Introduction

In spring 2005 the University Assessment Committee put out a request for proposals (RFP) to further the assessment endeavors on campus. A copy of the RFP is presented in Appendix 1. The committee received 16 grant proposals and 15 of these grants received at least partial funding (see Appendix 2). Grant proposals were received from departments in four Colleges. Each grant recipient was asked to submit a final summary, which needed to include at least:

1) a description of project success and how this was determined,
2) a list of materials (and contact person information) that could be used by other programs across campus (if applicable), and
3) a plan for changes, if necessary, to improve the program as a result of the project.

What follows are summary reports from the 15 grant recipients.
Embedded Assessment in the Biology Core Curriculum

Report to the Assessment Director

14 April 2006

Part I: Review of Proposal Abstract and Impact Statement

This proposal aims to create a set of multiple choice content and critical thinking questions that will be administered in five core courses required for any Biology major. All instructors involved in the core courses will participate in writing and administering the questions as part of the syllabus of each course. All questions will be linked to desired student outcomes from the Biology Department Assessment Plan.

Part II: Description of Project Success and How Success was determined

In August of 2005 the faculty instructors met and devised a 30 question multiple choice test based on content from the five Biology major core courses. These 30 questions were evenly distributed by content between the five courses at six content questions per course. The test is included in this report as Appendix A and will be referred to as the assessment tool.

The assessment tool was administered in the five core courses as described in the proposal as a pre and post-test in Fall semester 2005. For the Spring semester 2006 the same assessment tool has been administered as a pretest in the five courses and will be administered as a post-test.

At this point in the ongoing assessment tool process, success is determined by the mean score of the class administered the pre and post-test. In all cases the mean score has increased significantly, indicating an increase in content knowledge within each class and across the curriculum. Spring 2006 data are incomplete. Fall 2005 data are included for each course as Appendix B-F.

Part III: List of Materials (and contact person information) that could be used by other programs across campus (if applicable)

The single “material” generated from this grant is the assessment tool and its resulting data. Due to the heavy emphasis on Biology content it is unlikely that the assessment tool could be utilized by other programs across campus. Data generation and analysis is and will continue to be an ongoing process. Individuals interested in this Biology content assessment tool and its resulting data can contact Dr. Christopher Kvaal, Department of Biological Sciences, WSB-230, 308-4138 or cakvaal@stcloudstate.edu.

Part IV: A Plan For Changes To Improve The Program as a Result of the Project

Student performance, when plotted by question for 2005 (Appendices B-F), indicates some questions that have low success rate. These questions will examined over the summer of 2006 by faculty instructors to determine if the low score is an indication of our core course missing this content area, and, in turn, as referenced in the original proposal, our core courses are then missing a portion of our departments specific student outcomes as determined by the department assessment plan. A specific example is question 20, which will be changed for AY 2006-2007.
MULTIPLE CHOICE

1. The process by which cells divide to produce two genetically identical daughter cells is
   a. mitosis               d. translation
   b. meiosis              e. transcription
   c. synthesis

   ANS: A  NOT: 151 I B

2. The cytoplasmic space in eukaryotic cells is occupied by many diverse membrane-bound structures with specific cellular functions. They are called
   a. organelles            d. cilia
   b. flagella              e. receptors
   c. chromosomes

   ANS: A  NOT: 151 I. B.

3. Plant cells usually have a large membrane-bound sac that is used for storing water and other substances. This structure is
   a. central vacuole       d. centriole
   b. chloroplast           e. nucleus
   c. Golgi body

   ANS: A  NOT: 151 I.B.

4. Which of the following structures would not be found in a plant root?
   a. mitochondria          d. nucleus
   b. chloroplast           e. centrioles
   c. plasma membrane

   ANS: B  NOT: 151 I.B or III.C.

5. Taxonomic classifications attempt to reflect phylogeny in that
   a. they group organisms by their appearance only
   b. they group organisms by their ability to survive and reproduce
   c. they group evolutionarily related organisms together
   d. they group organisms by size

   ANS: B  NOT: 152 III.A.

6. The first step in speciation in animals is ordinarily
   a. evolution of post-zygotic isolating mechanisms
   b. geographic isolation of populations
   c. character displacement
   d. evolution of hybrid sterility

   ANS: B  NOT: 152 II. C. 5

7. A phylum is
a. a major lineage within a domain  

b. a taxonomic category bigger than a family but smaller than a class  
c. many small molecular units joined together into long chains

ANS: B NOT: 152 III.A, Ci2, Di2

8. When Biologists refer to Protists, they mean all eukaryotes except which groups?

a. multicellular forms  
b. those with cells containing a cytoskeleton and a nucleus  
c. land plants, fungi, animals

ANS: A NOT: 152 III.A.B.

9. Which of the following is NOT one the four fundamental characteristics of an animal body plan?

a. how the adult stages proceed  
b. the type of body symmetry  
c. how the earliest developmental events proceed  
d. the number of tissue types found in embryos

ANS: A NOT: 152 II.D. ii

10. To be “fit” in an evolutionary sense refers to

a. producing more surviving offspring that other individuals  
b. avoiding illness and disease  
c. gaining more resources than others  
d. living longer than average  
e. growing stronger than most individuals

ANS: A NOT: 152 (312) II.C.iii

11. Evolution requires

a. Variability among members of a species  
b. Geographic isolation of a species from another species  
c. Catastrophic natural events  
d. Changes in climate  
e. Predation

ANS: A NOT: 152 (151) (312) IIC

12. The force in nature which distinguishes between fit and unfit individuals is called

a. Natural Selection  
b. Artificial Selection  
c. Inhibition  
d. Competition  
e. None of the Above

ANS: A NOT: 152 (151) (312) II.C.

13. Which of the following is NOT correlated with species diversity?
a. longitude   c. productivity
b. resilience   d. latitude

ANS: A       NOT: 312 III e ii

14. In general total biomass in a terrestrial ecosystem will be greatest for which tropic level?
   a. producers   c. omnivores
   b. carnivores   d. herbivores

ANS: A       NOT: 312 III c ii 1

15. Which of the following descriptions best characterizes this reaction?
   A + B + energy -> AB
   a. hydrolysis   d. exergonic reaction
   b. catabolism   e. endergonic reaction
   c. oxidation-reduction

ANS: D       NOT: 151 I C i

16. Water molecules are polar with ends that exhibit partial positive and partial negative charges. Such
    opposite charges make water molecules attract each other through bonds called
   a. ionic   d. water
   b. covalent   e. radioactive
   c. hydrogen

ANS: C       NOT: 151 I A 1

17. Which of the following is not a macromolecule?
   a. carbohydrates   d. proteins
   b. water   e. lipids
   c. nucleic acids

ANS: B       NOT: 151 I A iii

18. The type of transport that is specific, requires a carrier molecule and energy is
   a. exocytosis   d. endocytosis
   b. facilitated diffusion   e. osmosis
   c. active transport

ANS: C       NOT: 151 I c i

19. The process of transcription produces
   a. DNA   d. a polypeptide chain
   b. RNA   e. Lipids
   c. Carbohydrates

ANS: B       NOT: 151 262 II A iii

20. The process of translation produces
   a. DNA   d. Carbohydrates
   b. RNA   e. Lipids
c. a polypeptide chain

ANS: C NOT: 151 262 II A iv

21. Adenosine Triphosphate (ATP) is
   a. produced primarily by muscles as a waste product of their activity
   b. the principal energy currency within a cell
   c. a amino acid

ANS: B NOT: 151 262 360 I C i

22. Proteins differ from carbohydrates and lipid because they contain
   a. nitrogen
   b. oxygen
   c. hydrogen

ANS: A NOT: 151 262 360 I A iii

23. You are examining an enzyme associated with glycolysis. As such you would expect
   a. the protein to be expressed only during mitosis
   b. the protein to be induced by glucose
   c. the protein to be regulated

ANS: D NOT: 360 I C iii

24. The smooth endoplasmic reticulum function in the synthesis of
   a. DNA
   b. polysaccharides
   c. lipids

ANS: C NOT: 360 I B iii

25. Which of the following processes would be the most likely to occur in the Golgi apparatus?
   a. glycosylation of proteins
   b. synthesis of steroids
   c. synthesis of DNA

ANS: A NOT: 360 I B iii

26. Which of the following organelles is NOT generally found in animal cells?
   a. mitochondrion
   b. endoplasmic reticulum
   c. centriole

ANS: D NOT: 360 I B

27. DNA is different than RNA in that
28. Enzymes catalyze chemical reactions by lowering the
   a. entropy   d. enthalpy
   b. free energy e. calories
   c. activation energy

   ANS: C   NOT: 151 360 I A v

29. The total amount of energy fixed by all autotrophs in an ecosystem is called
   a. gross primary production d. an energy pyramid
   b. primary production e. trophic dynamics
   c. trophic level

   ANS: A   NOT: 312 I C 4 Website

30. Which of the following describes the typical pattern of species abundance in communities?
   a. most of the species are moderately d. all of the above abundant
   b. a few species are extremely abundant e. A and B are correct or extremely rare
   c. when plotted yields a normal distributin curve

   ANS: D   NOT: 312 1 h 2
Appendix B

Biology 151, Cell Function and Inheritance

Figure 1. Student performance by question in Biology 151 Fall Semester 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Raw</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Basic Course Statistics of Assessment Tool Administered in BIOL 151 Fall Semester 2005. N = number of students, Mean Raw = number correct of 30, STD = standard deviation, Max = maximum score in class, Min = minimum score in class
Appendix C

Biology 152, Organismal Biology

Figure 1. Student performance by question in Biology 152 Fall Semester 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Raw</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Basic Course Statistics of Assessment Tool Administered in BIOL 152 Fall Semester 2005. N = number of students, Mean Raw = number correct of 30, STD = standard deviation, Max = maximum score in class, Min = minimum score in class
Appendix D

Biology 262, Genetics

Figure 1. Student performance by question in Biology 262 Fall Semester 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Raw</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Basic Course Statistics of Assessment Tool Administered in BIOL 262 Fall Semester 2005. N = number of students, Mean Raw = number correct of 30, STD = standard deviation, Max = maximum score in class, Min = minimum score in class
Appendix E

Biology 312, Ecology

Figure 1. Student performance by question in Biology 312 Fall Semester 2005

Table 1. Basic Course Statistics of Assessment Tool Administered in BIOL 312 Fall Semester 2005. N = number of students, Mean Raw = number correct of 30, STD = standard deviation, Max = maximum score in class, Min = minimum score in class
Appendix F

Biology 360, Cell Biology

Figure 1. Student performance by question in Biology 360 Fall Semester 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Raw</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comprehensive Assessment of CHEM 140 (Prep. Chem) as a Predictor of Success in CHEM 141 (Organic and Biol. Chem)

Dr. Nathan Winter
Dr. Tamara Leenay

Why CHEM 140 and 141 Assessment?

The purpose of this project was to assess the success of CHEM 140 in preparing students for CHEM 141. Student grades in these courses were evaluated and correlated. Student surveys provided additional information regarding content areas in CHEM 140 that are problematic for CHEM 141 students.

Department Learning Outcomes

This assessment project relates directly to the chemistry department’s first learning outcome:

Students will demonstrate general knowledge of the basic areas of chemistry that is appropriate for each successive chemistry course. This content will allow them to continue in successive chemistry courses, as well as the knowledge to real-world situations.

Why this assessment project will help our department:

CHEM 140 is under curriculum review in our department. Large enrollments have put a significant strain on course offerings in the department.
- Proposals presently being discussed on how to address enrollment management issues
- We are working on course content for an allied health general chemistry course and course content is be re-evaluated for preparatory chem.
Questions to Ponder

1. Is there a minimum grade necessary in CHEM 140 for enrollment into CHEM 141?
2. Should a minimum grade be a pre-requisite for in the SCSU registration system?
3. Is the CHEM 141 placement exam minimum score realistic?

CHEM 140 and 141 Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 140</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 141</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Methodology

In order to evaluate CHEM 140 as a preparatory course for CHEM 141, a variety of methods were employed:

1. Investigate the relationship between students’ course grade in CHEM 140 and CHEM 141 course grade
2. Study the relationship between CHEM 140 final exam (departmental final) and CHEM 141 course grade
3. Student survey regarding how CHEM 140 prepared them for CHEM 141
4. Correlating 140 semester grade with 141 semester grade.

The term semester grade will be used to avoid confusion with the final exam grade.

Data

We obtained our data for students who completed CHEM 141 between the summer semester of 2002 and Spring semester of 2005. 363 students were evaluated. For each student we received their semester grades for CHEM 140 and 141 and the semesters they took each class.

Overall CHEM 140 GPA: 2.9 B
Overall CHEM 141 GPA: 2.3 C+
### 140 Semester Grade versus 141

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>140 Grade</th>
<th>Avg. 141 Grade</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Max 141 Grade</th>
<th>Avg. Grade Change</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Conclusions**

Students getting an A, B or C in 140 can achieve a reasonable score in 141. 86% of students getting a D in 140 went on to get an F in 141, but only seven students with Ds in 140 went on to 141. 140 performance is a good predictor of 141 performance (Pearson Correlation Significance of 0.705).

**Does CHEM 140 Prepare Students for CHEM 141?**

We decided to see if the time between taking CHEM 140 and CHEM 141 affected the performance in 141. If 140 is important for 141, then we would expect that the longer the interval is between the two classes, then the lower the 141 grade should be.
### Lag time between 140 and 141

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters Between</th>
<th>Avg. 140 grade</th>
<th>Avg. 141 grade</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 first</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Infamous Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>141 grade</th>
<th>140 grade</th>
<th>Credits taken before 141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you need to take CHEM 140 before 141?

140 Final Exam correlated with 141 grade.

- We had data for 60 students from the 04-05 academic year who took the departmental CHEM 140 final.

All eleven students who scored below 50% on the 140 final exam earned Ds and Fs in 141.

We interpret this to mean you need some fundamental chemistry knowledge to succeed in 141.
Placement Exam Cutoff

Of the 27 students who took the 141 placement exam, one of them achieved the passing score of 66%. Since ~1/3 of Tammy’s CHEM 141 students in S’05 who scored between 55% and 66% on the departmental 140 final (which is the basis for our 141 placement exam) were able to earn Bs and Cs in 141, our cutoff score may be too high. Students who scored <55% on the 140 final earned Ds and Fs. We might consider changing the cutoff to be between 55% and 66%. Only two students taking the 141 placement test scored close to the cutoff with scores of 56% and 62%.

FYI: five students have taken the placement exam twice.

CHEM 141 Student Survey

During the last week of lab in CHEM 141 last semester, students were asked to complete an anonymous survey. Students were asked questions regarding how they felt CHEM 140 prepared them for CHEM 141. 132 students participated in the survey.

Students were asked how they felt CHEM 140 prepared them for subject areas such as ionic and covalent bonding, electronegativity, intermolecular forces, valence electrons etc. Of the 12 topics listed, students were asked to rank the most difficult topics.

From the rankings, the top three topics were analyzed from the survey. The most difficult topic students encountered were:

1—Polar and nonpolar bonds (70 responses)
2—Polar and nonpolar molecules (61 responses)
3—Intermolecular forces (52 students)
4—Electronegativity (46 responses)

Question: Has CHEM 141 helped you in other courses this year?

- Biology 202/204 (Anatomy and Physiology)
- Biology 206 Microbiology
- Biology 151 Cell Function and Inheritance
- Biology 103 Human Biology
- Nutrition

Table 1. Basic Course Statistics of Assessment Tool Administered in BIOL 312
| Fall Semester 2005 | N = number of students, Mean Raw = number correct of 30, STD = standard deviation, Max = maximum score in class, Min = minimum score in class |
Report on Assessment Project:
CIM Undergraduate Program Assessment

“Projects that receive funding must complete a summary …. The summary must include at least: 1) a description of project success and how this was determined, 2) a list of materials (and contact person information) that could be used by other programs across campus (if applicable), and 3) a plan for changes to improve the program as a result of the project.”

Project Success:
This project assisted in the implementation of the departmental assessment plan through collection and organization of data prior and input into a spreadsheet to be ready for input into the COE data system (which is not yet ready for data entry).

The project focused on evidence of student ability to design, develop, use process and resources to create learning media, manage and evaluate instructional technology will be assessed at four transition points in a student’s progress through assessment of products created in IM260, IM420, IM444 and IM486 using rubrics developed for that purpose (available upon request).

This resulted in assessment results which are now being used to revise and improve the programs.

Project Materials:
Project materials include a spreadsheet for date entry and improved rubrics for program assessment. Materials may be obtained by contacting Jeanne Anderson, MC110E at 308-4823 or Jeanne@stcloudstate.edu.

Plan for Changes:
1) The Assessment Committee determined that too few students were enrolling in IM486 (Electronic Portfolio Seminar), which has been an elective until now, so an inadequate quantity of data was available for assessment. They recommended that and the IM444 internship be made a program requirement for IM majors. The plan is to submit these changes to the curriculum committee by the end of Spring 2006.
2) The committee also recommended that the portfolios be reviewed by a committee in the last semester before graduation. This will be implemented after the program changes have been approved by the curriculum process.
3) Each student will complete an exit interview that will provide additional assessment data. This will be implemented after the program changes have been approved by the curriculum process.
4) The program assessment data will continue to be collected and will be reviewed and recommendations for program improvement be made annually (or more frequently as needed).
Interim Report – May 4, 2006

Title: Elementary Science Education & Science Cognate Assessment Project

Participating Faculty:

1. Dr. Patricia Simpson, Biology Department, Science Education
2. Dr. Mark A. Minger, Biology Department, Science Education
3. Dr. Rebecca Krystyniak, Chemistry Department, Science Education

Time Line

Summer of 2005 – We collected and reviewed existing science process skills instruments for use in the assessment grant. It was determined by the three science education faculty to not create a new science skills instrument, but rather to utilize an existing instrument, called the Test of Integrated Process Skills (TIPS).

Fall, 2005
- Administered pre and post TIPS instrument in 5 sections of Sci 226.
- Administered pre and post TIPS instrument in 2 sections of Sci 227.

Spring, 2006
- Administered pre and post TIPS instrument in 5 sections of Sci 226.
- Administered pre and post TIPS instrument in 3 sections of Sci 227.

Final collection of data for the 2005/2006 academic year took place May 4, 2006. We have submitted the data forms from the Fall, 2005 instruments to the Miller Center Statistics Center and are presently in-line to receive the analysis of that Fall, 2005 data. We will submit the Spring 2006 data forms for analysis by May 10, 2006.

We expect to receive the analysis of the data during the summer of 2006. We will meet and discuss the analysis, and make recommendations for changes to the two courses, Sci 226 and Sci 227, where appropriate. This first year of data collection will give us a base-line set of data that will help us to continue to develop the two elementary courses to be more effective at teaching science process skills.

In addition, a focus group was held in late April, 2006 with volunteer students from the two courses. This focus group was conducted to gather more in-depth information concerning the courses and the assessment of science process skills.

We expect that we may decide to revise the TIPS instrument if needed and we will continue to collect data from the Sci 226 and Sci 227 courses in the fall of 2006 and spring of 2007. We also would like to continue to follow our students as they choose a cognate and complete Sci 420. We will submit the results of our data collection in a timely manner in 2006, after receiving the analysis from the Statistics Consulting Group in the Miller Center.
The mission of the department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is to educate individuals in the knowledge and skills necessary to be competent and ethical speech, language and hearing professionals, and to increase awareness of and advocate for people with communication differences and disorders.

As part of our program, we aim to educate students to be able to think critically and communicate effectively both orally and in writing. Communication skills are demonstrated through oral presentations and academic and clinical report writing.

In 2005, the American Speech-Language-Hearing-Association (ASHA) and our accrediting agency (Council of Academic Accreditation) implemented new certification standards outlining the knowledge and skills necessary for students to demonstrate prior to entry into clinical practice. Some of these standards are related to written skills in the classroom and in the clinical setting. These new standards also mandate formative and summative assessment of these skills.

This grant allowed four CSD faculty (Devers, Rangamani, Crowell and Larsen) to spend time developing a rubric for our writing assignments and to implement systematic formative and summative assessment of the writing skills in our undergraduate major. Meeting the ASHA standards is critical for students graduating from our program and in the accreditation process. The ASHA standards mandate assessment protocols to document competency. Our grant allowed us to meet the following goals:

a. Evidence for student acquisition of the knowledge and skills related to the ASHA standards.
b. Documentation of formative and summative assessment
c. Documentation of the effectiveness of the CSD training program for accreditation purposes.

We selected fours classes in our undergraduate major. Two classes are taken in the junior year and two classes in the senior year. We developed programmatic formative and summative assessment measures of writing assignments. We developed writing assignments in each class that addressed the following writing goals:

1. Students will demonstrate written expression of complex ideas, analytical abilities and writing styles to meet the needs of different target audiences in various ways. These include:
   a. Students will write treatment plans consisting of measurable behavioral objectives with 100% accuracy.
b. Students will write professional reports with all its key components (identifying information; background information; objective measures; assessment and plan /impressions / progress) with 100% accuracy.

c. Students will write term-papers / scientific reports / lab reports / scientific papers using the key elements of organization, grammar and mechanics.

The classes that were involved in this project were:
- CSD 324 Speech Science (Devers)
- CSD 350; Clinical Methods (Larsen)
- CSD 426 Neurological aspects of speech and language (Rangamani)
- CSD 441 Hearing Measurement (Crowell)

In these classes, there were a total of approximately 45 students who were CSD majors or about to declare CSD as their major. Each student was required to complete the writing assignments and create a writing portfolio. When students are in their senior year, this writing portfolio will be evaluated by the CSD faculty to determine if students are meeting the UDWR in our program.

At the end of fall semester, the faculty reviewed the number of writing assignments that were completed in these classes and analyzed the average grades that were obtained by students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSD 324</th>
<th>CSD 350</th>
<th>CSD 426</th>
<th>CSD 441</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># writing assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 which spanned the entire semester</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average grades in writing assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 average: B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade = A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2: B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest: 72% = C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final: B / B+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postest: 85% = B</td>
<td>A -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Fall 2005, the faculty developed more writing assignments and a greater variety of writing assignments was completed. For example, in CSD 324, the writing assignments included two mini-papers (which were letters) and a more traditional research paper that followed APA guidelines. In CSD 426, Dr. Rangamani has one writing assignment that spanned the semester. See Appendices for examples.

The number of writing assignments increased and the grades of students also increased. Faculty perceptions of the rubric were missed. We are currently in the process of using it in spring and I anticipate that it will undergo some revision over the summer to make it a more efficient tool. While the rubric was helpful in outlining the writing expectations for students, it was more time-consuming for faculty to use the rubric.

This project will be self sustaining. We will be using the rubric in other upper discussion classes within our major. Moreover, we have established the requirement that students keep their writing assignments and create a writing portfolio. That portfolio will become the documentation for meeting various ASHA standards. The writing assignments at various stages in the undergraduate program will allow us to document changes in writing proficiency across the major.
APPENDICES

The CSD UDWR rubric

Writing assignments in CSD 324

Writing assignments in CSD 426

CDIS UDWR Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SKILLS</th>
<th>Independent (5)</th>
<th>Competent (4)</th>
<th>Developing (3)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
<th>Not Evident (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Organization</td>
<td>All sections are present in correct order / sequence.</td>
<td>Most of the elements (90%) presented in correct order / sequence.</td>
<td>75% of the elements presented in correct order / sequence. Some elements in wrong order.</td>
<td>50% of the elements present in correct order. Frequently missing elements or in improper order.</td>
<td>Consistently missing elements (less than 50%) or in improper order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logical transitions of ideas within and across sections are present throughout the paper.</td>
<td>Logical transitions of ideas within and across sections. Occasionally missing transitions</td>
<td>Inconsistent use of logical transitions within and across elements.</td>
<td>Frequently missing logical transitions within and across elements making the expression of ideas confusing and unclear.</td>
<td>No logical transitions. Poor understanding of the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Completeness</td>
<td>All relevant information (based on the assignment) included throughout the paper. Thesis / idea is clear, identifiable and</td>
<td>Most relevant information present. Good thesis, but may lack insight or originality.</td>
<td>Some relevant info is present.</td>
<td>Mostly irrelevant information. Generally unclear ideas with elements lacking structure. Lacking clear focus</td>
<td>No clear relevant information present. Poor understanding of the assignment. Thesis non existent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Accuracy</td>
<td>o All information presented is correct and current</td>
<td>o Most information correct &amp; current</td>
<td>o Information is current, but interpreted incorrectly</td>
<td>o Information is incorrect and outdated</td>
<td>o No additional details provided. Fails to support ideas or evidence presented offers no support to the ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provides correct analysis / interpretation of ideas / information using adequate supporting details and evidence. Excellent integration of all ideas. Is able to think of ideas or analyze ideas in new ways</td>
<td>o Correct interpretation of ideas using some details and evidence. Good integration of ideas.</td>
<td>o Very minimal or missing supporting details and evidence. Attempts to integrate ideas but misses several pieces.</td>
<td>o Incorrect interpretation with missing or inappropriate evidence. Some attempts to integrate ideas.</td>
<td>o Incorrect interpretation with no evidence. No attempts to integrate ideas. Ideas are disconnected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITING STYLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Word Choice / Terminology</th>
<th>o Uses professional terminology correctly throughout the paper. Professional terms are adequately /correctly described</th>
<th>o Uses professional terminology correctly in 80% the paper. Most terms adequately described with some missing descriptions</th>
<th>o Uses professional terminology correctly in 60% the paper Inadequate or missing descriptions.</th>
<th>o Uses professional terminology correctly in 40% the paper Mostly missing descriptions.</th>
<th>o Improper or inadequate use of professional terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Vocabulary is interesting.</td>
<td>o Varied vocabulary used in most</td>
<td>o Vocabulary is simple.</td>
<td>o Vocabulary is repetitive and simple</td>
<td>o Limited vocabulary and/or word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| b) Clarity of Expression | o Provides additional details with appropriate references that expand or substantiate information. Draws ideas from other sources and make convincing arguments. | o Additional details provided to support most ideas. Some evidence may be used inappropriate ly to support ideas. | o Some additional details provided. Ideas may lack supporting evidence or evidence inappropriate ly used. | o Few attempts to provide additional details – may be irrelevant or missing details. Lacks supporting evidence | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>c) Tone / Voice of expression</strong></th>
<th>o Ideas clearly and explicitly expressed in 80% of the paper.</th>
<th>o Ideas clearly and explicitly expressed in 60% of the paper.</th>
<th>o Ideas clearly and explicitly expressed in 40% of the paper.</th>
<th>o Mostly implied messages. Assumes the reader will understand.</th>
<th>o Unclear expression of ideas.</th>
<th>o No attempt to explain. Expects the reader will know the meaning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Writer has a clear sense of the audience</td>
<td>o Inconsistent sense of audience</td>
<td>o Inappropriate use of words</td>
<td>o No sense of audience</td>
<td>o Tone inconsistent and occasionally inappropriate to the context</td>
<td>o Wrong use of tone to express ideas / point of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Writer is aware of the connotations of words being used</td>
<td>o Uses the right tone to express ideas, feelings, point of view</td>
<td>o Tone inconsistent and occasionally inappropriate to the context</td>
<td>o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TECHNICAL SKILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>a) Grammar</strong></th>
<th>o Uses a variety of sentence structures.</th>
<th>o Mostly adequate sentence structure. Occasional errors (1-2) in syntax and morphology throughout the paper. Occasional errors in capitalization and punctuations. No run-on sentences or comma splices.</th>
<th>o Simple sentence structure with some errors (3-5) in syntax and morphology. Few errors in capitalization and punctuations with occasional run-on sentences or comma splices.</th>
<th>o Frequent problems with sentence structure with many errors (6-10) in syntax and morphology. Frequent errors in capitalization and punctuations with several run-on sentences or comma splices.</th>
<th>o Major problems with sentence structure. Improper use of syntax and morphology throughout the paper. Improper capitalization and punctuations. Very hard to read the paper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Uses correct syntax and morphology throughout the paper.</td>
<td>o No errors in capitalization and punctuations.</td>
<td>o Uses correct syntax and morphology throughout the paper. Occasional errors in capitalization and punctuations. Minimal run-on sentence or comma splice.</td>
<td>o Uses correct syntax and morphology throughout the paper. Occasional errors in capitalization and punctuations. Minimal run-on sentence or comma splice.</td>
<td>o Uses correct syntax and morphology throughout the paper. Occasional errors in capitalization and punctuations. Minimal run-on sentence or comma splice.</td>
<td>o Uses correct syntax and morphology throughout the paper. Occasional errors in capitalization and punctuations. Minimal run-on sentence or comma splice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>b) Spelling</strong></th>
<th>o No spelling errors in the entire paper.</th>
<th>o Very minimal errors in the entire paper.</th>
<th>o Few errors in the entire paper.</th>
<th>o Many errors. Interferes with easy reading.</th>
<th>o Too many errors make it hard to read.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Uses appropriate title and headings. Correct page formatting</td>
<td>o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page</td>
<td>o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page</td>
<td>o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page</td>
<td>o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **c) Format** | o Uses appropriate title and headings. Correct page formatting | o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page | o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page | o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page | o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page | o Uses appropriate title and headings. Occasional errors in page |

| o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and | o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and | o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and | o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and | o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and | o No clear title and/or headings. Page formatting and |
| and paragraph formatting | Provides references in APA format when appropriate. | formatting and paragraph formatting. | Very minimal errors in APA references. | paragraph formatting used incorrectly. References not in APA format. |
Writing Assignment 1: Why SLP students should enroll in a speech science class

**TASK**
The President of Snowland University, President Frost, wants to reduce the number of courses offered in the CDIS major. One of the courses he is thinking of eliminating is CDIS 324 Speech Science.

You decide to write a letter to the President informing him that this would be the wrong decision. You know that Speech Science is relevant and necessary for future SLPs. Write a letter outlining the reasons why CDIS 324 is relevant and necessary for your training to become a certified speech-language pathologist.

**Audience**
The president of Snowland University.

**Format**
Letter format. No longer than 1 page, typed. Use 1 ½ line spacing, font size 10 or 12.

Writing Assignment 2
You have begun to work as a speech-language pathologist in a clinical setting that specializes in providing speech production intervention for children and adults.

You supervisor informs you that there is extra money to be used to purchase equipment. He would like you to provide him with a proposal for what type of speech production equipment you would consider buying. He will be looking for the proposal to include information on the equipment (what it is), how it is used and a rationale for why this money should be used for speech pathology. The audiologist and the psychologist are also making a proposal that the money should be used for their treatment programs.

Your task is to write a proposal to your supervisor outlining the rationale for purchasing the piece of equipment that will be most valuable to clients on your caseload. You will have to explain to him who you work with in this setting as different SLPs have different areas of specialty.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the device you select? What speech science principles allow you to make a good decision? Provide good arguments for your decision to purchase the device you select.
This writing assignment is a part of the Upper Division Writing requirement for undergraduates. The goal of this assignment is to enable students to demonstrate written expression of complex ideas, analytical abilities and writing styles to meet the needs of different target audiences. This paper includes writing a scientific report on a neurological communication disorder of your choice.

In order to select a neurological communication disorder, you may first choose a part of the nervous system that controls or involved in the processing of any speech, language, or cognition process. Study the anatomy and normal functions of that part. Understand how it functions with regards to other parts of the nervous system. Study the effects of damage on speech, language and / or cognitive functions. Write a three to four page report on the resulting communication disorder.

The paper will consist of all the elements of good writing including the main idea, supporting evidences, adequate content, organization, adequate style of writing and technical skills with proper use of grammar, spelling and voice or tone. Specifically, the following may be included:

→ Appropriate title,
→ Introduction with a clear statement of thesis
→ Location and detailed normal functioning of the part of the nervous system
→ Effects of damage on speech / language and / or cognitive functions
→ Definition and Incidence of the disorder
→ Symptoms
→ Signs
→ Speech / language / cognitive characteristics
→ Evaluation and Treatment options
→ Conclusion along with your impressions / insights / reactions / analysis.
→ Appropriate page and paragraph formatting
→ Font size of 12 and 1.5 line spacing
→ All references in APA format

Your references will include at least two other books other than your textbook, at least one journal article and two web sources. You will maintain a portfolio (that is well organized for easy reading) for this assignment. The portfolio will include copies of your references, all notes, all drafts, peer review and comments, revision notes etc that will show your work. In order to be good writers, you should learn to read critically. Therefore there will be two peer reviews of the report before the final submission. Always run a spell and grammar check before submitting your paper. The first peer review will be a learning experience and will not be graded. The second review however, will be graded. Your portfolio will include all drafts, peer reviewed comments, and the changes that you make to your drafts with revision notes. All submissions will include turning in the entire portfolio every time.

The timeline for this assignment will be as follows:

Sep. 20, 2005          Professor approval of your selection of the part of nervous system and the neurogenic communication disorder you wish to study.

Sep 27, 2005          Professor approval of your minimum five references other than your textbook.

October 13, 2005      First draft due to the assigned peer reviewer.

October 20, 2005      First set of peer review comments due to the writer.

October 27, 2005      Second draft due to the second assigned peer reviewer with revision notes.

November 3, 2005      Second set of peer review comments due to the writer.
Final submission of your paper with revision notes due to the professor

You will include your final version of the paper in your writing portfolio. This will not only serve as the Upper Division Writing requirement, it will also serve the ASHA’s knowledge and skills acquisition standards on writing.

The final paper will be graded for content (60 points), writing style (30 points) and technical skills (15 points), totaling 105 points. Peer review is worth 50 points. Finally the paper is worth 155 total points.
Assessment Grant Report
Mark C. Petzold, Ph.D.
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Assessment of Electrical and Computer Engineering Students using the Fundamentals of Engineering Exam
This assessment project involved instructing and paying the costs for students to take the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam, given twice per year. The Fundamentals of Engineering exam is the first exam given to students wishing to pursue their Professional Engineering license, and is normally taken in a student’s senior year.
The project was a qualified success. We had 9 students take the exam, with 7 passing and two failing. Exam results are shown in Appendix I, as reported by the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES). As can be seen from the results, the SCSU students performed well versus the national averages on this exam. This information can be used for accreditation purposes for our ABET accreditation.
The success is qualified in that 1 student for whom we paid the exam fees failed to attend the exam, and we missed our goal of 20 students. Electrical Engineering students do not generally need to obtain their Professional Engineering license, so interest in taking the exam is low. Also, it would appear that if the students don’t put up the money, they are not concerned with whether they actually take and pass the exam, which is to be expected.
For the exam, the following materials were purchased:
3) HP 33s Scientific Calculators (15)
The Sample questions book is specific to the Electrical Engineering discipline, but the Supplied-Reference Handbook and the calculators could be used by other programs (such as the Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Department) for their student’s use on the FE exam.
The proposed assessment plan for the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering includes the FE exam as part of the assessment. The department will attempt to provide some funds for the exam for students on an every-other year basis. I would make the following recommendations:
1. A stipend or other compensation for a faculty member to assist students with the exam.
2. Further instruction into the exam materials.
3. Reimburse students for the exam costs after they take the exam, rather than pay for the exam outright. Or find another way to encourage students to take the exam after the department pays for it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM Subject</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Comparator Groupings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Probability and Statistics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Business Practices</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Economics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Mechanics (Statics and Dynamics)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Properties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid Mechanics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and Magnetism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermodynamics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuits</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electromagnetics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Systems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Assessment and Data Base Strategies for Distance and On-Campus Students: M.S. in Behavior Analysis

Eric Rudrud, Ph.D. Educational Leadership and Community Psychology
Kim Schulze, Ph.D. Educational Leadership and Community Psychology

M.S. in Behavior Analysis Learning Outcomes:
http://www.stcloudstate.edu/elcp/handbooks/distanceed/general.asp

Project Narrative
The M.S. in Behavior Analysis received accreditation Spring 2005 by the Association of Behavior Analysis (ABA) (http://www.abainternational.org), the Behavior Analyst Certification Board (http://www.bacb.com), and by Minnesota On-Line (http://www.minnesotaonline.org). The M.S. in Behavior Analysis is the first graduate degree to be offered on-line at St. Cloud State University and is the only graduate program in behavior analysis offered in Minnesota. Currently the M.S. in Behavior Analysis program has 90 students who come from 25 states, 4 provinces in Canada, and has students enrolled in New Zealand, Australia, India, and England. We receive upwards of 900 plus students inquire about the distance program each year. We requested funding to develop a comprehensive data base and online course evaluation instruments.

Development of Interactive Data Base
Assessment data will be incorporated into an interactive data base so faculty can retrieve information for accreditation and programmatic purposes. To this end faculty members will explore the use of two different data base programs: ACCESS and File Maker Pro. Information fields will be categorized for data entry and access. Students will be able to enter data into most fields through the internet, i.e., course evaluations, demographic information, practicum and internship activities and evaluations, etc. However, not all data field summaries will be available only to faculty so no confidential nor identifying information will available to un-authorized persons, i.e., students will be able to access information regarding their own performance in a class and the class summaries, but will not be able to access other individual student information.

Project Objectives and Activities
1.0 Development of Student Demographic Data Fields - May, June, July 2005
   1.1 Meet with Graduate Studies to determine which data fields are collected.
   1.2 Identify additional Data fields.
   1.3 Discuss data transfer policies, procedures, and implementation strategies.

2.0 Development of On-Line Qualitative and Quantitative Outcome Measures for Each Course. – July, August, Sept 2005
   2.1 Develop On-Line Course Evaluations for each course
   2.2 Develop Pre and Post Tests for each course
   2.3 Develop authentic assessments protocols for course papers and projects
   2.4 Develop student assessment for satisfaction with on-line environment, i.e. access to course materials.
2.5 Develop student assessment for satisfaction with SCSU’s on-line registration and support programs.
2.6 Meet with SCSU Instructional Technology program to transfer assessment to an on-line environment.

3.0 Development of Interactive Data Base Protocol - August, September 2005
   3.1 Meet with SCSU Instructional Technology program to determine which data base program would be best suited for assessment program.
   3.2 Design Interactive Data Base Protocol
   3.3 Implement Interactive Data Base Protocol.

4.0 Implementation of Data Collection Procedures – September, October, November, December 2005
   4.1 Identify current Graduate Students in M.S. Program
   4.2 Enter Demographic Data into Data Base
   4.3 Incorporate On-Line Assessment Data Forms into existing courses
   4.4 Field Test On-Line Assessment Data Form collection
   4.5 Revise On-Line Assessment Data Forms
   4.6 Students complete On-Line Assessments for Fall Coursework
   4.7 Provide Summary of On-Lines Assessments

5.0 Complete Assessment Summary – December 2005
   5.1 Provide a description of project development and implementation
   5.2 Provide summary of student demographic information
   5.3 Provide summary of pre and post tests results
   5.4 Provide summary of course evaluations
   5.5 Provide a final copy of all evaluation assessments and on-line course evaluation shells
   5.6 Provide summary of how assessment information will be utilized to improve the M.S. in Behavior Analysis Program.

Project Accomplishments
1.0 Development of Student Demographic Data Fields - May, June, July 2005
   1.1 Meet with Graduate Studies to determine which data fields are collected.
   1.2 Identify additional Data fields.
   1.3 Discuss data transfer policies, procedures, and implementation strategies.

We purchased File Maker Pro 7 which was used in the creation of the data base. To date the data base was developed and data for approximately 350 students has been entered. The major obstacles include resources to enter the data and obtaining archival data on students. The following data entry fields were created.
## M.S. Behavior Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>22267 Great North Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Cold Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>56320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country if other than U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Schulze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>A B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Application
- **Date of Application**: 3/1/1998
- **Date of Acceptance**: 1/6/2003
- **Application For**: M.S., BCAB, BCABA
- **Outcome**: Accepted On Campus

### Enrollment
- **Date of Enrollment**: 6/6/2001
- **Date of Blue Sheet**: 6/6/2001

### Graduation
- **Date of Graduation**: 6/6/2002
- **Date of Dismissal**: 6/6/2002
M.S. Behavior Analysis

Record: 272

Last Name: Roberts
First Name: Sarah
Street Address: 22287 Great North Drive
City: Cold Spring
State: MN
Zip: 56320
Advisor: Schulze
Plan: A

Sex: Female
Age: 27
Ethnicity: White
  - African American/Black
  - Latina/o
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Asian/Pacific Islander
  - Other

Country if other than U.S.:
## M.S. Behavior Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Roberts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>22287 Great North Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Cold Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>56320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Schulze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practicum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicum Start Date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practicum Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FamiliesREM Health Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>3101 Wesl 69th St, Suite 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Edina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>55435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practicum Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Supervisor</th>
<th>Dr. Eric Larson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSU Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudrud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schulze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practicum project Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicum Project Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
M.S. Behavior Analysis

Last Name: Roberts
First Name: Sarah
Street Address: 22267 Great North Drive, Cold Spring, MN 56320
City: Cold Spring
State: MN
Zip: 56320
Country if other than U.S.: 

Application Demographic Practicum Internship Thesis/comp Follow-up

Thesis
Thesis Title: The effects of choice versus no-choice on on-task behavior and disruptive behavior with Kindergartners in learning stations

Thesis Advisor: 
○ Bruce
○ Repp
○ Rudrud
○ Schulze

Preliminary Conf Date:
Thesis Defense Date:

Institutional Review Board
IRB Submission Date:
IRB Approval Date:

Comprehensive

Comprehensive 1 Date: 
Outcome 1: 
○ Pass
○ Partial Pass
○ Fail

Comprehensive 2 Date: 
Outcome 2: 
○ Pass
○ Fail
Various reports are created from the data base to summarize data fields, combinations of data fields, and track student progress within the M.S. Program in Behavior Analysis.

2.0 Development of On-Line Qualitative and Quantitative Outcome Measures for Each Course.
   – July, August, Sept 2005
2.1 Develop On-Line Course Evaluations for each course
2.2 Develop Pre and Post Tests for each course
2.3 Develop authentic assessments protocols for course papers and projects
2.4 Develop student assessment for satisfaction with on-line environment, i.e. access to course materials.
2.5 Develop student assessment for satisfaction with SCSU’s on-line registration and support programs.
2.6 Meet with SCSU Instructional Technology program to transfer assessment to an on-line environment.
An online course survey was developed for each course in the M.S. in Behavior Analysis program. This provides a qualitative assessment of our distance based M.S. in Behavior Analysis Program. The major obstacle encountered was Desire2Learn, fall version, was unable to load our survey and we had to wait until Spring Semester 2006 to load the survey. Progress to date, the survey is available in each of our distance based courses.

### Distance Based Course Evaluation

#### Course Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reading level of the material was appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of difficulty of the material was appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of material covered was appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The layout of the course material was appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concepts were explained clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The readings/articles were relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practice quizzes were helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study guides were helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course supplements and links were helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The discussion feature in d2l was helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The test items were representative of course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The test items were difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The test items were relevant to the course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course papers/projects were relevant to the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course papers/projects were graded fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Distance Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have easy access to a computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to access course material easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to access electronic reserves easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to access Library resources easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to contact the instructor easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor returned contacts in a timely fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compared to Traditional Classes
1=Less 3=Same 5=More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The difficulty of the course was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of studying required was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of time spent reading the material was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of new material learned was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you taken another distance based class?

- Yes  
- No

Would you take another distance based course?

- Yes  
- No

Why?
What were the biggest hurdles, barriers, problems encountered when taking a distance based course?

What did you like best about taking a distance based course?

What did you dislike about taking a distance based course?

What changes would you make to the course content?

Please provide additional comments regarding needs not being addressed, positive or negative aspects of the course, support, administration, logistics, etc.
3.0 Development of Interactive Data Base Protocol - August, September 2005
   3.1 Meet with SCSU Instructional Technology program to determine which data base program
       would be best suited for assessment program.
   3.2 Design Interactive Data Base Protocol
   3.3 Implement Interactive Data Base Protocol.

4.0 Implementation of Data Collection Procedures – September, October, November, December 2005
   4.1 Identify current Graduate Students in M.S. Program
   4.2 Enter Demographic Data into Data Base
   4.3 Incorporate On-Line Assessment Data Forms into existing courses
   4.4 Field Test On-Line Assessment Data Form collection
   4.5 Revise On-Line Assessment Data Forms
   4.6 Students complete On-Line Assessments for Fall Coursework
   4.7 Provide Summary of On-Lines Assessments

5.0 Complete Assessment Summary – December 2005
   5.1 Provide a description of project development and implementation
   5.2 Provide summary of student demographic information
   5.3 Provide summary of pre and post tests results
   5.4 Provide summary of course evaluations
   5.5 Provide a final copy of all evaluation assessments and on-line course evaluation shells
   5.6 Provide summary of how assessment information will be utilized to improve the M.S. in
       Behavior Analysis Program.

These activities were accomplished to create the data base and course evaluations. We have developed
pre and post tests for most courses and are collecting data regarding course effectiveness. As we are
still collecting and entering data for this year, we do not have all reports finished. However, we do
know that we have students from 10 different countries, 46 states, and 5 Canadian provinces.

At the end of spring semester we will have the first course evaluations for all distance courses and
results of the pre and post tests for courses was well.

We will write a summary of our results and make them available to the Department Chair, Deans of
College of Education, Dean of Continuing Studies, and Vice Provost.
1. **Title of Assessment Project:** English Graduate Program Assessment

2. **Specific Student Learning Outcomes to be Addressed by the Project:**

   English Department Graduate Program Goals:

   The English Department at St. Cloud State University offers programs in:
   - English, Master of Arts
   - English, Master of Science
   - Teaching English as a Second Language, (TESL) Master of Arts

   Each academic program is dedicated to reasoning, critical thinking, and effective oral and written communication. Although no specific goals can define the Masters in English for every student, the following goals guide areas of emphasis:

   1. Students analyze discourse from a variety of theoretical perspectives, as they pertain to the appropriate fields of rhetoric/composition, linguistics, literary study, and/or creative writing.
   2. Students articulate connections between theories and practices.
   3. When possible, students demonstrate their understanding of theory and practice connections through teaching/tutoring/service learning in departmental or external programs.
   4. Students develop an understanding of rhetorical situations including ability to respond to those situations through writing.
   5. Students develop multicultural awareness through course content, readings, teaching opportunities, and professional development opportunities.
   6. Students develop intercultural communication skills through activities such as international or multicultural experiences within and outside course work including teaching opportunities in multicultural classrooms.
   7. Students develop an awareness of professional options available to them and the types of preparation necessary for succeeding in their chosen career.
   8. Students bring together critical, theoretical knowledge and reflective practice in a variety of contexts.
   9. Depending on emphasis area, students conduct a culminating scholarly or creative achievement or research project and report the results for an academic audience.

   (Approved by English Department 09/04)

3. **Description of Project:**

   This project involved graduate program assessment through two direct assessment methods: analysis of course-embedded assignments to determine if and where we meet our graduate program goals, and holistic scoring of graduate papers to determine the quality of graduate writing. We were guided by ACT materials specifically prepared for NCTLA and SCSU’s Strategic Plan Goal B. KPI B1.
Our work also focused on developing an assessment reporting method that would track where each graduate student meets a departmental goal and in what manner. To do this, we drafted a reporting rubric for approximately 150 students in the English Department Graduate Program. This work required a committee of six graduate faculty to cover all six emphasis areas in our graduate program: Literature, Rhetoric/Applied Writing, Research, TESL, Linguistics and English Education. In this manner we could come to consistent expectations of student work across emphasis areas.

* How does the grant relate to departmental assessment plans?
As listed earlier, the English department has a mission statement and graduate program goals. In light of the upcoming North Central Accreditation visit, we needed to assess our students’ learning and identify where graduate goals are met.

* Findings of project activities:

**Part I.** We first gathered and analyzed syllabi from English 602, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 620, 621, 622, 623, 627, 628, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 640, 650, 652, 653, 655, 656, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 683, 684, 696, 697, 698, 699. This analysis identified where graduate program goals are embedded and what various assessments are implemented.

This analysis of syllabi shows program Goal #1. Students analyze discourse from a variety of theoretical perspectives, as they pertain to the appropriate fields of rhetoric/composition, linguistics, literary study, and/or creative writing. Goal #2. Students articulate connections between theories and practices, and Goal #4. Students develop an understanding of rhetorical situations including ability to respond to those situations through writing, being consistently met across emphasis areas and across courses. (#1 met in 34 of 37 classes, #2 met in 25 of 37 classes, #4 met in 28 of 37 classes).

**Goal #3.** When possible, students demonstrate their understanding of theory and practice connections through teaching/tutoring/service learning in departmental or external programs. Goal #3 was most often met in pedagogy classes (8 out of 8 classes).

Goal #5. Students develop multicultural awareness through course content, readings, teaching opportunities, and professional development opportunities and Goal #6. Students develop intercultural communication skills through activities such as international or multicultural experiences within and outside course work including teaching opportunities in multicultural classrooms, could receive more emphasis in our program ( #5 met in 13 out of 37 classes and #6 met in 18 out of 37 classes).

Goal #7. Students develop an awareness of professional options available to them and the types of preparation necessary for succeeding in their chosen career. We offer professional development sessions throughout each semester, but these are optional for our graduate students. We may need to offer the sessions at a different time.

Goal #8. Students bring together critical, theoretical knowledge and reflective practice in a variety of contexts. This is another goal that could receive more emphasis. (#8 met in 16 of 37 classes).

Goal #9. Depending on emphasis area, students conduct a culminating scholarly or creative achievement or research project and report the results for an academic audience. This goal is met by all of our students who graduate through completion of a thesis, starred papers, portfolio, or creative work. Along their graduate journey, smaller research papers provided practice.

(Refer to Appendix A for list of courses, goals identified and the type of assessment used).

**Suggested Actions:** List graduate goals on syllabi. Note goals met in that course and in what manner. Put more emphasis on goals 5, 6, 7, 8.

**Part II.** Holistic scoring of graduate papers to determine quality of graduate writing. We asked if the writing done by our students meets graduate level expectations.
To do this, we first developed a rubric based on sample papers. We then holistically scored papers from English 606: Bibliographic Research, a course that serves as an introduction to graduate work and academic writing. Once the papers were scored, we spent a long time discussing scores and reasons for those scores. Through this process we refined a rubric that can be used to rate papers in our program and check that graduate goals #1 and 4 (and new #9) are being met in all emphasis areas. (See Appendix B).

**Suggested Action:** Implement rubric in graduate courses. Students will see more consistency in expectations of papers and grading of papers. (The rubric allows each instructor to write his/her own descriptors to fit the particular assignment).

We also developed a chart to track student progress from entry to mid-point to exit level. (See Appendix C)

* **Statement indicating how project will lead to a sustainable assessment endeavor that will continue with little or no funding.**

Because program assessment will be charted and embedded into each required course, funding will not be required. However, program directors will have an increased workload as they chart student progress. The committee’s aim will be to streamline and equalize this work, but it will entail additional workload. Further holistic scoring of graduate papers will need departmental support.

* **How the success of the project will be assessed**

Based on a content-analysis of course syllabi, we identified where goals are embedded, or, as the case may be, where they needed to be embedded. The success of the project will be attained when we chart student progress through the program, as we continue holistic scoring of papers, and as we meet goals in more emphasis areas.

* **Timeline:**

March 28, 2005: proposal due
April 12, 2005: awards announced
Early May, 2005 one non-duty day: one day of committee work to analyze syllabi, link assignments and embedded assessments, establish charts, cover all program emphasis areas, also holistically score writing samples
Early July, 2005 one half non-duty day: one half day of committee work to complete work on syllabi, flow charts, writing rubric and final report
September 22, 2005: Share report with graduate steering committee
October 27, 2005: share results and recommendations with English Department Graduate Faculty
October 30, 2005: final assessment report given to University Assessment Officer

4. **Budget:**

(Costs for 1.5 extra duty days at normal rate of salary for five faculty members).

Michael Connaughton: $647.90
Judy Dorn: $487.62
Catherine Fox: $394.04
Raymond Philippot: $433.17
Jim Robinson: $589.35
Chris Gordon: $584.93

Total amount approved and paid: $3101.01

Appendix A.

Part I. English class - goal met and type of assessment
502 = 1 (lead discussion on theory), 4 (seminar paper)
503 = 1, 2, 4 (readings and MOOs), 5, 7 (readings, discussions) 8 (literacy narrative and web project)
514 =
523 = 1, 2, 4, 8 (reader’s journal, papers, short criticism)
524 = 1, 2, 4, 8 (readings, discussion and papers)
531 = 1 (embedded throughout course), 2 and 4 (course objectives note repertoire of stylistic resources and revising practice), 7 (Journalistic style qualifiers)
532 = 1 (articles assigned), 2 (various writing assignments), 4 (embedded in course), 7 (course itself is to apply principles), 8 (range of distinct assignments)
541 =
542 =
543 = 1 (portfolio), 4 (discussions and feedback), 7 (discussions)
551 = 1 (papers and research), 2 (lesson plans and units), 3 (micro and macro teaching), 4 (papers), 5 and 6 (readings and discussions), 7 (sharing and discussing), 8 (projects)
553 =
554 = 1 and 7 (objectives), 4 (various assignments), 6 (readings), 9 (final project)
559 =
560 =
561 = 1 (readings), 2 (apply through lesson plans), 4 (paper)
562 = 1 (readings), 2 (paper), 6 (research writing)
563 = 1 (paper), 2 (instructional activity), 5 (paper), 6 (paper), 8 (paper)
564 = 1 (project), 6 (project)
565 =
566 = 1 (research), 2 (exercises), 4 (critique), 6 (research paper)
567 = 1 and 7 (objectives), 4 (course description), 6 (profile and test construction), 9 (final project)
569 = 1 (papers), 6 (Research project)
581 = 1, 5, 8 (readings), 4 (research and discussion)
593 =
602
606 = 1 (readings), 2 (paper), 5 (class mix), 4 (research), 6 (ethnic study unit), 9 (annotated bib and oral presentation), 7 (discussions)
607 = 1 (critical review or lit. review), 2 (informal journal), 4 critical review, 7 (informal journal and progress report), 8 (presentations)
608 =
609 =
610 = 1 and 2 (papers), 4 (kinds of assignments), 6 (read multicultural texts), 9 (20 pages critical analysis)
611 = 1 (readings), 2, 4 and 8 (paper and oral presentation)
612 = 1 (readings), 2 (literary movements), 4 (papers), 8 (discussion and report)
613 =
620 =


621 =
622 = 1 (close readings), 4 (seminar paper)
623 =
627 =
628 =
631 =
632 =
633 = 1 and 2, (conversation starters and discussion), 4 and 8 (papers)
634 =
635 =
640 =
650 = 1 (participation, reflection, portfolio), 2 and 3 (final paper), 4 (video analysis), 5 and 6 (content of course), 7 (standards linked to paper), 8 (all assignments)
652 = 1 (analysis of cyber texts), 2 (course description and assignments), 3 and 4 (production of web-based teaching materials), 7 (provided audience)
653 =
655 = 1, 2, 3, (readings and discussions), 4 (reflections), 5, 6 (classroom experiences), 7 (discussions), 8 and 9 (papers and interview)
656 = 1, 2, 3, (discussions), 4 (course requirements), 7 (discussions and speakers), 8 (reflections), 9 annotated bib and oral presentation
661 = 1 (readings and article presentation), 6 (study group), 7 (project), 8 final paper
662 = 1, 2, article presentations, lesson planning, curriculum project), 3 (observation of teaching), 4 (teaching report), 5 and 6 (observe in ESL classes), 7 (lesson planning and curriculum development) 8 (reading theory to application)
663 = 1 (exams, take homes, homework), 2 (paper), 3 (paper on teaching), 4 (take home and paper), 5 and 6 (indirectly with assignments on EEL)
664 = 1 (readings and project), 4 (paper), 5 (grammars study), 8 (paper)
665 = 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 (Journals, video tape teaching, observations, reports, construct syllabi
666 = 1 (critique), 4 and 6 (research)
667 = 1 (readings/discussions), 2 (practice test), 5 (readings), 6 (project)
668 = 1 (readings/discussion, critiques), 2 (literature review), 3 (ethno. Report), 4 (papers), 5 and 6 (assignments focus on multicultural populations)
669 =
683
684
696 = 3 (reflections), 5 and 6 (mc classrooms), 7 (cc teaching), 8 (assignment and assessment development)
697
698
699 = 9 (final thesis, starred papers, portfolio or creative work)

Appendix B.
Part II. Rubric to assess graduate writing goals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate Goal 1</th>
<th>Graduate Goal 4</th>
<th>Graduate Goal 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet minimum expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 1: Students analyze discourse from a variety of theoretical perspectives appropriate to the field under study (e.g., rhetoric, literary studies, TESL).

Goal 4: Students develop an understanding of rhetorical situations including the ability to respond to those situations through writing (i.e., student is rhetorically savvy).

Goal 9 (new goal): Students analyze and evaluate historical and contemporary research as it pertains to a particular discipline.

Note: Not applicable is a designation most likely applied to creative works.
Appendix C.

Tracking Student Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Entry level (use GRE score)

Midpoint (use paper scored holistically)

Goal Attainment (use thesis or other final project)
## Final Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>1/2 of 05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Thesis

| Year | 6  | 16 | 10 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 20 | 16 | 10 |

## Total completed: 8 20 16 21 16 15 13 18 26 19 11 (for 1/2 of year)
The Racial Issues Colloquium obtained an assessment mini-grant in order to support an on-going, longitudinal, cross-departmental assessment of Racial Issues courses. During the summer of 2003, the Colloquium held their annual summer seminar in which they developed a system of pre-and post surveys that instructors in collaborating departments would give to their students as a way to assess students' achievement of knowledge and attitudinal learning outcomes. The cooperating departments include: Ethnic Studies, Community Studies, History, Sociology, and Human Relations (in COE). They used the grant to hire a graduate assistant to carry out the rather complicated process (given the number of courses and instructors) of gathering all of the survey results, coding the data to ensure student and instructor privacy, and having statistical analyses done. One of their goals for this summer's seminar will be to review these results and to reflect upon how they could be used to inform beneficial changes.
1. Introduction
In Fall 2005 we administered the instrument (essay) twice, once at the beginning of the semester and once at the end. It has also been administered as a pretest in the Spring of 2006 and will be administered as a post test at the end of the Spring semester. (These results are not available yet).

Each time it was given to two sections of Core 5, and counted at least somewhat for students’ grades in these sections. We feel that embedding the assessment in a particular course and having the incentive of graded work will enhance the completion rate as we conduct the assessment in future semesters. Compliance in the initial set was almost 100 percent.

The first set was used as a pretest for the purposes of assessing Core 5 and the second set as a posttest. The total number of completed essays in the sample is 151 with a total of 149 with complete data on the student. 55% came from two classes in Political Science. One class did the pretest and one class, taught by a different professor, did the posttest. 45% came from Economics. These came from two classes of the same professor and were both done as pretests.

The two other Core areas obtained pretest and posttest sets from dividing the essays into those written by students who had not yet had that Core area (or who had just begun it) and those who had already had that Core area (or were just finishing it). There were thus a variable number of students in each Core area’s pretest and posttest groups, but there were 147 students overall who participated.

Additional data was gathered from the students through a brief questionnaire attached as a cover to the directions for the essay. In addition to asking about course taking behavior in the Core, we also asked for year in school. 75 freshmen made up about one-half of the sample. 49 sophomores made up another third of the sample. The remaining 6% were juniors and seniors.

2. Instrument
The instrument we created is attached to the end of this document. The three faculty involved in this assessment met various times in the summer of 2005 to discuss a common instrument for assessment of the Core of General Education. We settled on an essay format for our instrument. At the time we felt that this would best get at the various goals in each of the three Core areas being assessed.

We then searched for a common topic and a set of readings for students to use to write the essay. (We have attached those readings and the directions given to students.) We settled on the topic of social security and chose five editorial pieces for students to use as a starting point. We opted for these editorial articles because they had the three essential aspects we were looking for. We wanted the pieces to address the broad topic of public policy and citizen responsibility. We also wanted the pieces to make an argument that could be critiqued for logical accuracy. In addition, we wanted reading selections that presented some quantitative evidence that students could consider in their analysis of the arguments made.

Each of the faculty then developed a rubric to assess the particular goals of the Core area they represent. Below you will find the summary analysis for each Core area.

3. Reports on each of the Core areas assessed

A) Core 3 (Mathematical/Statistical Thinking)

For the Core 3 area, involving a number of quantitative courses (MATH 193, MATH 196, STAT 193, and higher level MATH courses which waive the Core 3 requirement), there are three common goals which have been adopted.

Core 3 Goals:
   A. Students will understand and implement problem solving and decision making strategies.
   B. Students will use mathematical tools that have broad applications to solve real problems.
   C. Students will learn to use reasoning and mathematical tools to communicate and defend their solutions to real problems.

The general goals presented above have been developed into learning objectives to assess this particular essay. While it is not possible to assess all three goals in one instrument, the following rubric attempts to pick out several learning outcomes that can be assessed by the instrument created. Of the three goals, one in particular, Goal C, was identified as being most assessable with this instrument.

On the next page are two tables that summarize the findings for the Pretest and Posttest students.
Pretest results for Core 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>Not at All =0</th>
<th>Minimal Use and Effectiveness =1</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use and Effectiveness =2</th>
<th>Superlative Use and Effectiveness =3</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses quantitative information or reasoning effectively.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses effective representation or interpretation of quantitative information.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of relative magnitudes of quantitative information.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers highlighted in yellow indicate the most common score for that goal area. Numbers highlighted in pink indicate that there were two scores that were close for that goal area making the top category a range between those.

The average total score for a pretest student was 3.68. The scores could range from 0-9, and the actual scores ranged from 0-9.

Posttest results for Core 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>Not at All =0</th>
<th>Minimal Use and Effectiveness =1</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use and Effectiveness =2</th>
<th>Superlative Use and Effectiveness =3</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses quantitative information or reasoning effectively.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses effective representation or interpretation of quantitative information.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of relative magnitudes of quantitative information.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers highlighted in yellow indicate the most common score for that goal area. The average total score for a posttest student was 3.76. The scores could range from 0-9, and the actual scores ranged from 0-8.

The instructions gave no direction to students as to how to incorporate the quantitative data into their essay. So expectations were not particularly high that students would score high according to this rubric. Generally, we can see that students did fairly well in the first two learning outcomes. Most students were able to follow use the given quantitative information in some way to support their own point of view. Very few students explicitly demonstrated
understanding of the relative magnitudes of the quantitative information, although some did so implicitly in their writing.

Comparing the pretest and posttest results, we see that the posttest scores are marginally higher on the first two learning outcomes and overall. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. In this instrument, the students’ use of quantitative information does not seem to be related to whether or not they have already taken a Core 3 course.

B) Core 4 (Critical Reasoning)

Of the 147 essays, 65 were from students who had not taken Phil. 194 (or who were just beginning the course) and 82 were from students who had completed the course (or were just completing it). Seven learning objectives were assessed, and each was assessed according to the corresponding scale:

1) Student identifies arguments
   0: not at all
   1: does so somewhat or unclearly or incorrectly
   2: does so partly clearly and correctly
   3: does so appropriately, explicitly and correctly

2) Student distinguishes premises and conclusions
   (scale as above)

3) Student distinguishes different issues
   (scale as above)

4) Student recognizes propositional inferences
   (scale as above)

5) Student judges deductive validity or inductive strength
   (scale as above)

6) student address objections
   (scale as above)

7) Student avoids/recognizes informal fallacies
   0: neither avoids nor recognizes
   1: recognizes but does not avoid
   2: avoids but does not recognize
   3: both recognizes and avoids

The following table summarizes the results of the scores for the pretest group and the posttest group and the differences between them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>learning objective</th>
<th>pretest</th>
<th>posttest</th>
<th>difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>+ .322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greatest change (nearly half a point) was seen in learning objectives 2 and 5, those dealing with distinguishing premises and conclusions and judging validity and strength. The next largest difference (around a third of a point) was seen in objectives 1 and 7, those dealing with identifying arguments and recognizing and avoiding fallacies. A very small increase (less than a sixth of a point) was seen in objectives 3 and 4, those dealing with distinguishing issues and recognizing propositional inferences. Finally, hardly any increase was seen in objective 6, dealing with addressing objections.

This last result is somewhat surprising; the others less so. In general one would expect to find the more specialized skills (2 and 5) in analyzing reasoning (distinguishing premises and conclusions) and evaluating reasoning (judging validity and strength) to show the greatest improvement after training; and indeed this is what we find.

The other objective which falls into the category of more specialized skills and hence for which one would expect to find more improvement is recognizing propositional inferences (4). That there was far less improvement in this area may be due to the fact that the readings the students were commenting on did not lend themselves very well to such recognition (see Integrated Report point #3 below).

The more modest increases in identifying arguments, recognizing and avoiding fallacies, and distinguishing issues (1, 7, and 3) deserve separate comment.

Most students have some knowledge of what an argument is and can minimally point one out when they see one. This coupled with the fact that they were explicitly asked to do so in the instructions makes is less likely that there would be significant improvement in this area (1) as there would be in some of the other objectives. Students who have studied Critical Reasoning are at most more conscious and explicit about argument identification.

Scores tended to be relatively high for recognizing and avoiding fallacies (7) (indeed the highest scores for both the pretest and the posttest group were found for this objective). Few students actually commented on fallacies; again, the readings gave them little opportunity to do this. However, the scale assigns a 2 to work that neither commits nor discusses fallacies, artificially inflating the scores. It was decided that neither committing nor discussing fallacies deserved a higher score than work that discussed fallacies but committed them as well (these were assigned a 1). It might be a good idea in the future to resolve this objective into two: “student recognizes informal fallacies” and “student avoids informal fallacies”.

Finally, students improved at distinguishing issues (3) by about the same amount as they improved in recognizing propositional inferences (4), which was not very much. Although the readings gave the students some opportunity to address objective 3, it was certainly less central to the task they were asked to do in the instructions than many of the other objectives.
were. It is therefore not surprising that few students addressed this objective at all in their
essays, especially given all that they were expected to do in the space of 1-2 pages.

C) Core 5 (Democratic Citizenship)

When the requirement of a course in Democratic Citizenship was initiated, the faculty
involved developed several goals and learning objectives for this core area. In all section of
Democratic Citizenship, students will demonstrate knowledge, values and skills of citizenship
in a democracy by covering the following five goals.

A. *Students will understand and appreciate that an important and primary
   purpose of higher education and of general education is preparation for
citizenship and for participation in a democratic society.*

B. *Students will identify the skills needed for responsible citizenship and
demonstrate the ability to apply those skills to contribute to the common
welfare of society.*

C. *Students will analyze the citizen’s role in society and critically examine
diverse values about people, society, and the environment.*

D. *Students will integrate knowledge from several disciplines and demonstrate
understanding that citizenship and responsibility have multiple facets within
pluralistic society.*

E. *Students will evaluate ethical responsibilities in their personal, professional
and public lives and relate these value to other people, to society, and to the
biophysical environment.*

The general goals presented in the document that created Core 5 have been developed into
learning objectives to assess this particular essay. While it is not possible to assess all five
goals in one instrument, the following rubric attempts to pick out several goals that can be
assessed by the instrument created.

Below is a table that summarizes the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Minimal Use and Effectiveness</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use and Effectiveness</th>
<th>Superlative Use and Effectiveness</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets substantive requirements and addresses the topic set forth in the guidelines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes reference to materials provided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes reference to materials other than those provided</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains correct usage of terms and concepts related to the subject of Democratic Citizenship</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses multiple viewpoints and critically examines diverse values</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates ethical responsibilities in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their personal, professional, and public lives

| Identifies skills needed for responsible citizenship | 58 | 62 | 23 | 6 | .95 |
| Integrates knowledge from several disciplines | 83 | 48 | 16 | 2 | .69 |
| | 141 | 7 | 0 | 0 | .167 |

Note: Numbers highlighted in yellow indicate the most common score for that goal area.

Generally, we can see that students did fairly well in the first two goal areas. All students were able to follow the basic directions and a large majority were able to satisfactorily work with the materials provided. Almost no students made reference to materials other than the editorials provided.

Additionally, students were at least minimally competent in addressing a variety of viewpoints and using the language of democratic governance. However, very few students were able to evaluate ethical responsibility or identify the skills of citizenship. Only seven students were able to integrate knowledge from several disciplines. This may be due to the wording of the directions for the assignment. The specific instructions do not ask them to do this so in a relatively short assignment it may be difficult to assess this goal.

### Pre-Test / Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>Not at All =0</th>
<th>Minimal Use and Effectiveness =1</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use and Effectiveness =2</th>
<th>Superlative Use and Effectiveness =3</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets substantive requirements and addresses the topic set forth in the guidelines</td>
<td>Pre 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes reference to materials provided</td>
<td>Pre 6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes reference to materials other than those provided</td>
<td>Pre 100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains correct usage of terms and concepts related to the subject of Democratic Citizenship</td>
<td>Pre 12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses multiple viewpoints and critically examines diverse values</td>
<td>Pre 7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluates ethical
responsibilities in their personal, professional, and public lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifies skills needed for responsible citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrates knowledge from several disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers highlighted in yellow indicate the most common score for that goal area.

From the Pre-Test and Post-Test data we can see that the general trends in the data remain the same. In each category, all students were able to follow the basic directions and a large majority were able to satisfactorily work with the materials provided. Almost no students made reference to materials other then the editorials provided. Statistically there is no difference between those that took the course and those that did not.

Having said that, it should be noted that the group for the pos-test was far smaller than the group for the pre-test. We would need much larger samples of each before we could feel confident in the validity of our analysis. We should not make any rash judgements about the quality of the Democratic Citizenship experience until we have collected more data. However, we can already see that there may be areas where we can increase our efforts.

4. Integrated report and recommendations

The reports above indicate some interesting issues. Most notably, very little improvement was seen for several of the learning objectives. There are several possible explanations for this, and probably all are factors in the results.

1) Student learning needs to be improved. This no doubt goes without saying. However, it would be easy to design in instrument which would show great improvement (by testing knowledge of technical vocabulary, for example) but which might not show the true level of understanding on the part of the students. Real increase in understanding is likely to be modest in the best of situations; students enrolled in MATH/STAT 193 are not likely to be very mathematically inclined, for example.

2) Although the instrument is designed to assess three different Core areas, the fact is that it counted for students' grades in only one area, Core 5, the area in which it was administered. Students likely were shaping their answers for the course in which their grade for it would count. At the very least, even though the instructions ask them address the material from the perspectives of Core 3 and Core 4 as well as Core 5, Core 5 issues would be likely to loom large in their thinking, given the context in which the instrument was administered. It would be interesting to see if the results would be different if it were administered in other Core areas.
3) It is extremely difficult to find a set of readings students’ responses to which can show what they know, not only in three different areas, but relative to several different learning objectives in each. We gathered excellent materials, but it was impossible to find a limited enough number of readings that were short enough, but which still gave students adequate opportunity to address all the learning objectives we found important.

We recommend that the instrument be revised in one of two ways.

The more conservative approach is simply to change the reading prompts to give students more of an opportunity to address the learning objectives. This can be done in two ways. One is to find readings that target our learning objectives better. This would be very difficult; we found it very difficult to find ones that were as good for our purposes as these were. The other way is devise readings ourselves. This would also be difficult, and in principle it would be nicer to have actual rather than contrived readings. But devising ones ourselves would at least allow us to make sure the students have good opportunities to address the objectives we want addressed.

The other approach would be to abandon the essay format of the instrument while retaining these or other reading prompts, and substitute a series of multiple choice or even short answer questions. Multiple choice questions would have the advantage of requiring little grading time on the part of faculty. It would also enable to us to target more specifically the learning objectives that we want to assess. The instructions for the essay are focused enough to give students the opportunity to address the learning objectives, but are necessarily vague enough to make it somewhat unlikely that they will not. They are asked to "address the issues of public policy and the debate over individual vs. public responsibility… To develop your point of view, examine the views expressed in the handouts, then identify, analyze and critically evaluate the authors’ arguments and quantitative reasoning." Several more specific and more directed questions would enable us to gauge their level of understanding better. The disadvantage is that this format would not allow writing to be assessed, while the current format could easily be revised to include objectives related to Core 1.

5. Project success and plan for changes

Our proposal specified success of the project in terms of satisfaction of our timeline (see attached). The project was not technically successful in this way. For example, our timeline specified that we choose readings for the instrument in June, but we did not finalize these until August. Our rubrics and questionnaire were not completely developed until August either. But the pretest and posttest were administered in September and December respectively, as per the timeline, and these were the crucial dates to observe. We set the other dates merely to ensure we would be ready for administering the test, which we were. The essays were read and analyzed in December, January, and February, rather than all in December, and obviously this report is being submitted in April rather than in December, in accordance with the extension provided by the Assessment Office. In any case it would have been difficult to process all the data by December as the posttests had to wait until the end of the semester to be administered. All in all, although we did not adhere to the letter of our timeline, we believe our results have been processed in a timely fashion.
Our immediate plans for change as a result of this project revolve around revising the instrument as discussed above rather than making recommendations for programmatic change. It would be premature to make program changes on the basis of a pilot instrument such as this. However it seems clear on the basis of our results that students do not tend to transfer skills from one Core area to another (no doubt this is a problem generally and not just with our Core areas). It is not clear whether they are unable to or just that they tend to compartmentalize their learning. More focused questions on such an instrument as this would help make this clear. In any case, more assignments where students are required to apply what they have learned in different contexts seem to be called for. If students are expected to use their learning in a variety of ways it may become more second-nature to them to apply their learning more widely. We therefore recommend that instructors of our Core areas (and probably others) regularly use a variety of issues, readings, contexts, etc. to test student learning. This may encourage students to apply their skills more widely.
Appendix A- Assessment Instrument Directions

General Education: Core Assessment

First, please answer the following questions. Make two copies of your essay and staple this sheet to the front of one of your essays when you hand them in. Thank you.

1. Date you’re turning this assignment in: ____________

2. Department & Course Number for this course: __________

3. Check off the Core areas you have completed (already received a grade for):
   _____ Core 1: Rhetorical and Analytical Writing (ENGL 191)
   _____ Core 2: Communication Studies (CMST 192)
   _____ Core 3: Mathematical Statistical Thinking (MATH/STAT 193)
   _____ Core 4: Critical Reasoning (PHIL 194)
   _____ Core 5: Democratic Citizenship (CMTY 195, ECON 195, HIST 195, POL 195, SOC 195, or SW 195)

4. Check off the Core areas you are currently enrolled in:
   _____ Core 1: Rhetorical and Analytical Writing (ENGL 191)
   _____ Core 2: Communication Studies (CMST 192)
   _____ Core 3: Mathematical Statistical Thinking (MATH/STAT 193)
   _____ Core 4: Critical Reasoning (PHIL 194)
   _____ Core 5: Democratic Citizenship (CMTY 195, ECON 195, HIST 195, POL 195, SOC 195, or SW 195)

5. Place a check next to your class rank according to how many credits you have completed:
   Freshman (0-29) _____
   Sophomore (30-59) _____
   Junior (60-89) _____
   Senior (90+) _____

Social Security Debate

Democratic societies depend on public debate and discussion for a healthy development of public policy. “Debate as dialogue… is the lifeblood of democracy. Democracy is the one form of government that requires leaders to give reasons for their decisions and defend them in public…. Debate is crucial to a democracy not just because it leads to better decisions but because it helps to create better citizens…. This process of listening attentively to different sides and examining their assumptions helps us to clarify and critically examine our own political values.”

Often times the outcome of public policy is directly related to the quality of debate on the issue. The assumptions and standards we bring to our understanding of important issues affects our evaluation. The media play an important role in this regard; attached are several

---

articles that have appeared recently in major newspapers addressing the current situation in Social Security.
Writing Assignment:
Attached are four readings which explain different points of view concerning the current debate about Social Security and discuss possible changes to the system. Your assignment is to comment on the debate over Social Security, and how it relates to the issue of policy development in a democratic society.

Write a 1-2 page essay in which you address the issues of public policy and the debate over individual vs. public responsibility discussed in the readings. To develop your point of view, examine the views expressed in the handouts, then identify, analyze and critically evaluate the authors’ arguments and quantitative reasoning. Feel free to use research beyond the material presented here. We have also included a summary of the issue and additional data to assist you.

Summary Of Fiscal Situation Related To Social Security:

- Workers and employers in the U.S. are currently paying in more each year to the Social Security system than is being paid out in benefits. The excess goes into the Social Security trust fund, somewhat like a savings account. This annual excess will peak in the year 2008, and then begin to decline. In 2018, it is projected that as a country, we will pay out more in benefits than we take in, so that the total amount in the trust fund will begin to decline. It is projected that without further changes or adjustments to the system, the trust fund will disappear between 2042 and 2052 (depending on how the projections are made). At that point, more taxation from workers will be required to pay benefits or benefits to retirees will have to be cut. The current debate involves how to avoid waiting until the middle of the century to face up to this problem. Privatization of Social Security is a possible solution proposed by President Bush. Privatization would mean designating some of the Social Security assets to individual accounts for each worker, which might be invested by workers in higher yielding investments, such as stocks. Such investments would be subject to market fluctuations, which may increase or decrease a worker’s retirement benefit.

Some Additional Facts And Figures:

- There are currently about 47 million people receiving Social Security benefits.
- Of these, about 17 million are not retired workers, but are disabled workers, spouses and children of retired or disabled workers, spouses and children of deceased workers.
- The average benefit paid by Social Security is approximately $10,740 per year.
- For the majority of households headed by someone age 65 or over, Social Security provides more than half their current income.
- The current amount paid into Social Security is 12.4% of each worker’s wage income, up to a maximum wage of $90,000 annually. This percentage and wage maximum have historically risen over the years. Current projections assume the 12.4% remains constant in future years, while the maximum wage increases according to the cost-of-living.
- Currently, the annual benefits paid by the Social Security system are 80% of what is received. The remaining 20% goes into the Social Security trust fund.
- The current amount in the Social Security trust fund reserves is over $1.6 trillion, which has been accumulated over a 22 year period.
• The U.S. government has borrowed against these reserves to meet current budget obligations, and issued Treasury bonds to represent the value of this debt to the reserve.

• By the year 2018, it is projected that the trust fund reserves will grow to about $5.3 trillion, and by the year 2025, grow to about $6.5 trillion, including the interest owed on the Treasury bonds.

• By the year 2080, it is projected that there will be an accumulated shortfall in Social Security resources of $3.7 trillion over a 30 year period, with the onset of the shortfall projected to start around the middle of this century.

• From the beginning of the Social Security shortfall, it is projected that there will be sufficient resources available to cover between 73% to 80% of the obligations to Social Security beneficiaries.

• Recent decades of robust economic growth and productivity have softened the magnitude of the projected shortfall. If this level of economic growth continues for the coming decades, the problem will be less severe than what is described.

• As an investment, government bonds typically yield a rate of return about 2% above inflation. Historically, rates of return for riskier investments such as stocks yield a higher average rate of return, but with more variation from year to year in that rate of return. Stocks sometimes suffer a poorer return on investment in comparison to bonds, but more often yield a higher rate of return than bonds.
Reports of program's demise are greatly exaggerated

Stephen Moore, a 44-year-old Republican activist who supports partially privatizing Social Security, is decidedly skeptical about what awaits him in retirement. "I'm with the majority of people my age who think it's more likely that we're going to see a flying saucer ... than a Social Security check," he told TheWashington Post recently.

Hyperbole to be sure. But Moore has plenty of company. Half of the respondents to a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll last month said they did not expect to receive Social Security when they retire. Among those under 30, 62% said they didn't expect such a benefit.

President Bush is expected to use his State of the Union address tonight to promote his plan to allow people to divert a portion of their Social Security taxes into accounts under their control. To sell the plan, Bush has described Social Security as a crisis that needs to be addressed urgently.

Bush's proposal may have merit. But portraying Social Security as a system in crisis overstates the problem and adds needless emotion to what should be a sober and deliberative debate.

Social Security does need a fix. Left alone, it will begin to pay out more than it takes in about 2018, as baby boomers retire. By 2042, according to the Social Security Administration, or 2052, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it will have spent its reserves.

Social Security is not in such dire shape, however, that the existence of future benefits is in any serious doubt. The size of those benefits will depend on many factors, including acts of Congress.

Some widely accepted facts to bear in mind:

- **Immediate fix.** According to Social Security's trustees, the system could be fixed for at least the next 75 years by increasing the tax, paid collectively by you and your employer, from 12.4% to 14.3%. Alternatively, it could be fixed by decreasing payouts by an average of 13%. While these unpleasant options are not being recommended, they show how a fix — either in conjunction with private accounts, or not — is within reach.

- **Worst-case scenario.** If nothing is done and Social Security depletes its reserves at mid-century, it could still pay benefits at 73% of the level it currently promises, simply by lowering its payouts to the amount it takes in each year. Again, not politically palatable, but a lot more than zero.

- **Problems in perspective.** If nothing is done, Social Security could still pay promised benefits for 75 years by borrowing $3.7 trillion. That's a troubling amount of debt, to be sure. But it's less than the $8 trillion the recently enacted Medicare drug benefit is expected to cost during that time, or the $11 trillion in lost revenues caused by the tax cuts enacted in President Bush's first term.

- **Other solutions** Plenty of proposals exist to shore up Social Security, with or without private accounts. One is to raise the retirement ages, now at 62 for early retirement and as high as 67 for full retirement, to account for longer life spans. Other proposals include cutting benefits for affluent retirees, or reducing cost-of-living adjustments by pegging them to inflation rather than to the average annual growth in wages.

Social Security does, of course, present a problem well before 2042. As its annual surpluses, now at more than $150 billion, shrink and then turn to deficits, the total amount of government borrowing will skyrocket. But this will have to be addressed by controlling all forms of spending, most notably runaway health care costs, a far bigger problem than Social Security.
Many supporters of individual accounts argue they need to accentuate the negative to get Congress to act now, rather than postponing a fix until some point in the future, when it will cost more. This is a valid point. Congress is not naturally inclined to fix problems unless it concludes it absolutely has to.

But Congress should not feel pressured to adopt a particular course of action, such as individual accounts, based on exaggerated claims about Social Security's problems. Even the biggest champions of individual accounts don't seriously argue that Social Security won't be there for retirees in several decades. They merely argue that such accounts will yield better returns.

As the debate begins, a thorough examination of the problems leads to one unavoidable conclusion: Unlike flying saucers, Social Security will be around.
Kinsley's Proof That Social Security Privatization Won't Work
By Michael Kinsley

MY CONTENTION: Social Security privatization is not just unlikely to succeed, for various reasons that are subject to discussion. It is mathematically certain to fail. Discussion is pointless.

The usual case against privatization is that (1) millions of inexperienced investors may end up worse off, and (2) stocks don't necessarily do better than bonds over the long run, as proponents assume. But privatization won't work for a better reason: It can't possibly work, even in theory.

The logic is not very complicated:

1. To "work," privatization must generate more money for retirees than current arrangements. This bonus is supposed to be extra money in retirees' pockets and/or it is supposed to make up for a reduction in promised benefits, thus helping to close the looming revenue gap.

2. Where does this bonus come from? There are only two possibilities-- from greater economic growth or from other people.

3. Greater economic growth requires either more capital to invest or smarter investment of the same amount of capital. Privatization will not lead to either of these.

   a) If nothing else in the federal budget changes, every dollar deflected from the federal treasury into private Social Security accounts must be replaced by a dollar that the government raises in private markets. So the total pool of capital available for private investment remains the same.

   b) The only change in decision-making about capital investment is that the decisions about some fraction of the capital stock will be made by people with little or no financial experience. Maybe this will not be the disaster that some critics predict, but there is no reason to think that it will actually increase the overall return on capital.

4. If the economy doesn't produce more than it otherwise would, the Social Security privatization bonus must come from other investors, in the form of a lower return.

   a) This is in fact the implicit assumption behind the notion of putting Social Security money into stocks, instead of government bonds, because stocks have a better long-term return. The bonus will come from those saps who sell the stocks and buy the bonds.

   b) In other words, privatization means betting the nation's most important social program on a theory that cannot be true unless many people are convinced that it's false.

   c) Even if the theory were true, initially, privatization would make it false. The money newly available for private investment would bid up the price of (and thus lower the return on) stocks, while the government would need to raise the interest on bonds in order to attract replacement money.

Privatization's Empty Hype

My argument define[s] success as bringing in more money than the current system. More money is the essential ingredient for either of the benefits usually claimed for privatization: closing the gap between projected benefits and revenues, and/or providing a bonus to future retirees.

More money for Social Security must come from somewhere. If reform doesn't somehow increase economic growth, the money must come somehow out of the pockets of other people.

Increased growth requires more private investment or smarter private investment. Privatization would deflect some money from the Social Security trust fund into private investment, but the government would have to
borrow an equal amount to replace it. So the total pool of capital available for investing wouldn't change. As for smarter investing, the only change caused by privatization would be a new role for millions of small, naive investors. There is no credible theory that this would improve the wisdom of capital investment decisions.

Many people believe that stocks pay better than bonds in the (risk-adjusted) long run. If so, letting people buy stocks with part of their Social Security tax payments would improve Social Security's overall return. But the bonus would have to come from whoever was silly enough, in this scenario, to buy bonds.

Privatization, in other words, requires Americans to accept a theory (stocks are better than bonds) that can be true only as long as lots of people believe that it is false. And the White House is campaigning hard to convince everyone that the theory is true. If the campaign succeeds, the theory fails.

Where am I wrong here? Gregory Mankiw, outgoing chairman of the president's Council of Economic Advisors, sent me a Berkeley economist Brad DeLong and blogger Mickey Kaus, among others, challenged my argument that nothing about privatization promises to increase private investment. They cited research by economist Martin Feldstein showing that Social Security reduces personal savings. Big surprise: If you know you've got a nest egg coming from the government, you may not be as avid a saver. It follows that less social security should increase personal savings.

But privatization is supposed to enlarge your nest egg, not produce a net loss. By the Feldstein thesis, that would reduce private saving. So once again, privatization relies on a theory that is wrong if it's right, and right only if it's wrong.

Stephen Moore, president of the Club for Growth, is probably the leading non-administration voice in favor of privatization. His e-mail, direct from President Bush's recent economic conference, made only two fresh points.

Moore also argues, as did others who wrote in, that a smaller Social Security trust fund to borrow from would lead the government to cut spending. Maybe. But justifying a policy on the grounds that it will indirectly create pressure to cut government spending has become a tired old game.

Republicans control the entire federal government. If they want to cut government spending, they should do it. They don't need to trash Social Security along the way.
A Surplus Idea
Congress should give workers back their extra Social Security taxes.

Thursday, June 23, 2005 12:01 a.m. EDT

The conventional Beltway wisdom says Social Security reform is dead, thanks to near-unanimous Democratic opposition. Well, not so fast. Republican reformers are introducing a new plan to invest Social Security surplus funds into personal accounts that has the potential to shake up the debate.

Wisconsin Congressman Paul Ryan and South Carolina Senator Jim DeMint are calling for legislation to bring an immediate halt to the ongoing political raid on the surplus payroll taxes collected by Social Security. Congress now spends that cash on current programs--from cotton subsidies, to defense, to the Dr. Seuss Museum. Every day that Congress fails to act, another $200 million is spent rather than being saved for future retirement. Daniel Patrick Moynihan once called this "thievery," and if corporate America were engaged in this type of accounting fraud Eliot Spitzer would be hauling CEOs to jail.

Instead of spending this retirement money, the reformers would allow individual workers to divert every surplus Social Security dollar--from now until the extra cash runs out in 2016--into personal retirement accounts. For the record, we endorsed this idea some months ago, so we're glad to see it gaining steam. Here's how it would work:

For the past 20 or so years, the federal government has collected $1.67 trillion more in payroll taxes (and accumulated interest) than it has paid out in retirement benefits to senior citizens. But not a penny of this money has been saved for any worker's retirement. The surplus dollars get spent by Congress, and the Social Security system is credited with an IOU from the right hand of the government, the Treasury Department.

This is the point President Bush made earlier this year when he went to West Virginia, opened up the Social Security "vault" as it were, and pulled out stacks of these government IOUs. These are essentially a debt the government owes to itself, and where the money will come from to pay these debts is anyone's guess--though if history is any guide it will be higher taxes. Wherever the money comes from, it can't be from the Social Security "trust fund" because those dollars have already been spent.

DeMint-Ryan would allow workers to create individual personal retirement accounts and place marketable government bonds worth their portion of the Social Security surplus into these accounts. Think of this as creating 140 million "lock box" accounts, one for every American worker. After three years, workers could trade these Treasury bonds and invest instead in higher-return mutual funds containing a combination of corporate stocks and bonds.
We're talking big dollars for most families. The federal government will continue to run surpluses of about $1.2 trillion through 2016 on a cash basis, and some $3 trillion through 2026 if interest on that cash is also counted. The nearby table shows the scale of the annual surplus cash payments, and how much larger they'd be if interest on them were included. The DeMint-Ryan proposal doesn't currently include interest, though we think it would be improved by doing so.

Workers deserve this interest since it is being paid on money that they earned. And if interest were included, workers would get payments into their accounts for 20 years instead of 10. A worker with a $40,000 salary would get an average of 3% of his paycheck deposited in a personal account, or roughly $1,200 a year. A 25-year-old making a median wage, and earning 4% interest, would have an account worth nearly $100,000 by age 67.

The virtues of this proposal are both economic and political. By investing the surplus, rather than letting Congress spend it, the money would be put to better economic use and add to net national saving. The latter ought to please the deficit scolds in particular.

Another benefit is that Congress wouldn't be able to keep using the Social Security surplus to disguise its other spending habits. This means more-honest federal budgeting, and we hope more pressure for spending discipline. Members can check out a list released this week by the Free Enterprise Fund of $80 billion in corporate welfare and pork barrel projects that could be extinguished to make up the difference.

As for the politics, this calls the bluff of Democrats who claim to be the sole protectors of the Social Security trust fund but have done nothing to stop depleting it. Do they want to protect it or not? And by investing only surplus payroll taxes into private accounts, the proposal blunts the (specious but politically potent) attacks from AARP and the left that personal accounts will endanger the program's solvency. The DeMint-Ryan plan enhances solvency by preventing raids on the trust fund, which is a practice that has long infuriated senior citizens.

The other political benefit is that this idea positions reformers for a longer run debate if the Social Security effort fails during this Congress. In order to succeed, reform was always going to require bipartisan cooperation, and at least five Senate Democratic votes. Yet Democratic leaders have made opposition to reform a party obligation and not one has budged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People Power</th>
<th>Social Security trust fund surplus per worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>$5,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes 4% interest.
Source: Social Security Administration, 2005.
Republicans are under no obligation to commit suicide by voting for benefit cuts in the House and Senate if reform has no chance of succeeding. The invest-the-surplus idea gives Democrats one more chance to join the reform party, while putting reformers in a stronger position going into 2006 if Democrats refuse.
As lives get longer, benefits should come later

When President Bush recently proposed curbing Social Security benefits for middle- and upper-income workers, he certainly took a gamble.

His plan, known as "progressive indexing," would slice deeply into monthly benefits — and not just for the rich. A 25-year-old making $36,000, for instance, would get checks 16% smaller at retirement than what's currently promised. Reductions rise with incomes. Perhaps unsurprisingly, initial reviews of the plan have been mixed at best.

But hate it or love it, Bush's idea at least creates a benchmark to measure other sacrifices against. No cost-free alternative exists, but we think a better tradeoff is available: Increase the retirement age.

Like Bush's proposal, this is not popular. But unlike Bush's plan — in fact, unlike any other proposal — it addresses the principal reason Social Security has a problem to begin with: People are living longer and therefore collecting more in benefits.

In 1941, the first year Social Security benefits were paid, the average person who made it to 65 would live another 13 years. Now, that same person is projected to live 18 more years. Health advances are expected to continue driving life expectancies upward.

That's good news, of course, but also a big part of the solvency problem. There's precedent for raising the retirement age: It was part of the last Social Security bailout, in 1983. Congress acted very gingerly then, phasing in an increase, from 65 to 67, of the age you can collect full retirement benefits. In the 22 years since, the age has moved a grand total of four months. It won't reach 67 until 2027. Meanwhile, about 55% of workers don't even wait for the full retirement age. They take early retirement as young as 62.

Increasing the retirement age and making it less financially attractive to retire early are logical parts of any plan to fix Social Security. An increase to age 70 would address from one-third to two-thirds of the program's long-term solvency problem, depending on how quickly it takes place, according to Social Security Administration projections.

We'd oppose moving the goal posts abruptly for those currently approaching retirement age. But for younger workers, already skeptical about whether Social Security will be there for them, a higher age could be factored into their retirement planning.

Gradually raising the retirement age could also help generate a healthier economy and a more equitable society. Consider:

• **Government of and for the retired.** Forty cents of every federal dollar spent go to a retired person. That includes Social Security, Medicare and benefits for retired government workers. This amount, about $800 billion, is almost 10 times what government spends on education at all levels from Head Start to post-doctoral fellowships.

• **A heavy tax burden on workers.** The amount of benefits paid annually is more than 4,000 times what it was in 1941. To pay for these soaring benefits, the tax rate has been increased 22 times, taking it from 2% to 12.4%.

• **The new workforce.** Many economists see healthy people ages 65 to 75 as the nation's biggest untapped resource. Currently, 12% of those older than 65 are in the workforce. If that number rose to just 25%, about 4 million jobs would be added to the economy, producing $360 billion a year in economic output.
Perhaps the best argument against increasing the retirement age is the disparity between white- and blue-collar workers. A lawyer or accountant is generally more capable of continuing to work at age 65 or 70 than is a miner or waitress. That argues for leaving the retirement age where it is for people in certain manual labor jobs or with disabilities.

No idea for fixing Social Security is without drawbacks. But raising the retirement age ought to be part of the solution. It would not involve increasing taxes or cutting monthly checks. Unlike the Bush plan, it would not undermine support within the middle and upper classes by causing them to see Social Security as welfare. It would not drive up the national debt.

And, unlike many other proposals circulating in Washington, it would not radically restructure what is, after all, the most popular and successful government program ever.

• **Government of and for the retired.** Forty cents of every federal dollar spent go to a retired person. That includes Social Security, Medicare and benefits for retired government workers. This amount, about $800 billion, is almost 10 times what government spends on education at all levels from Head Start to post-doctoral fellowships.

• **A heavy tax burden on workers.** The amount of benefits paid annually is more than 4,000 times what it was in 1941. To pay for these soaring benefits, the tax rate has been increased 22 times, taking it from 2% to 12.4%.

• **The new workforce.** Many economists see healthy people ages 65 to 75 as the nation's biggest untapped resource. Currently, 12% of those older than 65 are in the workforce. If that number rose to just 25%, about 4 million jobs would be added to the economy, producing $360 billion a year in economic output.

Perhaps the best argument against increasing the retirement age is the disparity between white- and blue-collar workers. A lawyer or accountant is generally more capable of continuing to work at age 65 or 70 than is a miner or waitress. That argues for leaving the retirement age where it is for people in certain manual labor jobs or with disabilities.

No idea for fixing Social Security is without drawbacks. But raising the retirement age ought to be part of the solution. It would not involve increasing taxes or cutting monthly checks. Unlike the Bush plan, it would not undermine support within the middle and upper classes by causing them to see Social Security as welfare. It would not drive up the national debt.

And, unlike many other proposals circulating in Washington, it would not radically restructure what is, after all, the most popular and successful government program ever.
I am writing to report on the assessment grant I received last year.

The purpose of the grant was to support development of a new Entry/Exit exam to assess the increase in the factual and theoretical knowledge in Mass Communication as a result of going through the program.

I developed a completely new test, with 60 multiple choice items covering the major areas of knowledge expected from a Mass Communications major, and circulated it among the faculty for approval.

The test was administered to 107 students with intended Mass Comm majors in COMM 220. The test will again be administered at the end of this semester to graduating students. We will compare the results to see whether increases in these areas will be apparent.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Warm regards,

Roya Majid
Chair and Professor
Department of Mass Communications
Summary for Assessment Grant 2005

Title of assessment project  Developing Assessment Instruments for Core Three

Applicants  Dale Buske, Sandra Johnson, Shawn Triplett, Department of Mathematics
            David Robinson, Department of Statistics

Description of the project proposal;
The applicants will
1. develop test questions to measure the core learning outcomes as they apply to
courses that fulfill the SCSU General Education core three requirement.
2. administer these questions to at least 300 students enrolled in MATH 193, STAT
   193, MATH 112, MATH 115, MATH 211 or MATH 221.
3. analyze student responses.
4. use data from analysis to recommend questions for future use and design additional
direct measures.

Our assessment was based on two of the five Core Learning Outcomes:
Students will identify and analyze problems in various contexts and will design
solutions.
Students will learn to learn by employing various methods to obtain, classify,
analyze, synthesize, and apply knowledge.

Knowing that the content of these courses varies widely, we decided to define a type of
question which could be asked using the content of each individual course. Our description of
the type of questions we developed is:
Translate a problem described verbally or by tables, diagrams or graphs into symbolic
language, solve the problem and interpret the result in the original context.
The questions were administered in pre and post tests. For each question, we developed a
scoring rubric. Student responses were analyzed and compared.

Sustainable assessment endeavor
Pre and post tests were administered to 724 math students and 215 stat students. In every class,
the average score improved from pre to post test. The committee concluded that the method was
sound, but that questions needed to meet clearly stated criteria. The questions developed in this project
will be improved and embedded in tests providing a direct measure of student learning in subsequent
years. These measures will serve as models for developing further assessments in both departments,
and may be used by other departments as well. The final result will be a set of questions, classified
according to the five Core Learning Outcomes, with appropriate scoring rubrics and accompanying
data.
Summary of the Project entitled “**Standard Test Bank of PHYS 232/235 to assess students’ performance**”

- Test Bank generation: The initial “FCI Prime” test bank has been completed from the exam papers developed by faculty and other resources (making sure not to infringe on copyrights).
- We have written 30 questions for the “FCI Prime” covering topics of Waves, Electricity, Magnetism, Light, and Optics. We are working on the guidelines for administering the exam during 2006-2007 course offerings and how to assess the results (based in part on the assessment tools we develop for the FCI).
- A class consisting of approximately 60 students has been assessed using a pre-existing assessment tool (32 question multiple-choice survey). For comparison, the results from the SCSU students were compared with a national average on this survey. The baseline with which to compare consists of results from approximately 5000 physics students across the country. SCSU students scored “at or above the national average”.
- We have analyzed our results from the FCI for the 2004-2005 academic year, comparing both pre- and post-test results. Successful completion of this goal has given us guidance for improvement in our Physics 231/234 pedagogy.
Report on Fall 2005 Assessment Grant

Assessment of Applied Sociology Senior Projects

James Sherohman
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

April 12, 2006

The goal of my project was to establish and implement procedures for using senior projects to assess selected learning objectives for the Applied Sociology Concentration. Based upon criteria for the senior project that had been approved by program faculty several years ago, I focused on the following three learning objectives:

1) Students in the program will be familiar with the discipline of sociology, such that they will be able to adopt a sociological perspective toward a situation or problem and explain how this perspective is sociological.

2) Students in the program will be familiar with sociological theory and its relationship to sociological practice, such that they will understand the value, as well as the limitations, of sociological theories as tools for examining issues & making recommendations for change.

3) Students in the program will be familiar with research methods and their relationship to sociological practice, such that they will understand the value, as well as the limitations, of research methods as tools for examining issues & making recommendations for change.

The project consisted of the activities listed below. This report fulfills Step 5. In the remainder of this report, I discuss the other four steps.

1) Inventory all senior projects in department files and create a database including student name, name of instructor, semester of graduation, title of senior project, assessment results (from this project), and date that assessment results were recorded. Although this project will assess only the senior projects of applied sociology students, all senior projects will be included in the database. This will make it easier to expand assessment to students in other sociology programs in the future. Work study students will do most or all of the data entry, but I will supervise their work and monitor it for accuracy.

2) In consultation with the Applied Sociology Committee (a committee of faculty members who teach courses in the program), I will develop measures and coding instructions for assessing the degree to which senior projects meet selected learning objectives of the program (see section 3A above). Since the data are qualitative, I will develop the indicators using an inductive method. I will code all of the senior projects myself, and I will ask an advanced work study student to code some of them as well, in order to test the clarity of the coding instructions and to see whether my coding is reliable.

3) Assess the degree to which senior projects meet the selected learning objectives of the program and present these assessment findings to the Applied Sociology Committee.
4) Facilitate a discussion with the Applied Sociology Committee as to whether these results indicate a need to make changes in the senior project, in other parts of the program, or in assessment methods.

5) Write the report for this assessment grant and disseminate it to the department.

**Step 1.** I created an Access database into which a work study student entered data on all of all senior projects that are on file in the department office. The database includes the following fields: student name, title of senior project, name of supervising faculty member, semester of completion, and whether the student was in the Applied Sociology program or another sociology program. The database contains 31 senior projects by Applied Sociology students and 124 by other Sociology students. The remaining steps include only Applied Sociology senior projects.

**Step 2.** I examined about a dozen of the Applied Sociology senior projects and took notes on how these addressed or did not address the three learning objectives. Based upon this initial review, I constructed a form that could be used to extract information from senior projects that would be useful for assessment. Originally, this form contained eight questions that focused on the senior project’s problem statement and on its use of theory and methods. I evaluated all 31 of the senior projects using this form, and a work study student who is a senior Sociology major evaluated 5 of these, as well. There was substantial overlap between my ratings and those of the work study student, indicating that future assessment of senior projects can be reliably conducted by other faculty members or by graduate assistants with a knowledge of the program.

**Step 3.** Instead of working with the Applied Sociology Committee, I decided to work with the Sociology Assessment Committee. This committee did not exist at the time I submitted the proposal for this project. I chose it because its purpose is even more closely related to the project than is the purpose of the Applied Sociology Committee. I met with Committee members after I constructed the form and explained the process that I used in constructing it. The Committee approved the use of the form.

**Step 4.** After all of the senior projects had been evaluated, I gave a brief report to the Sociology faculty and asked for their suggestions. Basically, my findings indicate that, of the three learning objectives, the one dealing with methods was met less effectively in senior projects than were the objectives on the sociological perspective and on theory. The implication is that the program should either emphasize methods more in senior projects, or it should revise the goals for the senior project to include less emphasis on methods. We will discuss this early next year. Part of the discussion with the Sociology faculty focused on whether we should adopt the senior project as the upper division writing requirement for Sociology. After deciding in favor of this, we added two items to the assessment form pertaining to writing. A copy of the revised assessment instrument is included. The two questions that were added are questions 2 and 3. The questions to be used for assessment are questions 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10.
The following actions have been taken as a result of the monies we received from this grant:

- Four (4) research assistants were hired for the 2005-2006 academic year;
- The research assistants investigated various web portfolio designs from universities around the nation and made recommendations for our Writing Portfolio;
- They have each designed their own Electronic Writing Portfolios, and are in the process of demonstrating to their peers in various classroom settings the construction process for those Portfolios;
- In the fall the assistants will be assisting students in the design and construction of the individual Electronic Writing Portfolios, which will be required of every social work major;
- During the month of June, I will be utilizing the duty days assigned to me to continue work on this project;
Appendix 1 – Assessment request for proposals (RFP)

Request for Proposals - Assessment Grants 2005

The University Assessment Committee will be awarding its first round of grants during Spring Semester 2005. A second call for proposals is projected for fall 2005. The purpose of these grants is to encourage faculty to develop or continue assessment efforts at the program level. Examples of programs include majors/minors within departments, general education, BES and graduate programs. Individual course assessment proposals will not be considered at this time. Money is not available to write or refine learning outcomes and assessment plans. Only direct (rather than indirect) assessment measures of student learning will be eligible. That is, the assessment directly measures the student’s performance with, for example, a paper, a test, a lab procedure or a creative presentation. Indirect measures include surveys, feelings, opinions and focus groups.

Awards: We expect an average grant of $4,000. Grants involving three or more people and especially those that involve assessments across departments (e.g., general education assessment) may receive up to $10,000.

Use of Funds: Assessment grant money can support faculty extra duty days or reassigned time, duplication, partial graduate assistantships and/or student help. Grant money cannot be used for purchasing software, computers, data processing costs, equipment, travel or consultants.

Dates: Grant proposals must be submitted by 28 March 2005. Awards will be announced by 12 April 2005. Funding must be committed by the end of Spring Semester 2005.

Grant Requests: All proposals should include at least the following:

- Title of the assessment project
- A copy of, or web address linking to, department learning outcomes served by the proposal
- Description of the project
  - Specific student learning outcome(s) to be addressed by the project
  - How the grant relates to departmental assessment plans or general education
  - Details of project activities - method(s) of assessment, number of students and classes to be assessed, etc.
  - A statement indicating how your project will lead to a sustainable assessment endeavor (i.e., assessments will continue with little or no additional funding)
  - How the success of the project will be assessed (i.e., how you will determine attainment of the project goals)
  - A timeline
- A detailed budget including any support provided by your department (in-kind)
- Signoff from your Department Chair (if applicable) and Dean
- Previous support from the Assessment Office - grant title, amount of award, date

Assessment Priorities: The Committee is particularly interested in the following:

- General education assessments involving multiple courses
- Program assessment that includes collaborative efforts and that could be used by several departmental programs (with minor modifications, if necessary)
- Projects that use direct assessment data already collected (and that will continue collecting data) to make meaningful program changes (“closing the loop”)
- Assessment projects that clearly indicate how they will continue with little or no funding after the initial project
- Development of course-embedded approaches suitable for program assessment

Projects that receive funding must complete a summary by the end of Fall Semester 2005, at the latest. The summary must include at least: 1) a description of project success and how this was determined, 2) a list of materials (and contact person information) that could be used by other programs across campus (if applicable), and 3) a plan for changes to improve the program as a result of the project.

Electronic delivery of proposals in Word format is preferred. E-mail proposals to: Assessment@stcloudstate.edu
If you have any questions regarding your assessment proposal, please contact Neal Voelz, University Assessment Director (njvoelz@stcloudstate.edu or Assessment@stcloudstate.edu).
Appendix 2 – Summary of assessment grant monetary requests and actual funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME(S)</th>
<th>DEPT/UNIT</th>
<th>GRANT TITLE</th>
<th>REQUEST</th>
<th>Amount Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebberson/Baugnet</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art Department Visual Assessment Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvaal et al.</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>Embedded assessment in the Biology core curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,724.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minger et al.</td>
<td>BIOL/SCI ED</td>
<td>Elementary Science Education &amp; Science Cognate Assessment.....</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,851.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leenay/Winter</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>A comprehensive assessment of preparatory chemistry...</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,491.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Jeanne L.</td>
<td>CIM</td>
<td>CIM Undergraduate Program Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devers/Rangamani</td>
<td>Comm. Disorders</td>
<td>Assessing program-wide writing in Comm. Disorders....</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,714.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petzhold, Mark</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>Assessment of Electrical and Computer Engineering Students...</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrud/Schulze</td>
<td>ELCP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Assessment and Data Base Strategies for...</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,550.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaughton et al.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English graduate program assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,154.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacourt, Jeanne</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Racial Issues Pre- and Post-Assessment Instrument:...</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhavan-Majid, Roya</td>
<td>Mass Comm.</td>
<td>Direct Assessment of Conceptual and Theoretical Learning...</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buske et al.</td>
<td>Math/Statistics</td>
<td>Developing Assessment Instruments for Core Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,801.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammes/Hartz/Robinson</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Assessment Across the Core</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta et al.</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>Standard Test Bank of Phys 23x to assess the student's...</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherohman, James</td>
<td>Soc&amp;Anthro</td>
<td>Assessment of Applied Sociology Senior Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,767.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitford, G.S.</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Converting Paper Portfolios to Electronic Portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,801.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>85,180.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>