

## **Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1: Outcomes Assessment – Educational Programs**

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in the following area: 3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.

Compliance     Partial Compliance     Non-compliance

### **Judgment of Compliance**

The institution is able to provide evidence through the narrative and supporting documents that educational programs identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which they achieve these outcomes, and make improvements based on analysis of the results.

### **Overview**

The institution has an annual educational program assessment process that includes student learning outcomes and is part of an overall institutional effectiveness plan driven by the university's strategic directions. The annual educational program assessment process is managed by program coordinators and their respective college assessment coordinators and deans. It is overseen by the university assessment committee, composed of assessment coordinators for each unit/division and led by the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Vice President/Chief of Staff. The Director of Assessment in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Office of Institutional Research provide support for the committee.

Educational programs are also analyzed through periodic local and University System of Georgia program review processes for viability, productivity, and quality. These processes include assessment of student learning outcomes and add a longitudinal dimension program-level assessment. Results of assessment of student learning outcomes and analyses of the viability, productivity, and quality of the educational programs lead to curricular modifications and improvements and further assessment of the impact of the improvements. Results are posted on an internal [Institutional Effectiveness](#) site (a link to the downloaded copy of the index page is

provided in the documentation, along with the URL).

## **I. The institution identifies expected outcomes for educational programs, to include student learning outcomes**

The University System of Georgia Board of Regents ([Academic Handbook 2.3.2](#) and [“Baccalaureate and Master’s Degree Procedures”](#)) requires all proposals for new degree programs to abide by an extensive list of requirements, which includes statements of goals and outcomes and an assessment plan. Program proposals are reviewed on campus by the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee of the University Senate and then also by the full University Senate to ensure compliance with BOR and institutional requirements. All degree programs and GCSU have stated student learning outcomes, published on our University Profile System. All courses within a program also have student learning outcomes that support the program goals and outcomes, again published through the University Profile System ([all courses listed by department and their outcomes from the University Profile System are provided in pdf files](#) in the outcomes section of the supporting documentation). A newly hired Director of Assessment works now on a daily basis with programs to refine their goals and outcomes for each annual assessment cycle.

A [complete matrix of all degree programs at GCSU and their stated goals/student learning outcomes](#) is included in the documentation. Note that our **distance education programs** are included on the matrix.

## **II. The institution assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes.**

GCSU has an annual assessment process, described below. All degree programs are required to complete each assessment cycle. Following the description of our process, as examples, we

include three matrices listing all undergraduate and graduate degree programs and providing their completed assessment reports for three annual assessment cycles (see below).

### **Annual Academic Assessment Process: The GCSU Assessment Planning Record**

All academic programs report the following materials annually through GCSU's "Assessment Planning Record (APR)," which exists in both an online and hard copy format that was developed internally:

- \*program goals in relation to the university and program mission

- \*course specific learning outcomes that support program goals/outcomes

- \*means of assessment for student learning outcomes

- \*desired standard of achievement

- \*data collected

- \*analysis of the results

- \*curricular modifications made in response

- \*impact of curricular changes on the curriculum.

Programs link their goals and outcomes to college-wide goals, and colleges link their goals to the [university's strategic directions](#), which drive the annual budget process.

We have a basic template for the APR, which has undergone some changes and improvements in the last two years, as illustrated by the chart below.

<p>All degree programs required to complete a generic APR template (<a href="#">generic template</a> illustrates its basic structure).</p>	<p>All degree programs in the College of Health Sciences, John H. Lounsbury College of Education, and J. Whitney Bunting College of Business continued to complete the generic template and to assess specific program goals/outcomes.</p>	<p>All undergraduate and graduate degree programs in all colleges assess program-specific goals and outcomes.</p>
<p>The College of Business recorded its annual learning outcomes assessments in a different format to fulfill accreditation requirements, though it often duplicated reporting in the online APR system as well.</p> <p>I. See examples from both graduate (<a href="#">2006-2007</a> and <a href="#">2007-2008</a>) and</p>	<p>The College of Arts and Sciences piloted <a href="#">a revised APR</a>, which focused on COAS undergraduate degree programs. These programs were required to link to and assess two of their program goals and learning outcomes in the context of the <a href="#">GCSU general education goals</a>, in addition to assessing additional program goals and outcomes.</p>	<p>All undergraduate degree programs in <b>all colleges</b> link to and assess at least two of their program-specific goals and outcomes in the context of the <a href="#">university-wide general education goals</a> in addition to other program-specific goals.</p> <p>See the APR templates from the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. <a href="#">College of Arts and Sciences</a></li> <li>II. <a href="#">College of Health Sciences</a></li> <li>III. <a href="#">College of</a></li> </ol>

<p>undergraduate (<a href="#">2006-2007</a> and <a href="#">2007-2008</a>) programs in business.</p> <p>II. These reports accomplished the same goals as the APR and addressed the same requirements.</p>	<p>I. During this year, not all the graduate degree programs in Arts and Sciences were assessed, to allow faculty to focus on the new assessment instrument/process for undergraduate programs.</p>	<p><a href="#">Education</a></p> <p>IV. <a href="#">College of Business</a></p> <p>Graduate degree program APR templates for 2010: <a href="#">COHS</a>, <a href="#">COE</a>, <a href="#">COB</a>, and <a href="#">COAS</a></p>
		<p>All degree programs now required to set a desired standard of achievement for each outcome by which to evaluate the success of their students.</p> <p>I. Many programs use key performance indicators, such as performance of GCSU students as compared to sister or peer institutions on statewide mandated exams; institutional mean scores on nationally normed or standardized exams, such as the Educational Testing Service (ETS) major field exams; and minimum and/or</p>

	recommended levels of achievement set by disciplines using licensure exams.
--	---

	II. Selected results of ETS major field achievement exams are reported in the documentation below, and results of licensure exams are reported in our FR 4.1 narrative.
--	---

[Training/resource manuals](#) are provided to each college dean and to all department chairs. The manual contains information on appropriate form for goals and outcomes, examples of direct and indirect measures, and other useful information. Each college has an assessment coordinator that works directly with chairs, departmental assessment coordinators, faculty, and deans to complete assessment reports.

After each program's APR is completed and all have been submitted, administrative units (such as colleges) and divisions (such as Academic Affairs), prepare [administrative response reports](#) summarizing general achievement of goals/outcomes across the division/unit and developing a plan to address common areas of concern that emerge from a collaborative analysis of the assessment data. This process includes the college assessment coordinator, the university assessment coordinator, and department chairs and faculty. (See the [APR template](#) pg. 2, which mandates consultation with the entire faculty on assessment reports. See also examples from minutes in the documentation list, such as in the College of Business, the College of Education, the College of Health Sciences, or the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, illustrating faculty participation in assessment conversations. In addition, assessment reviews are conducted by the University-wide assessment committee, which includes

faculty members from all colleges.) All documents are archived on the [Office of Institutional Effectiveness web site](#). (This site is password protected, but all completed assessment material from the last two years is provided on matrices listed below and on the CD. Directions for accessing the site are available in the supporting documentation.). Completed samples are highlighted below.

The annual APR process is illustrated by the charts below.

Phase I:





Phase II:

*Evidence That Programs Engage in and Complete Assessment: Matrices Showing Completed Assessment Instruments/Cycles for All Degree Programs for Three Assessment Cycles*

Although all programs are required to complete the annual assessment cycle, challenges have been encountered in assuring 100 percent compliance across all programs in previous years. The nature of these challenges concerned not only leadership transitions in the Office of Academic Affairs, but more specifically to technical difficulties that led in some instances to a loss of data within the online software package for assessment that was developed in-house. These technical difficulties have resulted in loss of data for some degree programs between 2006-2008. The Institution has remedied this situation by use of standard MS Word forms in conjunction with online reporting.

However, the University has made a great deal of progress in the last three years in terms of achieving 100 percent participation, as documented by the resources below. Note that our **distance education programs** are included on the matrices listed below, which include **all degree programs and their completed assessment materials for that year:**



<p><a href="#">Matrix of Degree Programs and completed APRs for the 2007-2008 cycle.</a> (click link to bring up chart; each instrument provided for each degree program illustrates completion of the assessment cycle: (note: materials submitted to SACS had clickable links to each report; specific reports are available from <a href="http://assessment.gcsu.edu">http://assessment.gcsu.edu</a> behind password protection)</p>	<p><a href="#">Matrix of Degree Programs and completed ARs for the 2008-2009 cycle</a> (click link to bring up chart; each instrument provided for each degree program illustrates completion of the assessment cycle: (note: materials submitted to SACS had clickable links to each report; specific reports are available from <a href="http://assessment.gcsu.edu">http://assessment.gcsu.edu</a> behind password protection)</p>	<p><a href="#">Matrix of Degree Programs and Assessment Plans for the 2009-2010 cycle.</a> (note: materials submitted to SACS had clickable links to each report; specific reports are available from <a href="http://assessment.gcsu.edu">http://assessment.gcsu.edu</a> behind password protection)</p> <p>This cycle will not be complete until September of 2010, so the instruments provided for each degree program show only statement of goals/ outcomes and planned means of assessment.</p>
---	---	---

<p>100 percent completion for the College of Business</p> <p>Less than 100 percent completion in the:</p> <p>*College of Health Sciences (78% completion; 2 of 9 active programs missing. One discontinued program requiring no assessment and another program in transition to online offerings with no enrollment);</p> <p>*College of Education (80% completion of active degree programs; 2 programs were deactivated; note that the college assessment</p>	<p>100 percent completion for all colleges but for the College of Arts and Sciences.</p> <p>In this year, under the direction of a new director of assessment, the College of Arts and Sciences implemented a new APR incorporating general education assessment, and focused on undergraduate programs. Consequently, not all graduate programs were assessed, but participation/ completion in COAS increased to 83% (Note there were also transitions in the VPAA's office during this year, which oversaw the completion</p>	<p>100 percent completion of assessment plans.</p>
---	--	--

<p>coordinator was on leave that year)</p> <p>* College of Arts and Sciences (58%; note there was a transition in the dean's office).</p>	<p>of the assessment cycle.)</p>	
<p>Not all college deans completed the Administrative Response reports. (Note that there were transitions in the VPAA's office that year, which oversaw the production of the administrative response reports.)</p>	<p><b>All</b> college deans completed the Administrative Response reports (see the matrix link above for access to these), noting both strengths and weaknesses reported in their programs. Note that the College of Health Sciences Dean also individually responded to issues within each degree program's APR.</p>	

*Selected Examples of Assessment Best Practices Illustrated in the APRs*

The items below provide an overview of best practices as evidenced in the APRs found in the

above matrices (or comparable instrument used in the College of Business) in each of the four colleges at GCSU along with a summary of strengths and weaknesses. Although we provide only samples here, the matrices listed above contain links to the **complete reports** from **all undergraduate and graduate programs**.

<p><b>College of Arts and Sciences</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Completed APR from 2008-2009 for the BS in Psychology.</a></p>	<p>Use of direct assessment methods, including sampling of actual student work, the creation of a common rubric, and evaluation by team of faculty.</p> <p>Responses to issues associated with the use of the rubric, including the intention to refine the courses involved to better address the specific learning outcome.</p> <p>Triangulated use of pre- and post-tests, combined with random sampling of student work and major field exams from the Educational Testing Service.</p>
	<p><a href="#">Completed APR for the IDST core courses in the BA in Liberal Studies.</a></p>	<p>Sampling of student work</p> <p>Creation of a common rubric and use multiple raters.</p> <p>Cuts across several disciplinary clusters in the core curriculum, such as arts and humanities (Fine arts courses discussed) and social science-focused courses (Global Issues; this course also involves scientific perspectives).</p>

		<p>Noted issues that need improvement: Results suggested the need to refine program and course outcomes.</p> <p>The reports in the actions to be taken sections could be improved in terms of specificity concerning the exact revision to the outcomes envisioned, illustrating issues that we continue to work on as an institution.</p>
	<p><a href="#">Completed Administrative Response Report</a></p>	<p>Clear discussion of and feedback on inadequate practices in several degree program APRs with regard to statement of goals and outcomes, development of means of assessment (including use of grades as a means of assessment), and reporting of specific results.</p> <p>Specific plan to address deficiencies in basic assessment practice through workshops.</p>
<p>J. Whitney Bunting College of Business</p>	<p>Completed assurance of learning reports for <a href="#">undergraduate</a> and <a href="#">graduate</a> programs.</p>	<p>100 percent review of all degree programs</p> <p>Sampling of student work, use of college-wide common rubrics, multiple raters</p> <p>Use of standardized exams for several programs.</p>

	<a href="#">Completed Administrative Response Report</a>	<p>Analysis of strengths and weaknesses of standardized testing as a means of assessment for BBA program.</p> <p>Clear plans for revision of curriculum sequence in Economics to address ETS exam results.</p>
College of Health Sciences	<a href="#">Completed APR for the MSN Family Nurse Practitioner</a>	<p>Use of licensure pass rates</p> <p>Use of indirect data from program self-evaluations</p> <p>Although no changes were made, they were deemed not necessary since benchmarks were met.</p>
	<a href="#">Completed Administrative Response Report</a>	<p>Clear discussion of and feedback on inadequate practices noted with regard to goal statements, means of assessment, and reporting of specific results using a common rubric.</p>
The John H. Lounsbury College of Education	<a href="#">BS Special Education</a>	<p>Use of common rubrics for evaluation of projects</p> <p>Use of Standardized exams (GSTEP)</p> <p>Clear actions identified</p>
	<a href="#">Completed Administrative Response Report</a>	

## Other Assessment Instruments used at GCSU

### *Educational Testing Services Major Field Achievement Exams*

Learning outcomes are also assessed in many programs through use of the ETS major field achievement exams. Several degree programs use the ETS exams as exit exams. Illustrated

below are selected ETS major field exam scores for GCSU students related to quantitative skills, which are an area targeted for improvement at GCSU. Math scores were below the institutional mean scores in 2005, but have risen and are now above the mean scores. GCSU students have demonstrated competency with regard to quantitative skills at rates comparable to the ETS institutional mean scores for ETS major field exam scores in relevant areas. Examples of curricular improvements made in response to this and other assessment data are provided in the section below labeled *“improvements based on analysis of the results.”*

Biology	150	154	154	152.2
Business	153	155	156	151.6
Economics		157	160	149.7
Psychology	155	159	160	156.3
Math	148	149	156	154.5

### *Annual Reports*

College and departmental Annual Reports are also required by GCSU. The annual reports often include program evaluations of pass rates on standardized examinations and other data related to student achievement of learning outcomes, as well as the impact of curricular changes on student learning. Student learning outcomes assessment is a secondary focus of these reports, and historically they have focused on productivity, viability, and quality measures. However, they do add another component to our overall assessment of student learning outcomes and provide an opportunity to summarize and synthesize the more extensive APR reports. The [annual report template](#) and completed examples are included in the documentation.

All documents are archived on an internal website managed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The web site is password protected, and log on information is provided in the

supporting documentation.

### *Comprehensive Program Reviews*

The University System of Georgia Board of Regents also requires Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs) to be completed every seven years for each undergraduate degree program and every ten years for each graduate program, unless professional accreditation cycles demand a shorter or longer time frame. In no case may any program go beyond a ten-year time frame. USG BOR requirements for CPRs are available through the USG BOR [Academic Affairs Handbook 2.3.6](#) and the [BOR Policy Handbook 3.6.3](#) and included in the documentation.

CPRs are self-studies designed to evaluate various aspects of program productivity, viability, and quality. Again, the focus is broad and is not limited to student learning outcomes. The Comprehensive Program Review process adds a significant dimension of triangulation to GCSU's overall efforts to assess both program and student learning outcomes, and to provide an opportunity to summarize and analyze trends over time in a manner that allows the institution to examine the impact of changes made through various assessment processes.

CPRs also feature external reviews of the results of the self-study by a group of GCSU faculty outside the discipline and off-campus, external experts in the field. Materials generated in response to accreditation reviews may also be channeled into the CPR reports, provided that BOR/GCSU guidelines for format are met. GCSU requirements for CPRs are available through the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook, sections [3.05.05](#) and [3.05.05.4](#), included in the documentation. The reports of the external reviewers, based on their review of the data-rich self-study reports, frequently include recommendations for changes to courses in curricula and provide an external assessment of program outcomes.

(Note that in 2007 a BOR system-wide review of the process resulted in a temporary halt to

campus conduct of CPRs. The BOR issued a task force report on CPRs in [September 2008](#) and will resume spot audits of campus reports in the fall of 2010; subsequently, GCSU has begun again the CPR process, retroactive to 2007-2008. All documents are archived on an internal website managed by the Office Institutional Effectiveness. The site is password protected and access information is included in the documentation area below).

### *Selected Examples of Best Practices in GCSU CPRs Related to Evaluation of Learning Outcomes*

Programs in the College of Business typically report on the use of standardized instruments to measure learning outcomes. [Sample CPR from](#) the BBA program.

The [BS in Outdoor Education Program CPR](#) (see p. 9) illustrates use of licensure and standardized exams and completion of nationally normed modules to evaluate learning outcomes. These licensure and module results are disaggregated by competency area, and resulting implications for revision to instruction are discussed and agreed upon by faculty.

### *External Review of Academic Programs*

In addition to the external reviews required as a component of GCSU's Comprehensive Program Review process, several departments have undertaken voluntary programmatic reviews during periods when they were not undergoing Comprehensive Program Reviews. Although purposes have varied, all have been focused on program assessment and development.

### *External Review of Academic Programs*

In addition to the external reviews required as a component of GCSU's Comprehensive Program Review process, several departments have undertaken voluntary programmatic reviews during

periods when they were not undergoing Comprehensive Program Reviews. Although purposes have varied, all have been focused on program assessment and development.

**Psychology:** In March 2009, [following an intensive reconsideration and restructuring of curricula and advising](#), the faculty in the Department of Psychology invited Dr. Dana Scott Dunn, a recognized figure in psychology program and curriculum development, to review the function and curricula of the department. The [resulting visitor's assessment](#) report reinforced the value of the efforts already undertaken, and generated additional programmatic concerns for the department to consider. Faculty [discussed results of the review and made modifications to the curriculum](#), including additional preparation for upper level courses.

**Sociology:** In April 2007, members of the sociology program faculty met with then-Dean Beth Rushing (COAS) and Dr. Idee Winfield, American Sociological Association program revision consultant, to review the sociology program mission, goals, outcomes, evidence of student achievement, and curriculum structure. In response to that work, several curricular changes were made, including modifications to the Senior Seminar, the required capstone experience. This course will facilitate the completion of the capstone, preparation of students for post-baccalaureate opportunities, and assessment of success in achieving key program goals.

### ***Accreditation Reviews***

All programs holding accreditation from national accrediting bodies undergo comprehensive program reviews based on detailed self-studies that culminate in a campus visit by a peer review team (see [the complete list of GCSU's accreditations](#)). For the accrediting bodies highlighted below, program assessment of learning outcomes and curriculum improvement based on

assessment are mandatory processes. Accreditation cycles vary in the number of years between reviews depending on the national organization. Selected examples of curricular modifications made in response to assessment findings are presented below in the section on “evidence of improvements based on analysis of data.”

## **Voluntary System of Accountability**

GCSU joined the VSA in 2008-2009. Beginning in the fall of 2010, GCSU will administer the CLA exam to a representative sample of its student population on a three-year rotation schedule.

Assessment data obtained will be used to revise program goals/outcomes and the curriculum where appropriate and to strengthen the general education curriculum.

## **Oversight of Assessment at GCSU**

### **GCSU’s Assessment Management Plan**

In Spring 2009, the President established an institution-wide assessment committee. The purpose and structure of the committee are described in the document: [“Overview of the Administration and Management of the Georgia College Assessment Program,”](#) included in the documentation. This new assessment structure requires an assessment coordinator in each College; in addition, each department has an assessment coordinator. Emphasizing the importance of assessment to the educational mission and the intensity of effort expected in the academic division of the university, two coordinators are required at the level of the Division of Academic Affairs. Assessment Coordinators plus four at-large faculty members from all of the divisions make up the University Assessment Committee, which has two standing subcommittees: the Learning Outcomes Assessment Subcommittee (chaired by a member of the faculty), which focuses on assessment related to student learning outcomes; and the Institutional, Academic, and Student Support Assessment Subcommittee (chaired by a

professional staff member), which focuses on institutional effectiveness in all other areas. The university assessment committee reviews all assessment/institutional effectiveness materials and establishes relevant institutional policies and procedures. All policies developed by this committee are forwarded to the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee for review/recommendation to the university senate.

## **Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee**

This is a standing committee of the university senate, which is charged to review, recommend, and develop university assessment policy ([committee charge](#) is included in the documentation). CAPC reviews of new degree programs take note of the effectiveness of the program assessment plan. Policies and new programs recommended by this committee are sent forward to the university senate, which then sends its recommendations to the university president. The CAPC is made up of elected faculty senators, faculty volunteers, a Presidential Appointee, and a Chief Academic Officer appointee. CAPC minutes are archived on an institutional minutes web site and all documentation for curricular and assessment proposals to the university senate are archived on the university senate motion database web site. A representative from CAPC serves on the university-wide assessment committee. Examples of the program review process, from start to finish, are included in the supporting documentation.

### **III. The institution provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in the following area: 3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes**

The table below provides evidence of improvements made to the curriculum in response to assessment data obtained from the instruments described above. The matrices cited

above listing all degree programs with links to their completed assessment instruments provide complete documentation of any and all curricular improvements made in the last three years.

*Selected examples of curricular modifications made in response to assessment data*

<p><b>J. Whitney College of Business</b></p>	<p>Lower than average performances in the quantitative areas of the curriculum (finance, accounting, statistics) in 2004-2005</p>	<p>Embedded more quantitative exercises across the curriculum.</p>	<p>In finance, students got 37 percent of the questions correct on the ETS major field exam in 2005, which increased to 55 percent correct in 2008. Similarly, accounting scores increased from 46 to 49 percent correct. (<a href="#">Annual Report, p. 19</a>) GCSU scores on quantitative business analysis section of the ETS major field exam in management were above the national norm. (<a href="#">Assurance of learning undergraduate program report 2008</a>, p.7)</p>
	<p>In 2006-2007, faculty in Economics rated the senior seminar papers in ECON 4900 using primary trait analysis and a common rubric. Students met expectations in writing skills in all areas but “acceptable citations and bibliography.” Faculty rated students as on the</p>	<p>Faculty developed writing assignments to require early submission of bibliographies</p>	<p>In 2007-2008, faculty rated student ECON 4900 papers as “meeting expectations” in this and other writing skills (see Academic Assessment Outcomes for Undergraduate Programs in Economics <a href="#">2006-2007</a>; <a href="#">2007-2008</a>).</p>

borderline between “fails expectations” and “meets expectations.”

Faculty noted in 2005 that presentations were required in only 50 percent of undergrad courses, mostly at the end of the term. Students received little feedback.

Faculty developed common rubrics to assess communication skills and began to require presentations earlier in the term and in more required business major core courses and 2 Area F lower level core courses.

○ In the capstone course for management majors (2006), the mean score for *communication of information* was 2.6 on a scale of 1-5 (where 5 is excellent), an improvement over previous years. ([assurance of learning, 2005-2006 p. 5](#))

○ In 2007-2008, faculty rated two groups of student presentations in the management capstone course. One group was consistently rated as “meets expectations” (3 of 5) for the items reviewed on the rubric, the other group was not. ([assurance of learning 2007-2008, p. 6](#))

○ In the spring 2008, improvements were noted in the

Accounting 6145 and 6505 courses as a result of requiring earlier and multiple oral presentations. Students were evaluated using a scale of 1 (poor) through 5 (excellent) to assess the extent to which communication of the information was

1. Clear
2. Accompanied by gestures and eye contact

			<p>3. Delivered professionally</p> <p>4. Interesting</p> <p>Students in both scored at 3 or above (met or exceeded expectations) in all areas. The majority of students scored above 3 (exceeded expectations), and no students scored below 3 (below expectations).  <a href="#">Assurance of learning 2007-2008</a>, p. 12-13.</p>
<p><b>College of Arts and Sciences</b></p>	<p>ETS major field exam used as an exit exam without a requirement to pass it. There were low rates of achievement.</p>	<p>Psychology raised the minimum ETS score necessary to graduate to the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile.</p> <p>Psychology modified degree program requirements to align with graduate school expectations (2005).</p> <p><a href="#">External review confirmed</a> that requirements aligned with new recommendations of the American Psychological Association (2009).</p> <p>Results of the External Review <a href="#">were discussed in a faculty meeting</a> and curriculum changes were made, including more strenuous prerequisites for 4000 level classes and standardization of</p>	<p>Scores increased on the ETS major field exam to the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile (2009).</p> <p><a href="#">Subscores on the ETS major field exam increased</a> in 2006 in Learning/ Cognition (21%), Neuropsychology (10%), Abnormal (8%), and Developmental/Social (24%). As a result of curricular modifications that resulted in more training in these areas. <a href="#">Scores continued to rise through 2009.</a></p>

		the content of 4000 level Statistics and Research methods sections.	
	<p>Low success rates in MATH 1262, Calculus II (DFWs in MATH 1262 for 2005-2007 were 39.8%</p> <p>of the students.</p>	<p>a new preparatory two-semester integrated calculus program (MATH 1115-1116 sequence) offered in addition to the standard preparatory course, Calculus I.</p>	<p>Aggregate scores on a post-Calculus I exam given at the beginning of MATH 1262 (Calculus II) were higher for those students who completed MATH 1115-1116 students (1.55) than they were for those who completed MATH 1261 Calculus I (1.16).</p> <p>DFW percentages have also declined significantly in MATH 1262 since the MATH 1115-1116 preparatory requirement was instituted in 2007 and support the results of the direct assessment cited above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFWs in MATH 1262 for two years prior (2005-2007) to new prerequisite implementation: 39.8%</li> <li>• DWFs in MATH 1262 for two years after prerequisite was introduced: 33.7%</li> <li>• DWFs for 1262 during 2008-2009: 33.1 percent</li> </ul> <p>See the <a href="#">Math APR for 2008-2009</a>.</p>

<p><b>College of Health Sciences</b></p>	<p>In October 2003, The School of Nursing Educational Effectiveness Committee reported data from 1 and 5 year graduate surveys indicated graduates perceived a need for more content about pharmacology during their nursing education. In April of 2004, the National Council of State Boards of Nursing made some significant changes to the NCLEX-RN (National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses) based on the practice analysis. One such change was as increase in the percentage of questions on the category labeled Pharmacological and Parenteral Therapies. The information from the practice analysis and subsequent changes to the NCLEX-RN gave additional validity to</p>	<p>In January of 2004 a pharmacology course was approved by the College of Health Sciences Curriculum Committees and began in Fall 2004.</p>	<p>Subscores on the Pharmacology and Parenteral Therapies have increased from an average of 973 prior to the implementation to a score of 1017. Additional increases have been found on related pharmacology principles such as medication administration ( 934 before and 967 after; P=.41) and medication math (938 before and 1103 after; P=.002).</p> <p><a href="#">Detailed analysis of this data was made</a> in 2009 and further suggestions for changes resulted (see <a href="#">minutes</a>).</p>
--	---	--	--

	the data from our graduates.		
<b>College of Education</b>	Dip in GACE sub-scores related to Individualized Educational Program (IEP) knowledge and development	Contracted with an outside contractor that sells IEP writing software, and through negotiations, they have provided us with their services free for 5 years in order to better prepare our students to write and implement IEPs.	Rise in these sub-scores with subsequent groups that did get to use and experience this software ( <a href="#">APR 2008-2009</a> , p. 15).
	Student feedback, test scores, and faculty input suggested that delivery of the instructional technology course was “too little too late,” since infusing technology into teaching and learning is such a broad scale goal of both educator prep. units and also in the P-12 schools. Students asked for more instruction and for a longer period of time.	Delivery of EDIT (Instructional Technology) course sequence changed from a one-time 3 hour course taken at the end of the program (the semester before graduation). Course was redesigned into 3, 1-hour sections that are distributed over the whole course of the undergraduates' 2 year program. They now	The new model allows the students more time to absorb and comprehend the technology content and to apply it more broadly in their different placements over the two years, practicing the skills with different age levels and content areas. <a href="#">Student self-evaluations in 2006</a> indicate that 97% of students rated themselves as good or excellent, the highest ratings ever received given for the technology skills question. These ratings were higher <a href="#">than they were at the time the change was implemented.</a> Results of the state regulated 2008 BOE Employer

	<p>receive technology instruction in 3/4 semesters as opposed to 1/4. The contact hours remained the same.</p>	<p>Satisfaction Survey shows that employers consistently agree that GCSU students have ability to use technology. See pages <a href="#">2</a> and <a href="#">3</a>.</p>
--	--	--

Many of our accreditation reviews have resulted in near-perfect findings, without suggestions for curricular modifications (see the [Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business review \(2005\), for example](#), which praises Economics starting on p. 5 for its assessment practices and makes no recommendations for changes to any programs). However, an example of a curricular improvement made in response to an NLNAC accreditation review is in the table below:

<p><a href="#">National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission</a></p>	<p>In the NLNAC report from 2005, GCSU was found in full compliance, but there was a note to continue to investigate course sequencing in the generic baccalaureate program (<a href="#">see last page of the PDF document</a>).</p>	<p>Change made for the following spring cohort. Faculty moved what was then NURA 4580 Adult Health II (now NRSG 4580) from the summer to the spring semester. The course it changes with was NURF 3540 Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing (now NRSG 3540). This was necessary</p>

because NURA 4580 carried 8 credit hours and NURF 3540 only carried 5. There was not adequate time in the summer for the students to meet the demands of an 8-hour course that carried 60 lecture hours and 120 clinical hours. NRSG 3540 carries 45 class hours and 60 clinical hours.

Impact:

A comparison was done using HESI scores for the semester changes. Three semesters were compared for each course prior to the change and after the change. A t-test revealed no statistical difference in the average HESI scores as a result of the change.

Average scores for NRSG 4580

	stayed the same 911 prior to the change and 911.33 after the change. Scores for NRSG 3540 increased from 938 before to 972 after.
--	---

## Summary

GCSU has developed a university-wide assessment process and its own online tool and assessment instruments. Though some program goals/outcomes and course level student learning outcomes are in need of further refinement, annual efforts are made to assess goals/outcomes, to develop a plan of response to the resulting data, and to evaluate the impact of changes made. GCSU has made progress in terms of the percentage of programs completing the annual cycle since 2007. Results of assessment have been used to improve the curriculum.

## Supporting Documentation

University System of Georgia Board of Regents Academic Handbook: [Academic Handbook 2.3.2](#) and “[Baccalaureate and Master’s Degree Procedures](#)”

*Program Goals/Outcomes and Course Outcomes*

[Complete listing of departments, courses offered, and course outcomes](#) (pdf file)

[Matrix listing all degree programs and their program goals/outcomes](#)

[Strategic Directions](#)

## *Assessment Planning Record*

### Information for 2007-2008

1. Sample Assessment Planning Record used 2001-2008: [generic template](#) and completed example from the [BS in Chemistry](#)
2. [Matrix listing all degree programs with links to their completed assessment reports/cycles in the APRs from 2007-2008](#): each instrument listed illustrates completion of the assessment cycle (note: materials submitted to SACS had clickable links to each report; specific reports are available from <http://assessment.gcsu.edu> behind password protection)

### Best Practice Samples:

- a. [Sample completed APR from the College of Health Sciences](#) (BSN program); illustrates use of alumni and employer surveys and end of program evaluations.
- b. [Sample completed 2007-2008 assessment report from the J. Whitney Bunting College of Business](#) and Graduate Learning Outcomes [2007-2008](#) (The College of Business uses a format required for their accreditation, which accomplishes the same goals as the APR; this is the undergraduate assurance of learning report)

### Information for 2008-2009

1. Assessment Planning Record template [for 2008-2009](#) for the College of Arts and Sciences
2. [Matrix listing all degree programs with links to their completed assessment reports/cycles in APRs from 2008-2009](#), along with completed administrative response reports; each instrument listed illustrates completion of the assessment cycle

## Best Practice Examples:

- a. [Sample completed APR from the College of Arts and Sciences](#) (sample is from Psychology; illustrates use of common rubrics, multiple raters, sampling of student work, and pre- and post-tests)
- b. Sample APR from the BS in Math: illustrates use of pre-and post-tests, embedded questions in beginning of course exam, and assessment of impact of curricular modifications.
- c. Sample completed [APR from the Interdisciplinary Studies Program in the College of Arts and Sciences](#): illustrates use of common rubrics, multiple raters, sampling of student work; illustrated data that resulted in realization of the need to modify of outcomes.
- d. College of Business [Undergraduate](#) and [Graduate](#) assurance of learning reports

## Information for 2009-2010

1. Assessment Planning Record templates for 2009-2010 ([College of Arts and Sciences](#), [College of Health Sciences](#), [College of Education](#), and [College of Business](#))
  - a. Assessment Planning Record Templates for Graduate degree programs for 2009-2010: [COHS](#), [COE](#), [COB](#), and [COAS](#)
2. [Matrix listing all degree programs with links to their preliminary assessment plans in the APRs for the 2009-2010 cycle](#) (which won't be completed until the fall of 2010)

(note: materials submitted to SACS had clickable links to each report; specific reports are available from <http://assessment.gcsu.edu> behind password protection)

[APR Training/Resource Manual](#)

*Administrative Response Report*

[Sample completed administrative response report](#) (COHS)

*Sample Minutes from Faculty Discussions of Assessment Materials*

Examples of Departments within the College of Education minutes/

[Special Education Minutes](#)

[Educator's Preparation Council Minutes](#) (college-wide)

[Middle Grades Program Minutes](#)

Examples of College of Business Minutes

[MBA meeting minutes](#): representing college-wide discussion of MBA assessment issues

Examples of College of Health Science Minutes

[Discussion of licensure rates for nursing in connection with funding issues](#): college-wide meeting minutes

Nursing program meeting [minutes](#) discussing impact of curricular changes.

Examples of Departments within the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes

Psychology department meeting minutes [discussing results of an external review and proposed modifications to the curriculum](#)

*Online Archives (Institutional Effectiveness Web Site):*

Office of Institutional Effectiveness Web Site with assessment reports dating back to 2001: [downloaded copy](#) from <http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/Academicassessment/assessmentroadmap1.html>

Username: gcsu Password: 1889 (note: files in the archived APR referenced on this page are visible without login; due to technical issues with this internally developed software, some files for some programs are missing, but were submitted in hard copy format during the years 2005-2007. Files referenced for the current online APR will be visible upon completion of the current academic year cycle. All materials from 2007 to the present have been provided on the matrices shown in the narrative and on the CD).

*Annual Reports*

[Annual Report Template](#)

[Sample completed report from the College of Arts and Sciences](#)

[Sample completed report from the College of Health Sciences](#)

[Sample completed report from the John Lounsbury College of Education](#)

[Sample completed report from the J. Whitney Bunting College of Business \(2007-2008\)](#)

*Comprehensive Program Reviews*

[Comprehensive Program Review Template from the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook](#)

USG BOR [Academic Affairs Handbook 2.3.6](#) and the [BOR Policy Handbook 3.6.3](#); Comprehensive Program Review and [USG Program Review task force report illustrating new CPR policy passed in September 2008](#).

[Sample completed report from the College of Arts and Sciences](#)

[Sample completed report from the John Lounsbury College of Education](#)

[Sample completed report from the J. Whitney Bunting College of Business](#)

The [BS in Outdoor Education Program CPR](#) from the College of Health Sciences (see p. 9) illustrates use of licensure and standardized exams and completion of nationally normed modules to evaluate learning outcomes.

[Sample feedback from the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia](#)

[University System of Georgia BOR taskforce on Comprehensive Program Review report \(September 2008\)](#)

*Sample External Reviews*

[Psychology Department External Review \(2009\)](#)

[List of accreditations held by GCSU](#)

[Accreditation review report from the AACSB](#): illustrates exemplary report on assessment practices

[Accreditation report from NLNAC](#): illustrates on the last page suggestions for course sequencing revisions

[Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee Charge](#) and Roster, and Sample Materials

CAPC review of degree program proposal illustrating discussion of assessment of

outcomes ([sample minutes](#))

[Link to downloaded copy of CAPC minutes page](#) from <http://info.gcsu.edu/minutes/CAPComm/>

Link to [downloaded copy of](#) university [senate motion database](#) where documentation related to specific curricular proposals are stored. [Sample curricular motion page](#) downloaded from <http://oldcapitol.gcsu.edu/senate/viewMotion.aspx?id=151>, including links to documentation.

Sample curriculum proposal from COHS illustrating flow through College C&I Committee to Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee, to University Senate: [Proposal Cover sheet for MAT in Health and Physical Education](#); [MAT in Health and Physical Education Program Proposal](#); [MAT in Health and Physical Education letter of intent](#); [Part-time sequence for degree proposal](#); [full-time sequence for degree proposal](#); [new course proposal for new degree](#); [new course syllabus](#). [Minutes indicating College of Health Sciences Curriculum and Instruction Policy review](#) of the course and degree program proposals. Minutes indicating Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee review of [new course proposal](#) and [new degree proposal](#). University Senate motion (downloaded [copy here](#)) and university [senate minutes](#) indicating review of proposal and approval.

*Assessment Management Structure*

[Overview of the Administration and Management of the Georgia College Assessment Program](#) (from the University Planning web site)

*Supporting materials for the section on use of assessment data for improvement*

## Finance Materials

Documenting increases in ETS major field exam following curricular revisions ([Annual Report, p. 19](#)). Materials documenting that GCSU scores on quantitative business analysis section of the ETS major field exam in management were above the national norm following revisions. ([Assurance of learning undergraduate program report 2008](#), p.7)

## Economics Materials

Documenting increases in writing skills following curricular modifications (Academic Assessment Outcomes for Undergraduate Programs in Economics [2006-2007](#); [2007-2008](#)).

Psychology materials: [Subscores on the ETS major field exam showing increases \(2006\) Chart showing continued increase in scores through 2009.](#)

Math Materials: Documenting impact of curricular changes on performance in Calculus II. ([Math APR for 2008-2009.](#))

Nursing materials showing impact of curricular changes in Pharmacology and impact on subscores on the Pharmacology and Parenteral Therapies: [Detailed analysis of this data was made](#) in 2009. Further suggestions for changes documented in meeting [minutes](#).

Special Education: Rise in GACE sub-scores after curricular modification to address weaknesses in IEP skills ([APR 2008-2009](#), p. 15).

Instructional Technology materials: documenting impact of curricular changes on mastery of technical skills:

[Student self-evaluations in 2006](#) (indicated that 97% of students rated themselves as good or excellent, the highest ratings ever received given for the technology skills question. These ratings were higher [than they were at the time the change was implemented.](#)

**Results of the** state regulated 2008 BOE Employer

Satisfaction Survey, pages [2](#) and [3.](#) Show employers consistently agree that GCSU students have ability to use technology.