
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: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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
Projected Completion Date: 08/2014
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
Projected Completion Date: 08/2014
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
Projected Completion Date: 10/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Tad D. Ransopher

Timing of assessment and practice problems
This assessment may come too soon in the semester before the students have had enough practice on the skill of issue identification. The assessment will be moved closer to the end of the semester to give the students more practice on identifying issues in research problems. This change will require a change in the class assignment schedule and the addition of more practice exercises.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Identifying Tax Issues | Outcome/Objective: To develop ability to conduct tax research

Implementation Description: Revise assignment schedule and include more practice exercises on identifying issues for Spring 2016 Tax Research class.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Prof. Smeal
Additional Resources: None

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Teaching & Learning PhD -- Teacher Education
As of 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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 teaching and teacher education to work in diverse national and international academic settings, with a special focus on urban
As part of this degree, graduates engage fully and deeply in the teacher education research and scholarship, theory and practice. Graduates of this program understand the Ph.D. as a lifelong engagement with research, scholarship, teaching and service in teacher education.

**Goals**

**G 1: Possess expert knowledge of teacher education theory and research**
Candidates have expert knowledge of teacher education theory and research.

**G 2: Possess expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of teacher education**
Candidates have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of teacher education.

**G 3: Are active contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels**
Candidates are active participants and contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels in teacher education.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (M: 1)**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and theories of teacher education, as well as methodologies specific to teacher education research.

Institutional Priority Associations
- 2. Student promotion and progression

Strategic Plan Associations
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (M: 2)**
Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars.

Strategic Plan Associations
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Service and Engagement (M: 3)**
Candidates participate in and contribute to professional organizations in teacher education through publication of manuscripts, presentations at conferences, leadership roles, review of manuscripts and proposals for publications, presentations, and grants.

Strategic Plan Associations
- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology (M: 4)**
Candidates access, develop, and promote the use of technology in their research, teaching, and service contributions to the field of teacher education.

Strategic Plan Associations
- 3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
- 5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Knowledge (O: 1)**
Candidates are assessed using a teacher education rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 1 and 2 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
100% (N=1) of our students received a score of "5" (highest score possible) for Standard 1: "Knowledge of Research methodologies" and a score of "5" on Standard 2: Knowledge of Psychological and Social Foundations” at the midpoint evaluation.

**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.
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 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).

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

100% (N=1) of our students received a score of "5" (highest score possible) for Standard 3: "Knowledge in Teacher Education Major" and a score of "5" on Standard 4: Scholarship in Teacher Education Major at the midpoint evaluation.

M 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 3)
Candidates are assessed using a teacher 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).

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

100% (N=1) of our students received a score of "4" (scores range from 1-5, with 5 being the highest) for Standard 5: "Knowledge in Cognate" and a score of "4" on Standard 6: Professional Identity/Service to the Profession at the midpoint evaluation.

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).

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

100% (N=1) of our students received a score of "4" (scores range from 1-5, with 5 being the highest) for Standard 8: "Technology" at the midpoint evaluation.

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

Evaluating opportunities to explore SLOs
We will have conversations related to where in the program our students are provided with opportunities to learn, practice, and master the SLOs.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: We have not, as program faculty, had conversations related to where in the program our students are provided with opportunities to learn, practice, and master the SLOs. Having these conversations and creating a curriculum map or matrix will be our action item for this upcoming year. We will also discuss ways to share findings/data in future years.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: AI affiliate program faculty, though the co-coordinators will take the lead in these conversations.
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): Describe where in the program our 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 not, as program faculty, had conversations related to where in the program our students are provided with opportunities to learn, practice, and master the SLOs. Having these conversations and creating a curriculum map or matrix will be our action item for this upcoming year.
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 only 1 student in our program (PhD in Teaching & Learning, Teaching and Teacher Education concentration) who has gotten to the midpoint evaluation (we evaluate our students with the attached rubric at comprehensive exams and at the end of the program (dissertation defense). This student received a score of either 4 or 5 (scale is 1-5, with 5 being the highest) on all measures which means we met our goal of at least 40% of students receiving a score of 4 or higher on all rubric elements. The student was very strong (5’s) in research methods, foundations, and knowledge of major area. The student was strong in the remaining areas: Knowledge in Cognate, Service, Teaching, and Technology. Given that this is a new program (and given that we have only had 1 student evaluated at the midpoint), we will need several more administrations of this assessment before we will be able to discuss the quality of the assessments.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 were shared (via email) with affiliate program faculty for the 2014-15 cycle. Because we only had 1 student who completed the midpoint evaluation there was little need to share and discuss results among program faculty. We will discuss ways to share this data in future years.

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 making any changes to the program and assessment process. We have only had 1 student evaluated at the midpoint (and she did very well); we will not make any changes to the program or assessment process until we have more data to analyze in future report cycles. We did not have any actions plans last year.
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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All candidates 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
All students have met this target.

M 4: Engagement with Technology (O: 4)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standard 7 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher)
### Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met

All students have met this target.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Increased International Visibility

- **Students will begin to work within and/or with international projects and educational spaces.**
  - **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
  - **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
  - **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure (Key Assessment):** Engagement with Technology
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Engagement with Technology
  - **Measure (Key Assessment):** Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

#### Increased International Visibility

Students will begin to work within and/or with international projects and educational spaces.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

#### Increased Number of Full Time Students

Our program continues to admit students interested in full time study.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure (Key Assessment):** Professional Service and Engagement
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2014-2015 Teaching & Learning PhD--Mathematics Education**

*As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM 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 mathematics education theory and research.

**G 2: Possess expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of mathematics education**

Candidates have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of mathematics 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 mathematics education.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (M: 1)**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and theories of mathematics teaching and learning, as well as methodologies specific to mathematics education research.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (M: 2, 4)**

Relevant Associations:
Candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical skills for teacher 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 math 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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 2014-2015 - 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All mathematics education faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue to Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All mathematics education faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue to Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All mathematics education faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue to Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Service and Engagement</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Continue to monitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 10/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Mathematics Education Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue to Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure (Key Assessment): Engagement with Technology</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Continue to monitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Mathematics Education Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue to Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue to Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment)</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15):** 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.

   Never updated

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?

   Never updated

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15):** 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.

   Never updated

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.

   Never updated

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Teaching & Learning PhD--Music Education**

As of: 12/13/2016 08:45 AM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

This post-master's degree emphasizes development of research skills and high levels of practice in the teaching and learning of music, particularly in school settings. Applicants must demonstrate strong potential for conducting successful research and a record of exemplary teaching. Students pursue studies in research methodology, music education, and a cognate area consistent with background and interests. This program is intended for those who wish to teach in colleges and universities or to work in the education programs of cultural and arts organizations.

**Goals**

**G 1: MusEd Goal #1 (Ph.D.)**

1. Our graduates will be informed teachers who know the content in music needed for teaching students in P-12 schools.

**G 2: MusEd Goal #2 (Ph.D.)**

2. Our graduates will be informed teachers who know the content in music teacher education needed for teaching undergraduate students in teacher preparation programs.

**G 3: MusEd Goal #3 (Ph.D.)**

3. Our graduates will be informed researchers who know how to identify research problems, pose appropriate research questions, employ methodologies sufficient to answer the questions, and draw meaningful implications for music teaching and learning.
G 4: MusEd Goal #4 (Ph.D.)
4. Our graduates will be informed theorists and philosophers who are able to articulate current theories and philosophies related to music education pedagogy both in the United States and worldwide.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<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. Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: MusEd Objective #1 (Ph.D.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 4 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two students completed formal internships in 2014-15 (signified by taking EDCI 9660). The scores were 3.6 and 3.7 of 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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. Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: MusEd Objective #2 (Ph.D.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 4 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two students taught undergraduate courses in 2014-15 (signified by serving as instructors, under faculty supervision, in either MUS 3240 or MUS 3340). (Score #1 (MUS 3240 was 3.7 of 4.0), Score #2 (MUS 3340 was 3.9 of 4.0).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: MusEd Assessment Measure #3 (Ph.D.) (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Measure: Defense of dissertation prospectus. Measure: Committee evaluation of dissertation prospectus and presentation. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: MusEd Objective #3 (Ph.D.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of &quot;Pass&quot; by consensus vote of committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two students presented prospectus defenses during the 2014-15 academic year. Both were asked for revisions and were finally passed by consensus vote of the committee. One student presented a dissertation defense during this period and passed by unanimous vote of the committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: MusEd Assessment Measure #4 (Ph.D.) (O: 4)</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. They will assess their teaching and student learning throughout the course and will recommend final course grades to the faculty supervisor. Rubric: &quot;MusEd - Effect on Student Learning (Ph.D.).&quot; Minimum Score: 3 of 4. 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 team teach similar content. We are accomplishing this in two ways: Spring 2013. The two courses (MUS 3310 and MUS 3350) will meet consecutively on Monday nights, and undergraduate students will be required to enroll in both. Fall 2013: We have submitted a curriculum change to fold the content of MUS 3350 into the content of MUS 3310, creating a single course that will be team-taught by two Ph.D. students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The curriculum change has been submitted and approved.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Freer, Coordinator of Music Education

Redefinition of Comprehensive Examinations

Our comprehensive examination process has been revised for an initial administration of November 2012. The wording below is contained in our new handbook for Ph.D. students in music education (pp. 10-11): "Each Ph.D. student will engage in the comprehensive examination during the final semester of course work as determined by the faculty academic advisor. The comprehensive examination occurs over a period of at least three weeks. The first two weeks involve written projects, and the final week includes the oral portion of the exam. All parts of the exam are to be completed at least one month (30 days) before the final day of classes for that semester. This will allow time for the completion of any additional work requested by the Doctoral Advisory Committee. *Detailed information about the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) requirements in Georgia State University's College of Education can be found in the current edition of the university Graduate Catalog. The relevant section is Section 4320. This section includes information about the Comprehensive Examination, assembling the appropriate faculty committee, and registering for courses after successful completion of the Comprehensive Examination. The catalog is online, and can be accessed through: http://www.gsu.edu/enrollment/catalogs.html Scheduling. The first step is to schedule the date for the oral comprehensive examination (see Week Three below). This must be done in consultation with the faculty academic advisor. Week One: Written Project (Research Methodology, Analysis & Interpretation) 2500 minimum words (approximately 8 pages) in strict accordance with the current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The above minimum word count does not include the required title page and references. The paper topic will be assigned by Friday at noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Two: Written Project (Music Education Pedagogy and Research) 2500 minimum words (approximately 8 pages) in strict accordance with the current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The above minimum word count does not include the required title page and references. The paper topic will be assigned by Friday at noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Three: Oral Examination Duration: 90 minutes Part One: Prepared Responses o The Ph.D. student will be assigned to answer four questions, one related to each of the four semesters of MUS 8960 (Proseminar in Music Education). The student will be assigned to speak to each question for ten minutes each (40 minutes total). For each question, the student may prepare a single side of a 3x5 index card (4 cards total) for reference during the presentation. o The four questions will be presented to the Ph.D. student seven days prior to the scheduled oral examination. • Part Two: Identification o The Ph.D. student will be asked to identify 25 items discussed in MUS 8960. These may include terms, people, movements, publications, philosophies, studies, and all manner of related topics within music education. Following successful completion of the Comprehensive Examination, Ph.D. students are required to form their Dissertation Advisory Committee. Instructions can be found online at the website of the College’s Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions (see “Graduate Forms” and scroll down to “Dissertation Advisory Committee”).

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Implementation will be in the Fall 2012 semester.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Freer, Coordinator of Music Education

Additional Redefinition of Comprehensive Examination

Fall 2015 Update: We will pilot application of the comprehensive examination rubric currently used by other programs offering the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning. We will make a decision whether to adopt the rubric in Spring 2016. In addition to the changes made in the fall of 2012, we will be adding two elements to the comprehensive examination. Details will be determined during the 2013-14 year, with implementation in the fall of 2014. The two elements to be added will be prerequisites to the written and oral portions of the exam and will need to be completed prior to scheduling of those portions: a. presentation at a conference; b. submission of an article to a peer-reviewed journal, with completion of at least one round of review.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Use of the rubric will begin Fall 2015.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Freer

Faculty Oversight

2011-12 was the first year in which Ph.D. students taught undergraduate courses. The instructors (Ph.D. students) requested that the schedule be configured so that they team teach similar content. We are accomplishing this in two ways: Spring 2013. The two courses (MUS 3310 and MUS 3350) will meet consecutively on Monday nights, and undergraduate students will be required to enroll in both. IN PROGRESS -- Fall 2013: We have submitted a curriculum change to fold the content of MUS 3350 into the content of MUS 3310, creating a single course that will be team-taught by two Ph.D. students.
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 during the Fall 2013 semester. The changes were the addition of two prerequisites to the Ph.D. students’ comprehensive examinations, prospectus defenses, and dissertation defenses. The changes illustrate that these are rigorous processes with high evaluative standards. Again, the changes were the addition of two prerequisites to the comprehensive examination process has been revised for the Fall 2013 semester.

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 4.320. 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 text is online, and can be accessed through: http://www.gsu.edu/enrollment/catalogs.html. 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 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 up to 4 pages of notes for reference during the presentation. o The four questions will be presented to the Ph.D. student seven days prior to the scheduled oral examination. - Part Two: Identification o The Ph.D. student will be asked to identify 25 items discussed in MUS 8960. These may include terms, people, movements, publications, philosophies, studies, and all manner of related topics within music education. Following successful completion of the Comprehensive Examination, Ph.D. students are required to form their Dissertation Advisory Committee. Instructions can be found online at the website of the College’s Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions (see “Graduate Forms” and scroll down to “Dissertation Advisory Committee”).

Additions of Comprehensive Exam Prerequisites

Our comprehensive examination process has been revised for the Fall 2013 semester. 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.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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.

N/A

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 assessments of Ph.D. students’ teaching continue to agree with our confidence in the students preparation. We routinely have students take the graduate methods course parallel to the undergraduate course they will teach, then they observe the class one semester before beginning the teaching assignment, and they are assigned a faculty mentor for the duration. Our assessments of Ph.D. students’ comprehensive examinations, prospectus defenses, and dissertation defenses illustrate that these are rigorous processes with high evaluative standards. It is not uncommon for faculty members to recommend revisions, and we have had several occasions where faculty agreed to disagree on the outcome yet ultimately achieve a consensus opinion.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 music education faculty meets monthly to discuss all matters pertaining to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Because we
are a small faculty (three CEHD graduate faculty members), communication is not problematic. It is typical that at least two or three of the faculty members are on each Ph.D. assessment panel, further facilitating communication and analysis.

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 do not plan any changes other than the piloted use of the comprehensive examination assessment rubric currently used in other program areas. The addition of prerequisites to the comprehensive examination in Fall 2014 was non-eventful.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Music Education faculty report this information annually to the College of Arts and Sciences. We do not collect this information at the program level.

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 challenges relate to faculty load as our program enrollments grow and/or students move closer to the dissertation stage.

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).
Music Education faculty report this information annually to the College of Arts and Sciences. We do not have any staff members assigned to Music Education. We do not collect this information at the program level.

Publications and Presentations--Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
Music Education faculty report this information annually to the College of Arts and Sciences. We do not have any staff members assigned to Music Education. We do not collect this information at the program level.

International Activities--Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
Music Education faculty report this information annually to the College of Arts and Sciences. We do not have any staff members assigned to Music Education.

Contributions to Student Retention--Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
Music Education faculty report this information annually to the College of Arts and Sciences and to our national accrediting body, the National Association of Schools of Music.

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).
Music Education faculty report this information annually to the College of Arts and Sciences. We do not collect this information at the program level.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Teaching & Learning PhD--Science Education
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning with emphasis in Science Education is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced expertise in research and scholarship of teaching and learning in science education to work in diverse national and international academic settings.

Goals
G 1: Possess expert knowledge of science education theory and research
Candidates have expert knowledge of science education theory and research

G 2: have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of science education
Candidates have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of science education.
G 3: are active contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels
Candidates are active participants and contributors to professional organizations at local, national, and international levels in science education.

G 4: Possess expert knowledge of science education theory and research
Candidates have expert knowledge of science education theory and research

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge of Science Education (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate knowledge of historical perspectives and prominent theories of science education research, as well as methodologies specific to science education research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2 Student promotion and progression

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Science Teacher Education (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars in science education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement in Science Education (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology in Science Education (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates access, develop, and promote the use of technology in their research, teaching, and service contributions to the field of science education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Research Knowledge (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 1 and 2 from the rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 3 and 4 from the rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2014-2015 - 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 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 2014-2015 - 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: 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 2014-2015 - 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)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

1. **Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15)**: 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.

   N/A

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 number of students who have submitted for publication and have had their manuscripts published has increased over the past several years. This increase represents a strength of the program. A weakness is that our enrollment numbers are down due to changes in the PSC for teacher certificate upgrades. Our assessments of Ph.D. students' comprehensive examinations, prospectus defenses, and dissertation defenses illustrate that these are rigorous processes with high evaluative standards. It is not uncommon for faculty members to recommend revisions, and we have had several occasions where faculty agreed to disagree on the outcome yet ultimately achieve a consensus opinion.

3. **Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15)**: 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 science education faculty meets monthly to discuss all matters pertaining to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Because we are a small faculty communication is not problematic. Typical all of the faculty members are on each Ph.D. assessment panel, further facilitating communication and analysis.

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.

   Changes in the program have largely resulted from changes initiated by the PSC. Nonetheless, the science education doctoral students continue to produce strong research publications, strong presentation skills, and strong commitments to service. The results are in part due to changes in the comprehensive examination procedures where students can submit for publication as part of the comprehensive examination process.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most important accomplishments for year**: briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.
Science Education faculty report this information annually to the Middle and Secondary Department. We do not collect this information at the program level.

**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 challenges relate to faculty load as our program enrollments grow and/or students move closer to the dissertation stage.

**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).
Science Education faculty report this information annually to the Middle and Secondary Education department. We do not have any staff members assigned to Science Education. We do not collect this information at the program level.

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
Science Education faculty report this information annually to the department of Middle and Secondary Education. We do not have any staff members assigned to Science Education. We do not collect this information at the program level.

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
Science Education faculty report this information annually to the Middle and Secondary Education department. We do not have any staff members assigned to Science Education.

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
Science Education faculty report this information annually to the Middle and Secondary Education department.

**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).
Science Education faculty report this information annually to the Middle and Secondary Education department. We do not collect this information at the program level.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2014-2015 Teaching & Learning PhD--Social Studies Education**

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree program is to prepare researchers, scholars, and teacher educators in the fields of social studies education to work in diverse national and international academic settings. As part of this degree, graduates engage fully and deeply in social studies education research and scholarship, theory and practice. Graduates of this program understand the Ph.D. as a lifelong engagement with research, scholarship, teaching and service in social studies education.

**Goals**

**G 2: Researchers**
1: Competent Researchers in Social Studies Education

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Professional & Pedagogical Skills (M: 2)**
Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

**SLO 2: Research Knowledge (M: 1, 2)**
2: Demonstrates Research Knowledge

**SLO 3: Professional Service (M: 2)**
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

**Target for O2: Research Knowledge**
80% of students will pass the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. 90% of students will pass with two attempts.

**M 2: Doctoral Dissertation and Defense (O: 1, 2, 3)**
The measure for Research Knowledge is the doctoral dissertation and defense. Evaluation of students’ work is qualitative. Professors respond to the dissertation project and provide feedback. Results are measured by Pass or Fail.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Professional & Pedagogical Skills**
100% of students will demonstrate strong professional and pedagogical skills through teaching internships in higher education or teaching leadership in local schools, county district, or state-wide organizations.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Two students completed the doctoral dissertation and defense in the 2014-2015 academic year. Both students demonstrated strong professional and pedagogical skills. One became a middle school coordinator and the other became an assistant principal.

**Target for O2: Research Knowledge**
80% of students will demonstrate strong research knowledge through their dissertation manuscript and oral defense.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
Two students completed their doctoral dissertation and defense. Both students had publications in leading social studies education journals. Both students had successful defenses and strong dissertations. One student won a dissertation award at a national organization.

**Target for O3: Professional Service**
80% will demonstrate professional service through leadership in a local, state, or national social studies organization.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**
The two students who completed their dissertation took on leadership roles at the local and state level. One student won an award from a national organization.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Graduation**
The number of students who complete the dissertation will increase.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Doctoral Dissertation and Defense | Outcome/Objective: Professional & Pedagogical Skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2016

**Responsible Person/Group:** Chara Bohan and Joe Feinberg

**Professional Activity**
Students will present at the state or national social studies conference and will work to recruit more social studies doctoral applicants.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Doctoral Dissertation and Defense | Outcome/Objective: Professional Service

**Publications**
The percentage of students who submit for publication to social studies journals will increase to 75%.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Doctoral Dissertation and Defense | Outcome/Objective: Research Knowledge

**Responsible Person/Group:** Chara Bohan and Joe Feinberg

**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 number of students who have submitted for publication and have had their manuscripts published has increased over the past several years. This increase represents a strength of the program. A weakness is that our enrollment numbers are down due to changes in the PSC for teacher certificate upgrades.

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.

Changes in the program have largely resulted from changes initiated by the PSC. Nonetheless, the social studies doctoral students continue to produce strong research publications, strong presentation skills, and strong commitments to service. The results are in part due to changes in the comprehensive examination procedures where students can submit for publication as part of the comprehensive examination process.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Urban Teacher Leadership MEd (UACM)
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The UACM is a rigorous program that seeks to serve the needs and aspirations of elementary students schooled in urban contexts by eradicating deficit perspectives through the development of pedagogically competent, equity-oriented, empowered teachers who are change agents inside and outside the classroom.

The UACM 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. As a multidisciplinary program serving culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students, candidates must demonstrate a strong understanding and a level of proficiency that can best support student learning.

G 2: Teaching as a Profession
Master's candidates will develop as reflective and collaborative professionals. Candidates are provided tools and opportunities to develop and practice reflecting and reviewing their teaching towards understanding successes and areas of improvement. Collaboration is one mechanism to enhance reflection but it also serves as a venue to develop the professional skills to be a
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 demonstrates expertise and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (G: 1) (M: 3)
The educator effectively manages and monitors student learning/development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning (G: 2) (M: 4)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities (G: 2) (M: 5)
The educator is an effective member of one or more learning communities.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning (O: 1)
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 1: Disposition Assessment.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Shows commitment to student learning & development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of dispositions needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous reflection, planning, and action.

Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met
92% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment. As of this reporting period (2014-2015), we have been instituting the college unit's designated system for determining dispositions. The rubric is based upon the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), which is a part of Georgia's new Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) and is aligned with the InTASC Standards and has designated performance indicators at the following levels: Proficient, Achieving, Needs Development, Ineffective, and Unsatisfactory. Items #7 and #9 constitute the rubric elements designated by the unit to qualify for dispositions. Those elements are as follows: 7. Positive Learning Environment The teacher provides a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all. 9. Professionalism The teacher demonstrates a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participates in professional growth opportunities, and contributes to the profession. The program met expectations for this assessment. All but 2 candidates' overall average score met final expectations. In examining the data, candidates were fairly even on both domains with a one person differential suggesting we can continue to support developing positive learning environment. As a result, faculty will continue to address candidate lesson planning with ongoing specific attention to culturally responsive pedagogy that supports respect for all. (See LiveText for aggregated data table).

M 2: Faculty Rating 2 - Expertise for Learning & Develop (O: 2)
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 2: Field Experience Observation Assessment.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 2014-2015 - Target: Met
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.583 on a 4.0 scale. The UACM Observation Rubric is based upon the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), which is a part of Georgia's new Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) and is aligned with the InTASC Standards and has designated performance indicators at the following levels: Proficient, Achieving, Needs Development, Ineffective, and Unsatisfactory. We saw solid improvement from midpoint to endpoint for differentiated instruction, assessment strategies, and providing an academically challenging environment. As of 2014-2015, the program observation rubric is built based on the Teacher Keys Effective System (TKES), as the system being implemented by the state and certification agency. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See LiveText for aggregated data table.)


**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 be scheduled in July of each year.

#### Setup:

- **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

---

**M 3: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning (O: 3)**

Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 3: Teaching and Learning Project.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of UACM Master’s candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.913 mean score on a 4.0 scale. All candidates met expectations for this assessment. Although all candidates overall met expectations, candidates had particular challenges with the Differentiated Menu task. As a result, specific attention will be given to supporting improving candidates’ proficiency on differentiation through this assessment. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates’ ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See LiveText for aggregated data table.)

**M 4: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship (O: 4)**

Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 4: Action Research Project.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through studying the effectiveness of one’s pedagogy.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of UACM Master’s candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.261 mean score on a 4.0 scale. All candidates met expectations for this assessment; however, the data show that great improvement could be made in almost half of the candidates’ abilities to report, synthesize, and make research connections. A concerted effort will be applied to better scaffold candidates this area, including an increased focus on instructional practice. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates’ ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See LiveText for aggregated data table.)

**M 5: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities (O: 5)**

Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into LiveText and/or the UACM MEd database for Standard 5: Capstone Project, which Cross Career Learning Community is a part of the score.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through active engagement as a member of the teaching profession.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

100% of UACM Master’s candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.583 mean score on a 4.0 scale. As of 2014-2015, this assessment was changed to reflect the state’s current assessment tool. Candidates are provided several opportunities throughout the program, including being a part of the cohort model, but also how this is leveraged with professional learning communities embedded in course assignments. These opportunities develop candidates in ways that they are able to apply in their school-based learning communities relevant to their development as capable and competent practitioners. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates’ ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See LiveText for aggregated data table.)
Monitor and Maintain
The Early Childhood Education UACM MEd (GATAPP) Program has met all of its objectives. Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective. Specific emphases for the upcoming year include focused attention on our assessments that relate to candidates’ capacities to develop and employ assessments in their teaching as well as revisiting the instructional demand for differentiation.

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 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 & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 3 - Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 5 - Professional Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities

Implementation Description: Target date is the first week students (PreK-5) report back to GSU classes.
Projected Completion Date: 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 & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 3 - Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | Outcome/Objective: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
- Measure: Faculty Rating 5 - Professional Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities

Implementation Description: Faculty coordinated the program schedule to ensure that students could receive all of their contact time on Monday evening.
Projected Completion Date: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish 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>The program director in coordination with appropriate faculty members will review and revise each rubric to be on a five-point scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Director and UACM Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish 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>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>UACM Program Director and Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 in 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish 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>Faculty will meet to discuss and restructure ECE 6415 to meet the goals of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>UACM Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish in Cycle:</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning &amp; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning &amp; Develop</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 3-Manage &amp; monitor student learning</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>UACM Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. Update: We will continue these efforts and have added phone conferencing support, where supervisor's regularly check in with our students (teachers) to help them problem solve and develop in their profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish in Cycle:</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning &amp; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning &amp; Develop</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating 3-Manage &amp; monitor student learning</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: 04/2016
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: Finished
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. Update: We are continuing to review our selection process to recruit and select dedicated urban teachers.

 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
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

Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: UACM faculty
Additional Resources: N/A

Action Research focus on instructional practices

To allow our students to have more experience applying the best practices they have learned in the program and analyzing its effect, the UACM program is requiring that the candidates' Action Research Project focus on instructional practices.

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

Projected Completion Date: 04/2016

Community i Movie

Candidates will conducting a community iMovie that serves several instructional purposes that support candidates' ability to know their students and plan their instruction accordingly. We anticipate that this feature of the course will support attention to differentiation and assessment. We also expect that attention to the community will bolster the dispositions of candidates regarding their development of a positive learning environment. Although candidates successfully met their disposition measure, our program focus requires that we continue to emphasize this aspect of teacher development.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2015

Differentiation Focus

Our students score lower in the area of being able to differentiate their instruction to meet their students' learning needs. As such we have revised the Teaching and Learning Project to address this by training teachers on the use of differentiated menus as a teaching method to meet their students' learning needs. We will analyze this new experience to see if it helps teacher gain this valuable skill.

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

Projected Completion Date: 12/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Dr Shonda Lemons
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

1. Program Learning Opportunities (optional in 2014-15): 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 following list details the Student Learning Objective (SLO), the corresponding course in which it is assessed, and assessment tool.

SLO 1: Shows commitment to student learning In all field courses students are provided opportunities to learn, practice and master their commitment to student learning. TAPS/TKES assessment rubric built on 10 items. Candidates are scored on the following scale: 

- Proficient: Achieving - Needs Development - Ineffective - Unsatisfactory

SLO 2: Applies expertise for learning and development In all field courses students are provided opportunities to learn, practice and master their ability to apply the teaching expertise regarding learning and development. TAPS/TKES assessment rubric built on 10 items. Candidates are scored on the following scale:

- Proficient: Achieving - Needs Development - Ineffective - Unsatisfactory

SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/Development Curriculum Integration Course. Candidates are assessed on their completion of a teaching and learning project that assesses their ability to use formal and informal assessments to evaluate students’ understanding and use the data to inform subsequent instruction. Candidates (a) administer a pretest, (b) analyze the data, (c) use the findings to inform and plan instruction, and (d) conduct a posttest and post-implementation analysis. SLO 4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning Action Research Course. Candidates are rated across 4 areas towards successful completion of their action research project. Action Research is a process in which inservice teacher participants examine their own educational practice systematically and carefully apply the techniques of research. The major purpose of the research is to improve classroom practice and help teachers reflect on their teaching, changes in instructional behavior and/or changes in classroom policies that affect the students. Candidates are scored on the following scale: 

- Proficient: Achieving - Needs Development - Ineffective - Unsatisfactory

SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities In all field courses students are provided opportunities to learn, practice and master their participation in a professional learning community, specifically they participate in an online professional learning community. TAPS/TKES assessment rubric built on 10 items. Of these items, professionalism includes candidates’ ability to engage with various opportunities for professional development, reflection on practice, and instructional support. Candidates are scored on the following scale:

- Proficient: Achieving - Needs Development - Ineffective - Unsatisfactory

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, (4) what did you learn from the assessment process, and (5) conduct a posttest and post-implementation analysis. In particular: (1) What strengths do the assessment 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, we recognize that we continue to have moderate to strong results in our key areas of assessment that facilitate our goals for our candidates. We find that although attention to instructional practices are solid, areas of improvement include differentiation and candidate reflection on practice. In addition, we notice that we should work to improve the use of student data for our learning environment efforts. Although this is an ongoing, assessment as the student learning project is an area that can reinforce our expectations. Likewise, we intend to place a greater emphasis on instructional practice through our action research assessment to determine any impacts it has on our outcomes. This year is also the first in which the TAPS/TKES assessment provides overall information regarding instructional planning and practice but 2 elements of the assessment also qualify for disposers regarding creating a positive learning environment and demonstrations of professionalism. We anticipate learning how to gauge this measure after future applications. Last year’s refinements on rubrics have enabled the data to be more nuanced in terms of identifying the strengths and challenge areas for our candidates. This is an ongoing process as we review the data discussed herein as well as engage in whole group and holistic analysis. 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.

3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 through monthly faculty meetings, partnership retreats (with our schools), and during student orientations. Specifically, faculty not only bring on the ground experiences in the field but context regarding their assignments and our program assessments that reflect both individual outcomes and overall outcomes. This process is iterative and allows for faculty and other stakeholders to offer timely responses to indicators in the data we need to address. Consequently, this provides a forum whereby our candidates are better able to meet and exceed our articulated goals.

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 effectiveness of the 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) development and use of assessments; and (b) differentiation. Overall, we continue to note any additional instructional areas that candidates require ongoing support, based on this year’s data and our expectations for their success as teachers. We have identified 3 areas, starting immediately within the designated course that implements our assessment, that will address our findings for areas in need of improvement. For the teaching and learning-project (describe in Analysis question 1), we will be paying particular attention to the use of a differentation menu developed by the candidates. Additionally candidates will conducting a community move that serves several instructional purposes that support candidates’ ability to know their students and plan their instruction accordingly. We anticipate that this feature of the course will support attention to differentiation and assessment. We also expect that attention to the community will bolster the dispositions of candidates regarding their development of a positive learning environment. Although candidates successfully met this disposition measure, our program focus requires that we continue to emphasize the teacher development process. This year’s data also served to place higher priority on developing a community of stronger scaffolding for the assessment that directs candidates to focus more on instructional practices. In addition, increased mentoring and support in the field is being implemented by providing phone conferencing and shifting literacy to online. Supervisors are available to candidates, as they experience instructional challenges in their classroom. Given the first year of the program’s strong instruction in literacy and ESOL, shifting literacy instruction towards online mentoring has allowed for increased attention on
other subjects: science, social studies, and math. These increased opportunities to mentor are intended to directly address the areas in need of improvement, while also maintaining and growing the areas of strength that have successfully sustained the program. We have moved from in progress to finished on two 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; and b.) utilize learning communities to support practice and reflection. 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.

**SLO 2: Planning Teacher Leader Work Sample (G: 2) (M: 3)**

100% of program completers will meet or exceed expectations on the measure. 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.

**SLO 3: Reflection Journal (G: 3) (M: 4, 5)**

100% of program completers will meet or exceed expectations on the measure. 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.

#### 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 PD to enact a significant change, you will plan a 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. Alternatively, you might base your PD on new curriculum materials and/or content-based teaching strategies based on feedback from administrators.) Content standards to be covered(GPS and/or CCSS) Detailed plan of activities planned (Rationale for individual activities (For example, your activity might be based on research-based best practices in your content area. Alternatively, it might be based on your evaluation of what is needed by the content teachers in your school.) Reflection (a 2-page reflection on the enactment of your PD) Additional requirements for the PD event: Some form of teacher engagement in analysis of curriculum and/or student work; discussion of new resources and/or strategies for teachers to consider; some discussion or activities related to issues of equity and diversity and teaching practices. The Teacher Leader Work Sample(TLWS) from EDCI 7680 is designed to parallel an Teacher Work Sample(TLWS) assignment given to preservice teachers to complete during their student teaching experience in their teacher leader's classroom. The purpose of this TWS project is to provide opportunities for student teachers to show how they use information about the learning-teaching context and students' individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. The teacher leader's TLWS assignment happens at the same time and engages teacher leaders in planning, enacting, and reflecting upon their role as a mentor who is supporting their student teachers' work on the TWS. Copy of the assignment as given to students: Teacher Leader Work Sample(Total project = 25%). Your student teacher will be completing a Teacher Work Sample this semester. The purpose of this project is to provide opportunities for student teachers to show how they use information about the learning-teaching context and students' individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. Areas covered will be knowledge of community, school, and classroom factors, knowledge of characteristics of students, knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning, and implications for instructional planning and assessment. At the same time, you will be completing a Teacher Leader Work Sample as you plan, enact, and reflect upon your role as a mentor who is supporting your student teachers' work on their work sample. As your student teacher works on their teacher work sample assignment, you will be guiding them through the process while creating your own teacher leader work sample. The components of your leader work sample are as follows: Learning goals: You will list the learning goals (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery, and assessment of your mentoring/coaching plan. These goals should define what you expect your student teacher to know and be able to do at the end of your work together. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline) challenging, varied, and appropriate. Assessment/Evaluation plan: You will design an assessment plan to monitor your student teacher's progress toward your learning goal(s). You should describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning. Design for mentoring: Describe your mentor plan for your student teacher, which will include things such as mentor/mentee meeting dates, your feedback plan, your discussion of adult learning theories, etc. Meeting agendas and reflection on mentor/mentee meetings. Throughout the semester, as your student teacher works on their TWS, you will be planning and enacting at least 3 meetings to help your student teacher do the following: select assessments for the TWS; identify resources and support services for students; and help your student teacher in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of assessment data. For this component, you will submit your meeting agendas and your reflections on those meetings. Written feedback to student teacher: You will provide written feedback on your student teacher’s final TWS project. You should focus on identifying multiple sources of evidence to 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) Clarity of Learning Goals (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.1 GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.1 Goals are vague or not in evidence. Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes Goals are stated clearly as learning outcomes in behavioral forms (e.g., learning goals (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.2 for assessment and evaluation Methods of assessment and evaluation lack congruence with learning goals or lack complexity Some learning goals are assessed through assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals Each of the learning goals is assessed and evaluated through the evaluation plan All learning goals are assessed by the evaluation plan and provide students with constructive feedback on their learning Mentoring Plan Standard (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.2 The mentoring plan does not demonstrate knowledge of how mentoring is created and developed The activities and meetings are not logically organized The activities and meetings are not logically organized to be somewhat useful Most organization and meetings appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving learning goals All activities and meetings are useful and relevant to student teachers' learning and reflection Use of a variety of activities, assignments, etc. (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.3 Only one method of mentoring is used Little variety of mentoring is used. Heavy reliance on one type of activity, reflection, and/or method of feedback Some variety of mentoring is used Significant variety of mentoring is used and this variety makes a clear contribution to learning Mentoring strategies are varied over time to account for the student teachers' learning style
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 3: Impact on Students; Teacher Leader Work Sample (O: 2)

Impact on Students: Teacher Leader Work Sample Description of how the assessment is used in the program: The Teacher Leader Work Sample below includes the rubric related to Impact on Students. 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 teacher leaders to plan, enact, and reflect 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. 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 your student teachers’ work on their work sample. As your student teacher works on their teacher work sample assignment, you will be guiding them through the process while creating your own teacher leader work sample. The components of your leader work sample are as follows: Learning goals: You will list the learning goals (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery, and assessment of your mentoring/coaching plan. These goals should define what you expect your student teacher to know and be able to do at the end of your work together. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline) challenging, varied, and appropriate. Assessment/Evaluation plan: You will design an assessment plan to monitor your student teacher’s progress toward your learning goal(s). You should describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning. Design for mentoring/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 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. When the candidates are enrolled in EDCI 7980, targeted to “Professionals” and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit.

Target for O2: Planning Teacher Leader Work Sample

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the measure. 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 teacher leaders to plan, enact, and reflect upon their role as a mentor who is supporting your student teachers’ work on their work sample. As your student teacher works on their teacher work sample assignment, you will be guiding them through the process while creating your own teacher leader work sample. The components of your leader work sample are as follows: Learning goals: You will list the learning goals (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery, and assessment of your mentoring/coaching plan. These goals should define what you expect your student teacher to know and be able to do at the end of your work together. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline) challenging, varied, and appropriate. Assessment/Evaluation plan: You will design an assessment plan to monitor your student teacher’s progress toward your learning goal(s). You should describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning. Design for mentoring/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 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. When the candidates are enrolled in EDCI 7980, targeted to “Professionals” and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit.

M 4: Dispositions (O: 3)

Dispositions Description of the Assessment: The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. A brief description of how the assessment is used in this program Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Teacher Leader Certification program, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university faculty prior to the residency experience when the candidates are enrolled in EDCI 7680. The dispositions survey is completed again at the end of the residency/end of practicum connected dispositions (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Marginal (2 pts) Unacceptable (1 pt) EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others’ points of view, bases communication on learner’s point of view, believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.2 Demonstrates empathy at a level that is appropriate for the context and far higher than expected Demonstrates empathy at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of empathy but needs improvement Demonstrates little or no evidence of empathy in practice

POSSIBLE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learners; capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can’t or won’t (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.3 No written feedback is provided to the student teacher on the TWS Very little written feedback is provided to the student teacher on the TWS Some constructive written feedback is provided to the student teacher at the end of the TWS Constructive written feedback is provided to the student teacher on the TWS at twice during the semester Constructive written feedback is provided to the student teacher on the TWS throughout the entire semester

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

POSSIBLE VIEW OF SELF: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of self; possesses a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; has positive expectations of self (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.3 Demonstrates a positive view of self at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of a positive view of self but needs improvement Demonstrates little or no evidence of a positive view of self AUTHENTICITY: Able to be open and genuine; self-discloses and mends personal uniqueness with culturally responsive interactions; does not feel one must play a role to be effective (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.1 Demonstrates authenticity at a level far higher than expected Demonstrates authenticity at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of authenticity but needs improvement Demonstrates little
or no evidence of authenticity MEANINGFUL PURPOSE AND VISION: Focused on the long range; is visionary and reflective as a professional; commits to growth for all learners; cares about what is really important (1, 20%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.4 Demonstrates meaningful purpose and vision at a level far higher than expected Demonstrates meaningful purpose and vision at a level that is appropriate for the context Demonstrates some evidence of meaningful purpose and vision but needs improvement Demonstrates little or no evidence of meaningful purpose and vision

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.

M 5: Reflection Journal (O: 3)

Reflection Journal How this assignment is used in the program This assignment is used during the residency experience in EPEL 7680. The reflection journal provides an opportunity for candidates to draw on their work in previous courses and to examine their work in the residency and then analyze how these experiences demonstrate their growth as a teacher leader. Assignment directions as given to the students For each of your assignments in EPEL 7680B, you are to validate your mastery of the Learning Outcomes by making entries into a reflection log and submitting them for approval to the course instructor. Your entries are threefold. First, you are to describe insights, new learning, and experiences you have had in the course. Second, you are to describe the impact of these experiences on your growth as an educator and scholar including describing any changes that have taken place as a result of this learning experience. Lastly, you are to outline a plan/goal by which you will take this new insight into the schools to improve your teaching, in turn improving student learning. This plan/goal should include a method of evaluation toward the goal. This log is to be kept in electronic format and should be maintained by the student and uploaded to the LiveText portfolio. EPEL 7680B Reflection Journal Rubric Exceeds Expectations (4 pts) Meets Expectations (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Does Not Meet Expectations (1 pt) Demonstrated reflective practice through written linkage of assignments to practice (Teacher Leader 1) (1, 10%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.4 GA-GSU-COE-CF.2.3 Very detailed reflection linking strongly to practice and future goals Somewhat detailed reflection linking somewhat to practice and future goals Lacking reflection No synopsis of completed module with strong reflection

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Reflection Journal

100% of program completors will meet or exceed expectations on the measure.

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.

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2014-2015 Women's Studies Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Women's Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women's Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

Goals
G 1: 1) Develop Critical Thinking Skills
Students should develop critical thinking skills, which include the ability to read and write clearly and carefully, and they should be able to evaluate and analyze claims presented in various textual sources.

G 3: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives
Students should develop a basic understanding of broad feminist/womanist interdisciplinary perspectives.

G 2: Develop writing skills
Demonstrates the ability to analyze concepts through writing clear, concise, well-argued and well-organized papers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Reading Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
Demonstrates critical reading skills through the ability to grasp the main point(s) and supporting arguments of an academic or narrative text.

SLO 2: Thesis Development (G: 1, 2) (M: 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 (O: 1, 3, 4)

Critical responses will enable you to expand upon your general reading of a text and delve deeper to more fully develop your own interpretive and critical voice. While you will demonstrate your understanding of the reading in your critical response, you will do so by crafting an argument about some element of the article or book. In other words, each critical response paper will have a thesis statement that you prove using evidence from the reading itself. Critical response papers should be typed and double-spaced, and should be 2-3 pages in length. In order to get a more nuanced measurement, we collected a set of reading responses from both the beginning and end of 2 classes (random selection, choosing specific students with both papers) in order to see what sorts of progress are made throughout the class. In the 2010-2011 cycle, we decided to look only at a sample of the final papers, because we are measuring writing skills in general, and not only those developed in a single class. We also switched the number system so that 5 is high because the old way of doing it confused members of the committee.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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, and the second involves writing skills on the level of the sentence, such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation. On the first set of papers from early on in the semester, we expect that students will have about 1/2 with a score of at least 3, and 1/3 with a score of 2 or higher. On the second set of papers from later in the semester, we hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2. Once again, on this target, we also only had samples from the final paper, and we had continued to use the altered scale.

M 2: Analysis Papers (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)

The analytic paper should develop a clear and persuasive argument, with a focused, specific thesis statement, solid organization and development, and sufficient evidence; it should also demonstrate appropriate grammar and syntax. The paper should also display students’s knowledge of and ability to apply feminist/womanist knowledge and perspectives to their chosen topic.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Thesis Development

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2. 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. In terms of writing skills, we have combined 2 measures from the rubric: one involves evidence, development, and organization, and...
the second involves writing on the level of the sentence, including syntax, grammar, and punctuation.

**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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Writing skills**

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2. We have also switched the scale for clarity, so that 5 is high and 1 is low; so we hope 3/4 of our students score a 3, and 1/2 score a 4 or 5. For this measure, we also used two separate rubrics: one measured the development of the argument, and the other measured the clarity of the writing, so that one looked at writing skills from a macro perspective, whereas the other focused on sentence-level skills.

**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 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.
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

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

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

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
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, health care, 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 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.

G 1: New and innovative ideas
To develop innovative approaches to relevant issues and debates within the field.

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.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Evidence
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty (Many of us teach WSt 3010)

Increase critical thinking through writing skills
Given that our assessment targets were not met in two particular areas: organization and evidence, it appears that our students are having the most difficulty in terms of critical thinking through writing skills. Hopefully, given that students will need to take a CTW course earlier in their careers, that will help students improve in these areas. Until the CTW is fully operational, we can work to increase writing instruction throughout our upper-level courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking through writing skills
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Core Faculty

Increased writing instruction
We need to develop a plan that will implement early intervention (perhaps a professor approval) of research questions. In 2012-2013, some professors are doing this, and others are collecting drafts of papers. We are still working on implementing this action plan.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Evidence | Organization

Collect final paper drafts
As a pilot program, we are going to collect drafts in an upper-level course in order to see if that helps students with the various aspects of assessment, especially those focused on writing. In 2012-2013, we did that, and we will discuss the findings in the question section.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: We are beginning this semester to collect rough drafts and compare them to final drafts.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: core faculty
Additional Resources: more time
### Assessment Data by Section

**2014-2015 Women's Studies MA**  
*As of: 12/13/2016 08:48 AM EST*  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

#### 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.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Our students received a 3.6 average, with scores ranging from a 3 to a 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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average of 3.65 with one student receiving a 5 and two students receiving a 3.0, one student receiving a 3.5 and one receiving a 4.

**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 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average of 3.6 with students receiving scores of: 4.5, 2, 5, 3.25, 3.25.

**M 2: Comprehensive exams (O: 2, 3, 4)**

Students are required to take comprehensive exams after completing the four core academic courses in the MA program. The comprehensive exams consist of two questions; one measures their ability to synthesize major feminist theories and methodologies and the other measures their ability to apply feminist theories to globalization.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Our students received a score of 3.9, with scores ranging from a 2 to 5.

**Target for O3: Theoretical Frameworks**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Our students received a score of 3.8 on average, with scores ranging from 2.8 to a 4.8.

**Target for O4: Feminist Epistemology**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average score of 3.8 with scores ranging from 2.3 to 5.

**M 3: Annual Evaluations/Student CVs (O: 2)**

Students are required to turn in CVs for the annual evaluation process. From these data, we will collect information about how many...
conferences students are attending in order to present their own research, how many publications they have succeeded in getting accepted and/or published.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing**

At least half of our students will attend one conference and at least 7% will have a publication accepted.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

Our students delivered 6 conference papers in 2014-2015. For the overall student body (15), this averages to .4 conference papers per student. The actual number of students presenting at conferences was 5. One student had 2 articles submitted for publication and one had 2, which means 13% of our students submitted an article for publication.

**M 4: Exit Interviews (O: 5)**

Student placement will be measured and evaluated based on their exit interviews, at which time they usually know what their future plans are.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O5: Placements**

At least 80% of our MA graduates will go on to a PhD program or be placed in a job relevant to their professional goals.

**Findings 2014-2015 - Target: Partially Met**

Out of 5 graduating MA students, 2 have entered PhD programs, one is pursing a professional field related to WGSS and the remaining 2 are pursing other career goals.

**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
  - Measure: Research Questions

*Implementation Description: We will identify students who have particular problems with grammar in the first year, and preferably the first semester of the program, and refer them to the Writing Studio in the first semester.*

*Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty in Women's Studies*

*Additional Resources: None*

*Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)*

### Increased Focus in Proseminar on RQ

Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar spent a lot of time on the literature review and on writing abstracts, but not as much time on defining a research question.

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

*Implementation Status: Finished*

*Priority: High*

*Implementation Description: We will incorporate more training and workshops on writing a research question in the proseminar.*

*Responsible Person/Group: The instructor for the Proseminar in consultation with women's studies core faculty.*

*Additional Resources: None*

*Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)*

### More Focus on Writing Skills

Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar focused more on the basics of putting a proposal together than on the mechanics of writing.

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

*Implementation Status: In-Progress*

*Priority: High*

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*
  - Measure: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing
  - Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing
  - Measure: Research Questions

*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, possibly including assignments such as critical responses, in which students must summarize the argument before providing analysis.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Feminist Epistemology |
| | Theoretical Frameworks |
| Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Theoretical Frameworks |

Implementation Description: Instructors for each of the courses will implement this action plan in whatever way makes the most sense for their class, given the structure of their assignments.
Responsible Person/Group: All instructors of the WST core classes.
Additional Resources: NA
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

focus on proseminar
The exit interviews and annual evaluations (specifically the CVs) are designed to measure the main goal of fostering successful scholars and practitioners of Women's Studies. These skills (presenting at conferences, applying to PhD schools, publishing papers, etc.) are desired outcomes of the Women's Studies Proseminar, which we instituted a few years ago to accommodate a variety of needs among our students (including helping them move more quickly through the program). Therefore, when we don't meet these goals, it makes sense that we would re-evaluate the structure of the WS proseminar to see if it can adjust to fit the needs of the students. So far, the feedback from students in exit interviews is that the Proseminar is extremely helpful, and they don't suggest any changes in it. From the perspective of the faculty, we also think that it is achieving its main goals (progress toward graduation seems to have improved significantly). We will wait another cycle to see what the findings are next year, since these set of data have a significant number of students who did not take the Proseminar (about 1/3). If the target remains unmet next year, we will re-evaluate to see if we should adjust the expectation or if we should revise the Proseminar.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Annual Evaluations/Student CVs | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing |
| Measure: Exit Interviews | Outcome/Objective: Placements |

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 cycle we had a smaller number of students presenting at conferences. One of the relevant factors is the last cycle we organized a conference which provided students opportunities to present their work. Future conferences, even on a small scale, would be useful to initiate our MA students into the process of preparing conference presentations. In our proseminar, students are required to write a conference abstract and submit to relevant conferences. Greater emphasis will be placed on encouraging students to submit abstracts. Overall, students are performing adequately on comprehensive exams and thesis projects, with a few students on the bottom or top end of the spectrum. Student publishing is difficult to achieve given the time limitation of a 2 year MA program, although students have found some online sites that provide publishing opportunities. We assign all students a mentor upon arrival to our program, and provide each student an annual written evaluation. Students are required to select an advisor at the end of their second semester. Our advising and proseminar have been successful in graduating our students within a 2 year time frame. We successfully graduated all 6 of the 2013 cohort.
3. Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings (optional in 2014-15): 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 discuss assessment finding in core 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.

Our formalized annual evaluation of students has been successful in tracking student progress. The proseminar is also quite successful in preparing students to defend their thesis proposal in the first semester of their second year. We continue to be committed to our goal of moving students through the program within a two year time frame.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most important accomplishments for year-- briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year.

We successfully graduated our entire cohort 2013-2015 (spring and summer).

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 a large 2014 cohort and will need to devote faculty time and resources to successfully graduate them on time (spring, summer 2016).