



Sam Houston  
State University

**2012-2013**

---

**College of Humanities &  
Social Sciences**

**Department of  
Communication Studies**




*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013


**Speech Communication BA**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)


---

**Goal** **Application Of Theory** 


To develop student understanding and utilization of rhetorical and communication theory in all major communication contexts, including the development of critical thinking skills. These contexts include interpersonal and family relationships, small group professional and business situations, and public/media messages.

**Objective (L)** **Applying Rhetorical And Communication Theory** 



Graduates will be able to apply rhetorical and communication theory to specific communication contexts.

**Indicator** **Student Application Of Theory** 


We will measure attainment of Goal 1 through an annual evaluation of a sample of final student term papers in 3300 and 4300 level courses, such as Intercultural Communication, Small Group Communication, Nonverbal Communication, Communication Theory, and Family Communication. The components of this rubric include the following: Control of the Mechanics of Written Composition, Evidence of Understanding of the Applicable Theory or Theories, and Effective Connection of Theory or Theories to Communication Behavior. The Communication Studies faculty met as a committee of the whole to develop consensus on the rubric and its components and to develop a Likert-type rating scale to be used as a holistic measure. The resulting numeric scale is as follows: 1=fails to meet the goal, 2=minimally meets the goal, 3=satisfactorily meets the goal, 4=meets the goal in an exemplary fashion, 5=exceeds expectations in meeting the goal. A score of 1 indicates serious deficiencies in all three of the components. 2 = moderate deficiencies in no more than two of the components. 3 = no deficiencies in any of the three components. 4 = superior handling of all three components. 5 = near flawless handling of all three components.

**Criterion** **Student Application Of Theory** 


An average grade of 4 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.

**Finding** **Student Application Of Theory**  


The average score for student application of theory was 3.2.

**Action** **Student Application Of Theory** 

Due to a surprising decline from previous years in the average score by faculty of student applications of theory, it is necessary to confer as a group about steps to take in each upper level class in which theory application is part of assigned papers. The average score was satisfactory but not so high as our criterion.

**Goal** **Communication Presentations** 

To train students to make a variety of effective communication presentations in different professional, educational, and social contexts. These presentations include public speeches, group discussion, and argumentation and debate.

**Objective (L)** **Communication Presentations** 

Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of oral communication

situations

**Indicator**

**Student Presentations** 🔑

We will measure attainment of Goal 2 through an annual evaluation of a sample of recorded final student presentations given in such courses as Public Speaking, Speech for Business and the Professions, Speech for Teachers, and the like. The components of this rubric include the following: Evidence of Content Mastery (including Source Citation) and Evidence of Mastery of Delivery (including Visual Aids). The Communication Studies faculty met as a committee of the whole to develop this rubric and its components and to construct a Likert-type rating scale for use as a holistic measure. The resulting numeric scale is as follows: 1=fails to meet the goal, 2=minimally meets the goal, 3=satisfactorily meets the goal, 4=meets the goal in an exemplary fashion, 5=exceeds expectations in meeting the goal. A score of 1 = serious deficiencies in both components. 2 = moderate deficiency in no more than one component. 3 = no deficiency in either component. 4 = superior handling of both components. 5 = near flawless handling of both components.

**Criterion**

**Student Presentations** 🔑

An average grade of 4 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.

**Finding**

**Communication Presentations** 🔑 🔑

The average score for student presentations was 4.08.

**Action**

**Communication Presentations** 🔑

The department will explore ways to make online presentations available for review and evaluation by the faculty.

**Goal**

**Research Literacy** 🔑

To develop student competencies in locating, understanding, assessing, and reporting communication research findings. This includes training in the use of both print and electronic media sources and focuses attention on published scholarly research.

**Objective (L)**

**Research Literacy** 🔑

Graduates will be able to assess and report the results of communication research.

**Indicator**

**Student Research Literacy** 🔑

We will measure Goal 3 with an annual evaluation of a sample of student papers involving reviews of research literature assigned in such courses as Introduction to Communication Theory and Communication Theory. The components of this rubric are the following: Control of the Mechanics of Written Composition and Evidence of a Comprehensive Knowledge of a Confined Research Area. The Communication Studies faculty met as a committee of the whole to develop consensus on the rubric and its components and to construct a Likert-type rating scale for use as a holistic measure. The resulting numeric scale is as follows: 1=fails to meet the goal, 2=minimally meets the goal, 3=satisfactorily meets the goal, 4=meets the goal in an exemplary fashion, 5=exceeds expectations in meeting the goal. A score of 1 indicates serious deficiencies in both components. 2 = moderate deficiency in no more than one component. 3 = no deficiency in either component. 4 = superior handling of both components. 5 = near flawless handling of both components.

**Criterion**

**Student Research Literacy** 🔑

An average grade of 4 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.

**Finding**

**Research Literacy**  


The average score for student research literacy was 3.64.

**Action**

**Research Literacy** 

The teacher who is responsible for the course which focuses on research literacy will be asked to provide a detailed account of what he expects from his students so that their work may be properly evaluated by other faculty.

**Goal**

**Computer Literacy** 

To develop student competency in utilizing personal computers, software, and the internet to perform research and prepare reports in the field of communication studies.

**Objective (L)**

**Computer Literacy** 

Graduates will be able to utilize appropriate personal computers and related software, as well as the internet, to perform routine assignments and tasks in the field of communication studies.

**Indicator**

**Computer Literacy** 

We will measure attainment of Goal 4 through an annual evaluation of a sample of student papers submitted in COM 2331, Introduction to Communication Theory, a course required for both majors and minors. This course incorporates papers specifically assigned to engage student skills and abilities in computer use and offers training in computer technology for those students whose skills and abilities are deficient. The components of this rubric are: Evidence of Mastery of the Use of Microsoft Word and Evidence of Mastery of Online Research Skills (including electronic databases as well as the internet generally). The Communication Studies faculty met as a committee of the whole to develop consensus on the rubric and its components and to construct a Likert-type rating scale to use as a holistic measure. The resulting numeric scale is as follows: 1=fails to meet the goal; 2=minimally meets the goal; 3=satisfactorily meets the goal; 4=meets the goal in an exemplary fashion; 5=exceeds expectations in meeting the goal. 1 = serious deficiencies in both components. 2 = moderate deficiency in no more than one component. 3 = no deficiency in either component. 4 = superior handling of both components. 5 = near flawless handling of both components.

**Criterion**

**Computer Literacy** 

An average grade of 4 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome. This average will be taken over all student papers and all reviewers (faculty committee).

**Finding**

**Computer Literacy**  

The average score for computer literacy was 3.3.

**Action**

**Computer Literacy** 

While the average score for student computer literacy failed to meet the departmental criterion, it was satisfactory. To raise this score in the coming year, more attention will be given in COMS 2331 to online research skills, especially electronic databases used as the basis for student papers.

### **Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

The Department of Communication Studies is meeting its goals, although there are minor weaknesses to be addressed. During the coming year, the department will explore with the campus online education facility ways of accessing student presentations in online courses so as properly to evaluate our progress in that area.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

Access to student presentations by other faculty members than the instructor continues to be problematic (as a software management issue), therefore efforts to include these online presentations in annual reviews will be abandoned.

### **Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

The Department of Communication Studies continues to meet its goals for the most part, although student performance was down a bit this year. The department has considered new efforts to address these lower student scores and will implement them in all relevant classes in the coming year.

[Jump to Top](#)

# **Department of English**






*Online Assessment Tracking Database*


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013


**English BA**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)



---



<b>Goal</b>	<b>Secondary English Education Certification</b>  English majors and minors seeking certification as Secondary English teachers will receive a grounding in literature, in writing, and in the pedagogy of Secondary English.
-------------	--

<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Secondary English Certification Validation</b>  Students seeking teacher certification will demonstrate knowledge and skills to teach English to secondary students. Our objective is, first, to produce highly competent secondary English language arts and reading teachers to be certified by the Texas Education Agency to teach in Texas high schools. Our curriculum and oversight of ELAR certification is designed with that objective, as opposed to a focus on test scores alone. We believe that if our courses and other preparations are solidly grounded in excellent practices (that have been appropriately aligned with state standards, the test results will take care of themselves. However, we do provide careful oversight and counseling of our certification students, as well as thorough (and thoroughly aligned) preparation workshops. Our objective, then, is well-prepared students who also perform at high passing rates on the state certification exam.
----------------------	--

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>English TExES</b>  Secondary English Education students will be prepared to pass the TExES English content area exam in their final semester or shortly after graduating. The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) developed standards for Texas educators that delineate what the beginning educator should know and be able to do. These standards, which are based on the state-required curriculum for students, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), form the basis for the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES). The TExES test is a criterion-referenced examination designed to measure the knowledge and skills required in English language and literature teaching. A score of 240 is the minimum level of competency required over all of the domains. A student may fail a domain but pass the test. The following are the areas tested: Domain I: Integrated Language Arts, Diverse Learners, and the Study of English; Domain II: Literature, Reading Processes, and Skills for Reading Literary and Nonliterary Texts; Domain III: Written Communication; Domain IV: Oral Communication and Media Literacy.
------------------	---

The measurement of our preparation (at least on the test-taking side) is performance on the Texas Examination for Certification Standards (TExES). (The particular examination for secondary English is Field 131—8-12 English Language Arts and Reading.) Last year, we indicated a desired passing rate of 75%, which we far exceeded. The fact is, we are confident that our passing rates should and will be significantly higher. The standard we are seeking to reach now is 90% passing rates for the secondary English certification students who take the exam.

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>TExES Scores</b>   At least 75 percent of students taking the TExES English content area exam will obtain passing scores in each domain. Although last year, 100 percent of students who took the test passed, two areas emerged as weaknesses, II. Literature, Reading Processes, and Skills for Reading Literary and Nonliterary Texts; and III. Written Communication. We are anxious to determine if our interventions have been successful in raising these particular scores.
------------------	---

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Certification Exam</b>   Goal: Producing High Rates of Certification Exam Passing Results  During 2012-13, twenty-one secondary English certification majors took the 8-12 ELAR TExES during the 2012-13 assessment period. (Actually 25 certification testers took the exam, but four of them—including one of the failures—were students from the graduate
----------------	--

Curriculum and Instruction program in the College of Education (and thus are not “our” students.) There were actually twenty-two test attempts, but since one of our students failed the test and then retook it, and passed, there twenty-one students tested. Twenty of the twenty-one instances resulted in passing scores, for an overall passing rate of 95.45%, exceeding the objective of 90%. All twenty-one of our test takers individual students passed the exam during the assessment period, for an effective passing rate of 100%.

For 2011-12, our identified strengths were in Domain II (Literature, Reading Processes, and Skills for Reading Literary and Nonliterary Texts) and Domain III (Written Communication). While our students’ overall results in these domains brought us into successful territory, their scores fell off alarmingly in Domain I (Integrated Language Arts, Diverse Learners, and the Study of English). During the year, we concentrated on enhanced instruction in this area, and for 2012-13, the Domain I results rose to be in accord with the high performance in the other domains.

**Action**

**Curricular Excellence In 2013-14 DRAFT** 

Action: With the substantial improvements in our only identified area of weakness (Domain I: Integrated Language Arts, Diverse Learners, and the Study of English), we have no real identified weakness as indicated by our students’ performance on the state certification examination. Our action is to continue our curricular and preparation initiatives to ensure a continuation of this excellent performance.

**Goal**

**Literature And Literary Theory (4000-level)** 

Students majoring in English will acquire an appreciation of various critical approaches and methodologies in studying literature and literary theory.

**Objective (L)**

**Reading Literature Critically And Writing About It Analytically**  

Students will be able to use various approaches and methodologies presented in analyzing literary texts and demonstrate the ability to interpret texts by communicating their understanding of those texts in analytic essays.

**Indicator**

**Writing Assessment** 

Reading and writing are part and parcel of each other. Essays written to analyze and/or apply literary texts suggest the depth and quality of the students’ reading, as well as their understanding of the assignment. Thus, during spring semester, we will collect writing samples of English majors from 4000-level (senior-level) classes and examine them to ascertain the effectiveness of reading that they evince. Our goal is to read 25 percent of the essays, chosen at random, written by English majors in 4000-level literature courses. We anticipate an enrollment of some 105 students in any given long semester and so should expect to read 26 to 30 essays. Two experienced English professors agree that 70 percent of the students write at college level. College-level writing is defined as fluent, coherent, nearly error-free writing. For the purpose of evaluation, clear criteria were developed (see attachment).

**Criterion**

**Score Of Five Or Greater On An Eight-Point Scale**  

The chosen essays will be assessed by a primary trait scoring done by Department of English faculty. The traits to be assessed will include plot summary vs. analysis and effective use of secondary sources. A score equal to or greater than 5 will be deemed acceptable. One weakness

evident last year was that we did not receive enough essays for the results to be meaningful and reliable. (We received only fifteen essays.) We will rectify that weakness this year. Seventy percent of the sample of collected 4000-level essays satisfies the requirements of mature academic BA-level writing as assessed holistically by two scoring professors. Students write fluent, coherent, and nearly error-free analytical essays which show sophistication in literary analysis that goes beyond mere superficial plot summaries, and their essays have a point (see attached evaluation criteria). We were concerned last year with whether our process was reliable. We are taking steps to ensure reliability of the process.

**Finding**

**Focus On Analyzing 2000-level Writing**

Intentionally, there is no finding of 4000-level writing this year. This year, our decided goal was to focus on analyzing 2000-level, as 4000-level writing had been quite adequate the previous year.

**Action**

**Collecting Essays In The Spring 2014 From Seniors**

Next year, we will resume to collect essays from our 4000-level writers to evaluate whether their writing has started to reflect more the changes we have made into the English sophomore curriculum. In a couple of years, these effects should start to show in the seniors' writing skills.

**Goal**

**Gaining Knowledge In World And Multicultural Literature (2000-level)**

Students majoring in English will be able to employ a variety of writing styles so that they may succeed in professional situations and/or as teachers.

**Objective (L)**

**Understanding Literary Terms And Having A Basic Knowledge Of Major Writers**

Students will demonstrate understanding of basic literary terms and a basic knowledge of important writers.

**Indicator**

**Literary Terms And Periods**

During Fall 2011, an objective test for the core English sophomore course was developed by professors who teach World Literature II (ENGL 2342). Seventy percent of sophomores are expected to pass the posttest with 70 percent correct answers. Comparing the pretest, given in the beginning of the semester, to the posttest in May will indicate whether any learning took place or not.

**Criterion**

**Quantified Success In Analytic Writing**

Seventy percent of the sample of 2000-level posttest results will show that students have necessary rudimentary knowledge (score of 70 percent or higher) of literature after having taken a sophomore World Literature course. This basic knowledge is necessary before continuing to junior- and senior-level English classes.

**Finding**

**Students Have Only Rudimentary Knowledge Of Literature**

50% of the tested sophomores failed the Sophomore Assessment Instrument for ENGL 2342.

**Action**

**Consciousness Raising Of The Results**

Action: Faculty will brainstorm how to improve the results.

**Objective (L)**

**Gaining Knowledge In World And Multicultural Literature**

2000-level students are able to write about literature.

**Indicator**

**Seventy Percent Of Sophomore Writers Are Deemed Acceptable Writers**

Two English professors assess 70 percent of ENGL 2331 essays as acceptable. This assessment is done through blind review. Acceptable is defined as a score 5 on an scale 2-8. See the attached grading criteria.

**Criterion**

**Under 30 Percent Unacceptable**

Only 30 percent or fewer of the essays are classified as not fulfilling requirements for acceptable academic writing.

**Finding**

**61-percent Passing Rate DRAFT**

Only 61 percent of our sophomores are assessed to write acceptably for their level.

**Action**

**Faculty Meeting To Discuss The Results**

In the fall 2013 faculty meeting, these results will be discussed to raise consciousness of the fact that there still is work to do even though some improvement has taken place. This discussion must take place before any more concrete action can take place, i.e., this consciousness raising is the first action step. Faculty teaching sophomore English will implement a rigorous regimen of (1) teaching literary terms and (2) teaching explicitly how to write an effective essay about literature.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

During AY 2011-12, the department restructured its freshman and sophomore courses. Composition I was defined clearly as an introductory writing course; Composition II was restructured to include elements from ENG 266, i.e., elements of writing about literature were added to persuasive and argumentative writing. Sophomore courses were redefined chronologically (2331 as World Literature before 17th century; 2342 as World Literature after 17th century) in order to avoid overlaps. Evaluation of these courses has been based on a combination of objective tests and assessing essays. Objective evaluation and essay assessment both reveal that much work remains to be done to raise the standards. A realistic approach includes admitting that our students need the three core writing courses in order to internalize the basics of academic writing.

Last year, the plan was to reevaluate all junior survey courses. The faculty met and came to the conclusion that everyone is satisfied with how the junior-level surveys are structured.

American Studies program was launched, and English taught the first "Introduction to American Studies" course. American Studies minor was thus added to the other English minors (secondary education, creative writing, and technical and professional writing).

Chances are that departmental objective testing in Composition I and World Literature II will help to raise the consciousness of shared standards across heterogeneous classes. It will be interesting to see whether this consciousness leads to higher achievements or not.

What is encouraging is the finding revealed in the comparison of the 2000- and 4000-level essay assessments.

Above tables are combined here for comparison:

	2000-level results	4000-level results
2	19%	8%
3	14%	13%

4	17%	13%
5	21%	18%
6	17%	29%
7	7%	11%
8	5%	8%
Tot.	100%	100%

Even though only 50 percent of the 2000-level essays were deemed as acceptable (score 5 or better), during the same rating session, the same professors rated 66 percent of the 4000-level essays as fulfilling academic standards of that level of writing. This is most encouraging, but it would be desirable to boost up the numbers of academically acceptable essays at both levels. Learning happens from the sophomore level to senior level, and faculty and students becoming more conscious about standards should help in our quest for excellence.

Regarding the certification standards and exam, we will call this deficiency to the attention of those specific instructors and will formulate specific strategies for increasing our scores in Domain I for the coming year, while continuing our successful efforts in the other domains (and in overall passing rates).

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

Last year (2011-12), a comparison between English sophomore and senior writing was carried out, with the purpose of evaluating whether senior-level writing is better than sophomore-level writing, i.e., whether students have learned to write better while in the English program. We found that, indeed, 66 percent of English seniors write at passing level (as determined via our department-internal criteria), while only 50 percent of sophomores do.

For the academic year 2012-13, we focused on evaluating our sophomore writers, of whom only 50 percent had passed our departmental criteria. In the spring of 2013, an electronic mail was sent to all English faculty teaching sophomore courses, with instructions to collect the last substantial essay assignment from every fifth student for evaluation purposes. Altogether 57 essays were collected from all sophomore English sections. This represented some 20 percent of students in all sophomore classes. In May, full faculty, adjuncts, and teaching assistants (some 30 people) gathered to evaluate the essays. Instructions to evaluators are attached. See Table 1 for improvement:

Score	Spring 2012	Spring 2013 (N=57)
2	19%	5%
3	14%	18%
4	17%	16%
5	21%	25%
6	17%	19%
7	7%	14%
8	5%	4%

	100%	101%
	Spring 2012	Spring 2013
Failing (2-4)	50%	39%
Passing  (5-8)	50%	<b>62%</b>

Table 1. Comparison between score results in 2012 and 2013.

We found that only within one year, a jump from 50-percent acceptance rate to a 62-percent acceptance rate had taken place. We attribute this to consciousness-raising of what sophomore writing should consist of. Also, the new sophomore curriculum can be credited for higher writing ability. Inter-reader reliability was very high; only three essays required a third reader (tie-breaker).

There was, however, a discrepancy between scores between the two sophomore courses, ENGL 2331 (World Literature I: Before the Seventeenth Century) and ENGL 2342 (World Literature II: Seventeenth Century and After) (see Table 2):



Score	ENGL 2331	ENGL 2342	Total
-------	-----------	-----------	-------

	(N=35)	(N=22)	(N=57)
	N	N	N
2	2	1	3
3	4	6	10
4	7	2	9
5	7	7	14
6	8	3	11
7	5	3	8
8	2	0	2
	% N	% N	% N
Failing (2-4)	37 (13)	<b>41</b> (9)	39 (22)
Passing (5-8)	<b>63</b> (22)	59 (14)	61 (35)

	100 (35)	100 (23)	100 (57)
--	----------	----------	----------

Table 1. Comparison of writing scores between ENGL 2331 and ENGL 2342 students.

It is interesting to note that while 63 percent of World Literature I (ENGL 2331) students write in a passable manner, only 59 percent of World Literature II (ENGL 2342) students do. We hope to follow up with this in the next year or the following one, to see if this is a coincidence or whether we are witnessing a trend. Last year (2011-12), a comparison between English sophomore and senior writing was carried out, with the purpose of evaluating whether senior-level writing is better than sophomore-level writing, i.e., whether students have learned to write better while in the English program. We found that, indeed, 66 percent of English seniors write at passing level (as determined via our department-internal criteria), while only 50 percent of sophomores do.

For the academic year 2012-13, we focused on evaluating our sophomore writers, of whom only 50 percent had passed our departmental criteria. In the spring of 2013, an electronic mail was sent to all English faculty teaching sophomore courses, with instructions to collect the last substantial essay assignment from every fifth student for evaluation purposes. Altogether 57 essays were collected from all sophomore English sections. This represented some 20 percent of students in all sophomore classes. In May, full faculty, adjuncts, and teaching assistants (some 30 people) gathered to evaluate the essays. Instructions to evaluators are attached. See Table 1 for improvement:

Score	Spring 2012	Spring 2013 (N=57)
2	19%	5%
3	14%	18%
4	17%	16%
5	21%	25%
6	17%	19%
7	7%	14%
8	5%	4%
	100%	101%
	Spring 2012	Spring 2013
Failing (2-4)	50%	39%
Passing (5-8)	50%	<b>62%</b>

Table 1. Comparison between score results in 2012 and 2013.

We found that only within one year, a jump from 50-percent acceptance rate to a 62-percent acceptance rate had taken place. We attribute this to consciousness-raising of what sophomore writing should consist of. Also, the new sophomore curriculum can be credited for higher writing ability. Inter-reader reliability was very high; only three essays required a third reader (tie-breaker).

There was, however, a discrepancy between scores between the two sophomore courses, ENGL 2331 (World Literature I: Before the Seventeenth Century) and ENGL 2342 (World Literature II: Seventeenth Century and After) (see Table 2):

Score	ENGL 2331 (N=35) N	ENGL 2342 (N=22) N	Total (N=57) N
2	2	1	3
3	4	6	10
4	7	2	9
5	7	7	14
6	8	3	11
7	5	3	8
8	2	0	2
	% N	% N	% N
Failing (2-4)	37 (13)	<b>41</b> (9)	39 (22)
Passing (5-8)	<b>63</b> (22)	59 (14)	61 (35)

	100 (35)	100 (23)	100 (57)
--	----------	----------	----------

Table 1. Comparison of writing scores between ENGL 2331 and ENGL 2342 students.

It is interesting to note that while 63 percent of World Literature I (ENGL 2331) students write in a passable manner, only 59 percent of World Literature II (ENGL 2342) students do. We hope to follow up with this in the next year or the following one, to see if this is a coincidence or whether we are witnessing a trend.

#### Attachments

1. [Instructions For Essay Evaluation](#)
2. [Criteria For Evaluating 2000-level Writing](#)
3. [Sophomore Findings](#)

#### **Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

Next year or the following year we will compare the results of ENGL 2331 and ENGL 2342 again, to see if we are looking at a trend or whether this year's discrepancy in results was a coincidence. All professors will be made aware of the results, and they will emphasize overall excellence to all students. It may be that students self-select to these two core courses, more diligent ones choosing ENGL 2331 (World Literature I: Before Seventeenth Century). This means that ENGL 2342 must be made aware that the expectations are the same for these two courses, despite the difference in the chronology of reading materials.

[Jump to Top](#)



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013

**English MA**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---



**Goal****Knowledge And Skills** 

To produce graduates who have acquired measurable skills in critical thinking, researching, and writing about English literature, language, and writing disciplines and have acquired demonstrable breadth of knowledge in the field. While the number of graduates who have entered PhD programs or taken teaching positions at two- and four-year colleges is an objective measure of our success in accomplishing this goal, not all of our students pursue further graduate degrees or post-secondary teaching. That in mind, the department has determined three measurable learning objectives that apply uniformly to all students taking a graduate degree in English from Sam Houston State University: (1) the demonstration of critical thinking, researching, and writing skills, as measured by their class writing; (2) the demonstration of critical thinking and writing skills and breadth of knowledge, as measured by their performance on the written comprehensive examination; and (3) the demonstration of critical thinking skills and breadth of knowledge, as measured by their performance in oral examinations.

**Objective (L)****Demonstrating Critical Thinking, Researching, And Writing Skills: Class Writing** 

English graduate students will demonstrate their abilities as independent critical thinkers, researchers, and writers capable of employing sophisticated skills in written analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of knowledge and of using a professional idiom in making written arguments. The program's success in achieving this objective will be measured by a holistic assessment of graduate class writing.

**Indicator****Holistic Assessment Of Graduate Writing** 

The ability of students to write according to accepted professional standards is a direct indicator of the English MA and MFA programs' success in producing graduates who have acquired appropriate critical thinking, researching, and writing skills and are prepared for future professional endeavors. To that end, a significant amount of student writing is required in English graduate coursework.

To assess the effectiveness of class writing assignments in developing students' ability to make sophisticated arguments about literature, language, and writing disciplines in a critical idiom appropriate to professional standards, the faculty will undertake an annual holistic review of representative graduate student writing produced during the reporting period.

**Criterion****Standards For English Graduate Student Writing**  

At least 92% of representative graduate essays evaluated during the holistic assessment will be scored as acceptable or excellent (a combined score of 5 or higher on the scale described below).

A rubric for evaluating graduate student writing is attached.

Assessment Process:

1. To assure that the assessment reviews a representative sampling of writing, graduate professors in both long terms are asked to submit term papers or other significant writing from every third student listed on their class rosters.
2. Two primary readers from among the graduate English faculty independently read and score each essay under review; in the case of an unreliable result, the essay is referred to a secondary reader, who reads the essay independently, without any knowledge of the previous results (see number 5, below)
3. Each primary reader scores each essay on a 4-point scale, with a score of 4 the highest possible. The two primary scores are added to yield a total, with the final scores ranging from 8 (highest possible) to 2 (lowest

possible). A combined score of 5 or higher is passing. A score of 7 or 8 indicates an excellent essay; a score of 5 or 6 indicates an acceptable essay; a score of 4 or less indicates an unacceptable essay.

4. Reliability of the two scores is assumed when both scores from the primary readers are congruent, that is, when they are within 1 point of each other. For example, a score of 6 that would be seen as reliable would mean that both readers marked the essay as a 3. A reliable score of 5 would mean that one reader assessed the essay as a 3 while the other reader assessed it as a 2.

5. Should the primary scores for an essay not be reliable—for example, a 4 and a 1, a 3 and a 1, a 4 and a 2—the essay is referred to a secondary reader. If that reader agrees with the higher score, the essay is certified as acceptable or excellent; if the secondary reader agrees with the lower score, the essay is certified as unacceptable.

## Finding

### Findings Of Holistic Writing Assessment

For the reporting periods from 2009-2012, an average 95% of essays read for the holistic assessment earned the exemplary-acceptable rating of 3-4. Because of a scheduling error, however, the department did not undertake the holistic review for the 2012-2013 reporting period. It will resume the assessment process for the 2013-2014 academic year.

## Action

### Developing Students' Writing Abilities

An average 95% of representative English graduate student writing reviewed over the previous three assessment periods met or exceeded the acceptable rating. Developing students' abilities to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate knowledge in writing, however, continues to be a primary program objective.

The first and most obvious action for measuring the program's success in accomplishing this objective is to resume the holistic review of graduate writing for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. To that end, the graduate director has already gathered representative writing from Fall 2013 graduate classes.

The burden of introducing students to professional research methods and establishing standards for critical and expository writing rests largely with individual classroom instructors, who provide formal guidance, models, and assessment. Because of the variety of classroom writing assignments and the variety of ways in which professors approach writing, it is difficult to impose uniform standards upon writing from coursework. However, after consulting with the Director of Writing in the Disciplines, the graduate director will make any necessary revisions to the assessment rubric and will then supply graduate professors with the rubric, to make sure that all agree with the standards by which the program measures its success in achieving the objective.

There are other ways in which graduate faculty can also guide students in their progress toward independent critical thinking, researching, and writing. One suggestion is that each graduate faculty member serve as a mentor to a certain number of students, assigned at the beginning of a long term. While the graduate director would still be responsible for general advising and new student orientation, the mentors would be available for discussing class research and writing projects with their advisees.

## Objective (L)

### Demonstrating Critical Thinking And Writing Skills And Breadth Of Knowledge: The Written Comprehensive Examination

English students will demonstrate that they have a graduate-level breadth of knowledge in literature, language, and writing disciplines and that they can express that knowledge in writing. The program's success in achieving this objective can be measured by the pass rate for the written comprehensive examination required of all students who take a graduate English degree at Sam Houston State University.

**Indicator****The Written Comprehensive Examination** 

A passing score on the written comprehensive examination is a direct indicator that a student in English has acquired a breadth of knowledge in the subject, has developed critical reading and writing skills appropriate to a graduate-level education in English, and is well-prepared for future professional endeavors. For the examination, students choose three comprehensive areas from among thirteen broad topics in literature, language, and writing disciplines. To demonstrate their mastery of a broad range of materials, they are required to choose at least one British literature area and one American literature area and at least one early (pre-1800) British or American literary area and one later (post-1800) British or American literary area. For each area, students are given a reading list of works selected by faculty area experts.

During the exam itself, the student chooses one of three questions for each area and has two hours to respond to that question. A double-blind grading system is used to evaluate the candidates' proficiency. Three graduate faculty members read and evaluate each essay.

**Criterion****Written Comprehensive Examination Pass Rate**  

At least 90% of examination essays will pass (with a grade of pass or high pass). The method of measuring the success in achieving the objective has changed since the previous assessment, when we counted the number of students who passed. Because most students who fail area exams pass them on a second take, the pass rate for essays themselves seems to be a more specific measurement of how well the exam assesses the success of the program in achieving the objective.

If we apply the new method of measuring this success to the exam results for Academic Year 2011-2012, 69% of essays passed.

An examination grading rubric and sample pass, fail, and high pass essays are attached.

**Finding****Written Comprehensive Examination Results: 2012-2013**  

In Academic Year 2012-2013, thirteen students sat for comprehensive exams during three sessions (Fall, Spring, and Summer). A handful of these were students retaking area exams after having failed in the previous academic year.

Students wrote a total of 33 essays.

The results follow:

Pass: 23 essays: 70%

Fail: 6 essays: 18%

High Pass: 4 essays: 12%

Total Pass: 27 essays: 82%

(Two of the failing essays were the result of the students' not having responded to questions. While we might adjust the pass rate percentage to account for this variable, presumably the two students failed to address the questions because they did not have the breadth of knowledge or critical thinking and writing skills that the exam measures; we include these essays among the failures.)

Observation about findings: The graduate faculty have expressed concern in the past about students who cluster their exam areas to ease the burden of preparation. Rather than spreading their areas over a broad range of literature, some, for example, will choose American literature before 1800, 19th-century British literature, and 19th-century American literature; in so doing, they narrow the range to a mere 250 years or so. One significant finding for this assessment cycle, however, is that four of the six failing essays came from students who clustered their areas. The suggestion is

that this strategy may be an indicator of general academic weakness or lack of confidence.

Conclusions about findings: The pass rate of 82% is an improvement over the 69% for Academic Year 2011-2012, but it still falls short of the projected 90%. (For a comparison of pass rates by exam area for the last four assessment cycles, see the attachment, "English Graduate Comprehensive Examination Pass Rate: Percentage/Number of Essays, 2009-2013.")

We have considered possible reasons for the failure to meet the projected pass rate:

(1) Students did not prepare well enough: They may have failed to give themselves enough time to read and synthesize all of the works and critical issues in a chosen area. They may have gambled by not reading all of the works on prescribed reading lists. Or their preparation may have been misdirected.

(2) Students did not receive adequate guidance in their preparation. The graduate director offers biannual exam prep sessions, and students are urged to consult faculty area experts in preparing for the exam. Not all students attend the prep sessions or seek out advice from area experts, however. And it is possible that the prep sessions do not adequately prepare the students.

Although students who fail essays sometimes complain that their graduate classes did not prepare them for the exams, it is difficult to establish a significant statistical correlation between coursework and the examination pass rate. For one thing, students sometimes take exam areas for which they have had no graduate coursework. For another, while the student's classes will suggest approaches for reading and analyzing literature and for synthesizing bodies of information, the exams are not tied specifically to courses. A professor may teach an MA-level survey of literature and English language that covers many works on an area reading list, but there is no contractual obligation that she or he do so.

Students are advised that the responsibility for reading all of the works on the area reading lists and for making comprehensive sense of them rests, finally, with them.

(3) Faculty expectations for the exam are too rigorous. While faculty do have high expectations for students' performance on the exam, both the reading lists and the exam questions have been carefully suited to MA-level students in the discipline. We have also found that, since instituting the current exam system ten years ago, students find themselves much better prepared for PhD work and college teaching in the field.

(4) Testing circumstances affect the students' performance. The graduate faculty readers are aware of the highly artificial—and too-often intimidating—circumstances under which students take the exam, and they make allowances for testing anxieties. However, the faculty also believe that a student who has prepared adequately will be able to perform well enough under these circumstances.

(5) The projected pass rate has been set too high. Perhaps the expectation that nine of ten essays pass is unrealistic.

## Action

### Preparing Students For The Written Comprehensive Examination

The ability to make an effective argument about any subject requires, first, a thorough knowledge of the subject. Students must understand that the burden of acquiring this knowledge through their independent reading and their classwork rests, finally, upon them.

Nonetheless, there are also processes by which the graduate faculty can help in

preparing the students:

The graduate director continues to publish an exam prep booklet and to conduct biannual comprehensive examination prep sessions, during which he discusses the exam process, suggests strategies for preparing and for addressing exam questions, and presents exemplary questions and responses.

It is difficult to measure objectively how effective the exam prep sessions have been. Students are not required to attend, and the graduate director has not kept records to see if there is any correspondence between attendance and the pass rate. One suggestion for improving the pass rate, however, is that attendance at at least one such session be required. Beginning with the 2013-2014 reporting period, the graduate director will also keep records to see if attendance corresponds with success.

Other graduate faculty have been involved in the preparation process in two ways: Although the examination is expressly kept separate from classwork, some instructors use typical exam questions in their courses for midterm and/or final examinations, as a way of acclimating students to the comprehensive exam expectations and circumstances. Others give advice informally to students who approach them. Faculty members are not involved uniformly in this preparation, nor do we believe that they should have to be.

One suggestion, however, is that each graduate faculty member serve as a mentor to a certain number of students, assigned at the beginning of a long term. While the graduate director would still be responsible for general advising and new student orientation, the mentors would be available to provide specific advice and encouragements and to check on their students' progress in the program during the term. These faculty members could also give advice as the students prepare for the written examination.

As with the comprehensive examination prep sessions, measuring the effectiveness of a faculty mentor system objectively is difficult. Perhaps at least the program could require that students preparing for the examination meet at least once with their mentors for that purpose.

In response to the persistent failure to meet the projected 90% target pass rate, we also need to consider whether expecting nine of ten essays to pass is unrealistic. Perhaps the best way to do so is to gather information about comprehensive examination pass rates at peer institutions that have similar exams.

## Objective (L)

### **Demonstrating Critical Thinking Skills And Breadth Of Knowledge: Oral Argumentation**

English graduate students will demonstrate their knowledge and critical thinking skills through oral arguments. We believe that the ability to make such arguments is necessary for future professional pursuits like teaching and further graduate education. The program's success in achieving this objective can be measured by the pass rate for the oral defense required of all thesis students and the oral comprehensive examination required of all non-thesis students.

## Indicator

### **The Oral Examination**

A passing grade on the oral examination required of all students who take the English MA or MFA degree at Sam Houston State University is a direct indicator that graduates are able to demonstrate their critical thinking skills and breadth of knowledge in the field. Thesis students sit for a one-hour oral defense of the thesis; having passed the written comprehensive examination, non-thesis students sit for a one-hour oral comprehensive examination covering the same three areas as those on the written exam. A committee of three graduate faculty members examines each student, awarding the candidate a pass, high pass, or fail, according to her or his ability to respond to specific questions. The committee for the oral defense of thesis comprises the members of the student's reading committee; the oral comprehensive examination committee comprises area experts appointed by the graduate director.

## Criterion

### Oral Examination Pass Rate

At least 92% of degree candidates will pass the oral defense of thesis or oral comprehensive exam at the first sitting or upon retaking it.

Thesis defense and oral comprehensive exam grading rubrics are attached.

## Finding

### Oral Examination Results: 2012-2013

In Academic Year 2012-2013, four students sat for the oral defense of thesis and five sat for the oral comprehensive examination; all nine students passed at the first sitting.

Observation about findings: Despite the pass rate, faculty who sit on oral comprehensive exam committees have still expressed disappointment with the quality of the responses from some students, who, they feel, demonstrate weak arguments and marginal knowledge-base.

Conclusions about findings: While all students who sat for oral examinations during the assessment period passed, the distinction between those who earned a high pass and those who earned a pass is one measure of quality. Two of the four students who sat for the oral defense of thesis were awarded high passes; none of the five students who sat for the oral comprehensive examination were awarded high passes. There is also the less easily measurable anecdotal evidence of faculty who express disappointment with the general quality of students' arguments during the oral comprehensive exams.

One obvious reason for the discrepancy is that the expectations for knowledge in the two types of oral examinations are unequal: While thesis students know the subjects of their theses as well as, sometimes even better than the examining faculty and have a much narrower subject, oral comprehensive exam students are expected to demonstrate the same breadth of knowledge as that required for the written comprehensive examination. And while the atmosphere of the oral exam is presumably less formal, with faculty examiners sometimes offering hints or suggesting ways that students can approach responses, many of our students find the exam terrifying.

## Action

### Preparing Students To Make Oral Arguments

During the last four assessment cycles, all twenty students who have sat for an oral defense of thesis and all twenty-six students who have sat for an oral comprehensive examination have passed. The 100% pass rate does not suggest, however, that the program should relax its efforts to prepare its students for making oral arguments. Nor should it suggest that oral examinations are the only ways to measure the program's success in preparing students for making oral arguments.

While all students passed, the discrepancy in the quality of their oral arguments suggests that the department should discuss both the nature of the exams and the expectations: What purposes does the oral comprehensive examination serve? What should the examiners' expectations be? What does the department need to do improve the quality of students' responses during these exams?

Preparing the students for making oral arguments overlaps significantly both with preparing them for the written comprehensive examinations and with assessing their graduate-level critical and expository writing: All such endeavors require a thorough knowledge of the subject under discussion. Students are advised, first, to know well the subjects about which they are speaking.

To prepare the students specifically for making oral arguments, however, the department has considered requiring an oral component in one or more of

their graduate classes, perhaps one that duplicates the circumstances of the thesis defense or oral comprehensive exam. One logical suggestion is that such a component be part of the research and methods class (ENGL 5330) required of English graduate students before they declare their degree plans.

As with efforts to prepare students for the written comprehensive examination, it is difficult to measure objectively the effectiveness of such a requirement, especially because 100% of students during the reporting period have passed the oral exam.

Formally instituting a faculty mentor system could also help if, for example, the mentors had their advisees sit for mock oral exams.

Faculty will also continue to urge students attend academic conferences, at which they must not only present their arguments about literature and language orally but also respond to any questions or challenges from the professional audience.

---

### Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

During the past year, the professional success of our English graduate students was shown by the fact that graduates continue to be accepted to respectable PhD and MFA programs; during the reporting period, graduates were accepted to terminal programs at Oklahoma State University and the University of Memphis. Our students have also entered professions including teaching, editing, business, law, and professional communications. Along with such successes, twenty graduate assistantships that we are able to offer for qualified graduate students make the program attractive; however, an increased graduate stipend would significantly raise the quality of the already relatively qualified graduate students. Comprehensive examinations that are administered three times a year ensure that the knowledge base of our graduating students is broad, and our graduate faculty are actively encouraged to stay up-to-date in their fields of expertise and to be productive scholars. Recently, a handful of graduate students have been paired with faculty members as research assistants; these collaborations have led to publications and conference presentations.

In addressing the weaknesses identified in the findings above, we need to consider the following:

First, we should re-ignite our departmental discussion of how the comprehensive examination does, in fact, test our MA candidates' mastery of a broad range of materials. While most students follow the spirit of the exam in choosing areas across a sufficient range, some do cluster their areas, thereby easing the burden both of critical understanding and of specific preparation. We need to consider how to close any loopholes so as to assure that the comprehensive examination does, in fact, adequately measure the students' mastery of the discipline.

Second, while the holistic assessment of essays suggests that our students write at or above an agreed-upon standard for English graduate-level critical thinking and writing skills, we are aware that some students do not, in fact, have adequate knowledge or the ability to synthesize arguments well. We acknowledge that writing is but one measure of such skills. We need to revisit this issue, first, by agreeing as a graduate faculty upon standards that will reflect the program goals; second, by agreeing how we can make sure that none of the students who take an MA in English at SHSU falls short of these standards.

Finally, to address the weaknesses in the oral performance of the students, we need to discuss the expectations that we have for students in oral exams and the best means for measuring these expectations. During new student orientation, the Graduate Director and/or Chair will also explicitly address the oral examination performance expectations.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

The plan for continuous improvement from the 2011-2012 assessment cycle identified several issues that needed attention: (1) Do the written comprehensive exams adequately measure our students' critical thinking and writing skills and breadth of knowledge? (2) Does class writing adequately measure students' critical thinking, researching, and writing skills? (3) Do graduate faculty all understand and agree upon uniform standards for graduate-level writing? (4) What expectations do the graduate faculty have for our students' ability to demonstrate critical thinking skills and breadth of knowledge in oral examinations? These issues are all tied

directly to the three program objectives.

The actions taken in response to each of these issues are listed below by number:

1. The plan for continuous improvement from the previous assessment cycle called for continued discussion of the effectiveness of the comprehensive examination in measuring our graduates' critical thinking and writing abilities and breadth of knowledge in the field. In several departmental discussions about the graduate program during the 2012-2013 assessment period, faculty discussed both the expectations for the examination and the methods of administering it.

In response to the concern that some students preparing for the comprehensive examination cluster their areas to reduce the breadth of knowledge and ease the burden of preparation, the graduate faculty decided that because such students do satisfy the exam requirements and because these students do not enjoy a higher success rate than those who spread their areas more broadly, we would not insist upon the broader range.

As a result of our departmental discussions about the exam, the faculty also refined the administration process, to make it both more efficient and more objective than it already was. Previously, two primary readers had read each exam essay, with a third settling any disputes between the two; now, however, three readers evaluate every essay from the outset. This new process obviates the need for a tie-breaker and also reduces the amount of time for reporting results. To accommodate the greater reading volume, we now require also that every graduate faculty member read essays for every examination. Although historically there has not been too much variance in the way that faculty evaluate the essays according to the rubric, the wider distribution of essays ensures, first, that readers will have fewer exams to evaluate and, second, that the results will represent a broader cross-section of faculty expectations for the students' breadth of knowledge and critical thinking and writing skills.

Although we stress that graduate classwork does not prepare students specifically for the exam, some faculty have also begun using the types of questions that students might encounter on the comprehensive examination in their class midterm and final exams. It is difficult to measure objectively how effective this method is in preparing students for the exam, especially because we will not require that graduate instructors use it. But anecdotal evidence suggests that the students have found it helpful, if for no other reason than that they gain some experience in working under the same circumstances as those of the comprehensive exam.

The graduate director has continued to conduct biannual new student orientation sessions and biannual comprehensive examination preparation sessions, both of which are designed to help students understand the standards of and expectations for graduate-level and professional work in our discipline. He has also published extensive information about the exam in print and online literature.

2. Because of a scheduling error, a holistic review of graduate class writing was not undertaken for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle. The program will resume this assessment of writing for the 2013-2014 reporting period.

3. In order to reach some consensus about the standards for graduate-level writing that adequately measures our students' critical thinking, researching, and writing abilities, the rubric used for evaluating class writing has been made available to all graduate faculty; the department has not yet undertaken a specific discussion about these standards, however.

4. In an attempt to strengthen students' ability to make convincing oral arguments, the graduate director has begun to include a discussion of the oral exam during comprehensive exam prep sessions and has also written into the graduate student handbook and online literature a section on preparing and sitting for the oral exam.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed**



**based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

One measure of our continuing success in producing graduates who have demonstrable critical skills and breadth of knowledge in the field is that our MA students continue to be accepted into respectable PhD and MFA programs. During the 2012-2013 assessment period, graduates were accepted to PhD programs at Arizona State University, the University of Arizona, Carnegie-Mellon University, Drexel University, and the University of North Texas; most of them were awarded full funding. Several other graduates were given teaching positions in two-year colleges. Although these indicators of success cannot be considered measurable because not all of our graduates aspire to such endeavors, as part of our plan for continuous improvement, the faculty will continue to encourage worthy MA graduates to apply for PhD work and teaching positions.

Another measure of the program's success in producing graduates with demonstrable critical researching and writing skills and breadth of knowledge is student participation in professional conferences. Not all students participate in such activities, however, so although faculty will continue to encourage them to present their scholarly and creative work at conferences, participation cannot be considered a measurable indicator of the program's success in achieving its objectives. One suggestion for the future, however, is that participation in at least one scholarly or creative conference or colloquium be a requirement for graduation. In such an event, conference participation could be included a measurable indicator.

Dr. Helena Halmari, English Department Chair, will also continue to pair qualified students with faculty members as research assistants. The requirement for this research assistantship is that the collaboration between student and faculty member lead to a publication and/or conference presentation. Again, because not all students qualify for such assistantships or seek them out, the work undertaken as a research assistant cannot be considered a measurable indicator of the program's success in producing graduates with critical thinking, researching, and writing skills.

In responding specifically to the findings for the three objectives above, we propose the following plan for continuous improvement in the 2013-2014 assessment period:

1. The graduate faculty will undertake a thorough review of comprehensive examination reading lists, to assure that the lists represent both the expectations for breadth of knowledge and current developments in the field.
2. The graduate faculty will undertake a review of comprehensive examination questions, to assure that they are both fair and representative, that they adequately test a student's critical thinking and writing skills and breadth of knowledge, and that they represent current developments in the field.
3. Because faculty who sit on oral comprehensive examination committees still find weaknesses in some students' ability to make critical arguments and demonstrate their breadth of knowledge orally, the department will undertake a pointed discussion about both the nature of and the expectations for this oral exam.
4. To improve its progress toward achieving the objective, the graduate faculty will also consider requiring an oral component in some types of courses or other means by which the program can develop the students' ability to make oral arguments.
5. The graduate faculty will resume the holistic assessment of graduate student writing. To that end, the graduate director has already collected representative writing from all graduate courses taught in Fall 2013.
6. To assure that the rubric for the holistic assessment of writing fairly measures our students' critical thinking, researching, and writing abilities, the graduate director will consult with the University's Director of Writing in the Disciplines, who is a member of the English Department.
7. After any necessary revisions to the rubric have been made, the graduate faculty will discuss the standards for classroom writing and how well that writing develops and/or measures our students' critical abilities. The aim of this discussion will be to reach some sort of departmental consensus on standards for writing in the graduate classroom.
8. To encourage greater faculty mentoring of MA students, the graduate director will propose that each graduate faculty member be assigned four or five students as advisees. While the graduate director will continue with general advising of students, the faculty mentors would meet with their advisees as needed to discuss class researching and writing assignments and to help them prepare for written and oral examinations. Although this advising would be informal, we may require that students meet at least once with their mentors in each long term.

[Jump to Top](#)

**Department of Family and  
Consumer Sciences**









***Online Assessment Tracking Database***

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**Dietetics MS**

**[View & Request Level Feedback](#)**

---

<b>Goal</b>	<p><b>Knowledge And Skills Development</b> </p> <p>Develop knowledge and skills to meet accreditation standards as a Registered Dietician (RD).</p>
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<p><b>Develop Knowledge And Skills Necessary To Provide Entry Level Services</b> </p> <p>Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills associated with the standards of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (AND).</p>
<b>Indicator</b>	<p><b>National Registration Examination For Dietetics (RD Exam)</b> </p> <p>Graduates who take the National Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) will pass it on the first time it is attempted. This indicator is consistent with the requirements of the Commission on Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND), the accrediting body for the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics.</p>
<b>Criterion</b>	<p><b>80% Passing On First Administration</b> </p> <p>The report from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics will indicate that 80% of first-time test takers on the National Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) who graduated from the Combined Master's and Dietetic Internship Program pass the exam.</p>
<b>Finding</b>	<p><b>RD Exam Results</b> </p> <p>The entire cohort of 9 students that graduated in December of 2012 took the Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) within 3 months of graduating. The first time passage rate for the 2012 cohort is 88.9%, exceeding the 80% goal.</p> <p>The finding was based on the official RD exam report for those that took the exam between January 1, 2013 and June 30, 2013 which was received in August 2013. The report shows our students averages in two areas (Food and Nutrition and Foodservice Systems Management) as well as the national average. For the students that took the exam in 2012, they were below the national average for Food and Nutrition and above in Foodservice Systems Management. However, the 2012 mean scores were higher for both areas when compared to the averages from the students in 2011. The 2013 scores show that the students that just took the test improved in the area of Food and Nutrition and were above the national average.</p>
<b>Action</b>	<p><b>Addressing Identified Weaknesses</b> </p> <p>At this point, this criterion has been met for 2012-2013. For the past three years, the pass rate has improved substantially over the rate for the graduating class of 2009. The two faculty members most directly involved with the program have continued to encourage students to take the exam in a timely manner.</p> <p>Maintaining this level of excellence will require continued vigilance on the part of these two faculty members as they direct dietetic interns in this program. This goal (of at least 80% passage rate) must continue to be met for continued program accreditation, and the program's reputation for excellence is closely tied to the high pass rate that has been achieved.</p> <p>The DI Director and faculty is continuing to provide case studies and class discussions/lectures specific to the area of Medical Nutrition Therapy, Food</p>

Service Management, and Community Nutrition to help increase knowledge and application of material. In addition, incoming interns must take an approved RD exam review course prior to graduation.

**Objective (L)**

**Internship/Field Activities**

Students will demonstrate knowledge and skills as they participate in internship/field activities that prepare them for entry-level positions as dietitians.

**Indicator**

**RD Supervisor Checklist Of Portfolio Activities**

Embedded assessments are found in courses such as FACS 5379, 5330, 5383, 5375, and SOCI 5414. For example, as each student completes a semester of FACS 5379, the supervised practice portion of the program, the Registered Dietitian supervising the student completes a check sheet indicating which skills of the entry-level dietitian have been met with that semester's work. A portfolio of activities in the courses FACS 5383, 5375, and 5379 will be used to measure student learning as they progress through the Combined Master's and Dietetic Internship Program. An example of a portfolio is available in the Dietetic Internship Director's office but portfolios for this program generally are much too large to attach to this document.

**Criterion**

**90% Of Students Scoring At Least 80% Of Entry Level Dietitian Competencies**

90% of students' portfolio evaluation (the evaluations of the Registered Dietitians with whom the students were working is part of this) will show successful completion of 80% or more of the competencies for an entry-level dietitian.

**Finding**

**Portfolio Assessment**

100% of students in this cohort demonstrated successful completion of at least 80% of the competencies for an entry-level dietitian based on portfolios and portfolio assessment. Even though the interns met the targeted score, they were weaker in the area of clinical nutrition.

**Action**

**Addressing Portfolio Weaknesses**

The DI Director will address program standards with incoming interns at orientation and mentor interns in portfolio development throughout the program. A pre-practicum exam is now given to incoming interns to evaluate their current knowledge base in clinical, food service management, and community. When competencies are not met, the DI Director and other faculty will mentor and guide the intern to meet the standards either through course assignments or additional rotation experiences. These assignments can be tailored based on the needs of the individual and group as evidenced by the pre-practicum exam and evaluation feedback from preceptors.

The portfolios are not accepted until the standard is met. The standard is based on requirements for an entry-level dietitian and is formed by regular attendance at and participation in AND-sponsored workshops and webinars regarding expectations of the profession.

**Objective (L)**

**Demonstrated Knowledge And Skills For Entry-level**

Students will demonstrate entry-level knowledge and skills to provide dietitian services.

**Indicator**

**Mock RD Exam** 🔑

The Mock RD Exam, developed by faculty, has proven, over the past four years it has been used, to be an excellent diagnostic tool as well as a predictor of whether or not the student will pass the National Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) on the first attempt.

**Criterion**

**90% Of Students Score At Least 80% On Mock RD Exam** 🔑

90% of students who exit the program will score a passing grade on the Mock RD Exam of 80% or higher (a passing grade on the Mock RD Exam is required before a Letter of Verification will be issued; the Letter of Verification must be issued before a student can sit for the National Registration Examination for Dietetics).

**Finding**

**Mock RD Exam Results** 🔑

The 9 students in the cohort passed the Mock RD Exam with a score of 80% or better and earned their Verification Statement. The exam showed that the students clinical nutrition base can be strengthened and was comparable to the previous intern group.

**Action**

**Mock RD Exam Results** 🔑

If an area identified on the Mock RD exam is less than satisfactory (80%), the DI Director will provide study/review material specific to that area to increase intern knowledge. The DI Director will also review the program to identify and modify the program as needed to strengthen the student skills identified by low results on the Mock RD Exam.

The Mock RD Exam will continue to be used as a method of determining whether students are ready and prepared to take the Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam). Students who do not pass the Mock RD Exam will not be issued the Letter of Verification that is required in order to take the RD Exam.

**Goal**

**Supervised Practice** 🔑

Students in the Combined MS and Dietetic Internship Program will progress through supervised practice in clinical, community and foodservice rotations and a curriculum that will augment knowledge and increase skills to promote excellence in research and dietetic practice.

**Objective (L)**

**Scheduled Rotations And Research Activities** 🔑

Students will demonstrate practical and critical thinking skills from each scheduled rotation and research activity. Rotations are in various clinical, community, food service, and research settings and total 1,200 hours over three long semesters. Content and activities in the rotations are designed to meet the requirements of the accrediting body, the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics.

**Indicator**

**End-of-Rotation Exams** 🔑

End of rotation exams developed by faculty will be used to measure students' progress toward knowledge and skills demonstrations.

**Criterion**

**90% Of Students Score 80% At End Of Rotations** 🔑

Over 90% of the students will indicate on an exit survey completed at the

end of the program that, through program goals, they have acquired practical and critical thinking skills and provide a rating of satisfactory or higher on the survey

**Finding**

**Progression/Successful Completion**

100% of the 9 students graduating in December of 2012 successfully completed their rotations and the exit survey. 66.7% of the interns indicated that all the rotations were satisfactory for achieving their goals and acquiring appropriate skills. The highest satisfaction was with the clinical rotation. The students had lower satisfaction with their food service rotations.

**Action**

**Progression/Successful Completion**

All 9 students of the cohort did complete the program by December 2012. After two years of student feedback and reflection, the DI Director will shorten the length of time spent in food service management from 15 weeks to 10 weeks. The activities and projects completed at these rotations will be revised to improve the experience the intern receives. If the site is unable to meet the standards of the program, then the site will no longer be used by the program.

In addition, incoming interns will create goals they want to achieve throughout the program at orientation. The DI Director will review the goals with each intern and provide feedback on whether or not the goals are realistic and in the scope of the program. The DI Director will help the interns set achievable goals.

**Goal**

**Knowledge And Skills Development**

Develop knowledge and skills to meet accreditation standards as a Registered Dietician (RD).

**Objective (L)**

**Develop Knowledge And Skills Necessary To Provide Entry Level Services**

Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills associated with the standards of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (AND).

**Indicator**

**National Registration Examination For Dietetics (RD Exam)**

Graduates who take the National Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) will pass it on the first time it is attempted. This indicator is consistent with the requirements of the Commission on Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND), the accrediting body for the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics.

**Criterion**

**80% Passing On First Administration**

The report from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics will indicate that 80% of first-time test takers on the National Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) who graduated from the Combined Master's and Dietetic Internship Program pass the exam.

There are no actions for this objective.

**Objective (L)**

**Internship/Field Activities**


Students will demonstrate knowledge and skills as they participate in internship/field activities that prepare them for entry-level positions as dietitians.

**Indicator**

**RD Supervisor Checklist Of Portfolio Activities**  

Embedded assessments are found in courses such as FACS 5379, 5330, 5383, 5375, and SOCI 5414. For example, as each student completes a semester of FACS 5379, the supervised practice portion of the program, the Registered Dietitian supervising the student completes a check sheet indicating which skills of the entry-level dietitian have been met with that semester's work. A portfolio of activities in the courses FACS 5383, 5375, and 5379 will be used to measure student learning as they progress through the Combined Master's and Dietetic Internship Program. An example of a portfolio is available in the Dietetic Internship Director's office but portfolios for this program generally are much too large to attach to this document.

**Criterion**

**90% Of Students Scoring At Least 80% Of Entry Level Dietitian Competencies** 

90% of students' portfolio evaluation (the evaluations of the Registered Dietitians with whom the students were working is part of this) will show successful completion of 80% or more of the competencies for an entry-level dietitian.

There are no actions for this objective.

**Objective (L)**

**Demonstrated Knowledge And Skills For Entry-level** 

Students will demonstrate entry-level knowledge and skills to provide dietitian services.

**Indicator**

**Mock RD Exam** 

The Mock RD Exam, developed by faculty, has proven, over the past four years it has been used, to be an excellent diagnostic tool as well as a predictor of whether or not the student will pass the National Registration Examination for Dietetics (RD Exam) on the first attempt.

**Criterion**

**90% Of Students Score At Least 80% On Mock RD Exam** 

90% of students who exit the program will score a passing grade on the Mock RD Exam of 80% or higher (a passing grade on the Mock RD Exam is required before a Letter of Verification will be issued; the Letter of Verification must be issued before a student can sit for the National Registration Examination for Dietetics).

There are no actions for this objective.

**Goal**

**Supervised Practice** 

Students in the Combined MS and Dietetic Internship Program will progress through supervised practice in clinical, community and foodservice rotations and a curriculum that will augment knowledge and increase skills to promote excellence in research and dietetic practice.



**Objective (L)**

**Scheduled Rotations And Research Activities**

Students will demonstrate practical and critical thinking skills from each scheduled rotation and research activity. Rotations are in various clinical, community, food service, and research settings and total 1,200 hours over three long semesters. Content and activities in the rotations are designed to meet the requirements of the accrediting body, the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics.

**Indicator**

**End-of-Rotation Exams**

End of rotation exams developed by faculty will be used to measure students' progress toward knowledge and skills demonstrations.

**Criterion**

**90% Of Students Score 80% At End Of Rotations**

Over 90% of the students will indicate on an exit survey completed at the end of the program that, through program goals, they have acquired practical and critical thinking skills and provide a rating of satisfactory or higher on the survey

There are no actions for this objective.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

This stringent, professional graduate program, with the benchmark measure (pass rate on the RD Exam at the first attempt) at 100% for this cohort, continues to do well. The DI Director continues to work with the DPD Director to ensure that all of the accreditation requirements are being met.

A new cohort of 10 students has been matched with the program for Fall 2012. The GRE scores for the new cohort are comparable with the group that graduated December 2011. The GRE score continues to be an excellent predictor of successful passage of the RD Exam.

To continue to strengthen the program and retain high passage rate on the RD Exam at the first attempt, the DI Director and DPD Director will strengthen the student's knowledge in the area of nutrition (including clinical, food service, and community) through case studies and assignments at rotation sites and in the classroom. The DI Director is also closely assessing the interns' portfolios throughout the program to ensure that all competencies are met. When competencies are lacking or missing, the DI Director will mentor and guide the intern to completing the competencies either through course assignments or additional rotation experience.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

During the past year, the competencies for the registered dietitian were updated to reflect the new 2012 guidelines. Feedback from past interns were used to help update the competencies and adjust for new technology and procedures. A new clinical site was added to strengthen the student's experiences and knowledge in the area of clinical nutrition.

All interns are now required to complete an RD review course prior to graduation. They must show the DI Director evidence they have completed the course. The case studies were revised and updated to reflect changes in nutrition and updated practices. Assignments were either added or removed based on if they met the competency and reflected the best practices for an entry-level dietitian.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

This stringent, professional graduate program, with the benchmark measure (pass rate on the RD Exam at the first attempt) at 100% for this cohort, continues to do well. The program continues to exceed the 80% first time pass

rate for the RD exam. A new cohort of 10 students has been matched with the program for Fall 2013, and all of them have been formally accepted into the program. The GRE scores for the new cohort are comparable with the group that graduated December 2012. The GRE score continues to be an excellent predictor of successful passage of the RD Exam.

New sites are also planned for clinical and community rotations for the upcoming year. Finding a new site and getting a contract signed takes 6 to 12 months. New preceptor sites allows for more diverse experiences for the interns.

To continue to strengthen the program and retain high passage rate on the RD Exam at the first attempt, the DI Director will meet with the interns every two weeks and provide additional education in the areas of clinical nutrition, community, and food service management through assignments and case studies. The DI Director is also monitoring the intern's portfolios every semester to ensure that all competencies are being met. If the intern does not successfully complete a rotation, then additional assignments and/or additional rotation experience will be required.

[Jump to Top](#)










*Online Assessment Tracking Database*








Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**Family And Consumer Sciences BA**



[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Employer/Supervisor Feedback</b>  The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate general Family and Consumer Sciences majors who perform well in employment positions within the field
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Demonstration Of Applied Professional Competence</b>  The student will demonstrate professional competence and the ability to apply what they have learned (e.g., appropriate product knowledge, knowledge of business procedures, knowledge of industry systems) in various aspects of family-and-consumer-sciences-related positions.
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Employer/Supervisor Evaluation</b>   Supervisor evaluation form for general family and consumer sciences interns evaluates three skill areas (personal skills, interpersonal skills, and professional characteristics including appropriate use of knowledge from the program content). Both questions from this form used as indicators are essentially overall supervisor ratings of the intern. One of them rates the interns on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest rating. The other is a "yes-yes, hire with reservations-no" indicator of whether the employer would hire the intern in the company for an entry-level management position. Internship is a requirement for degree completion in this program, so all family and consumer sciences students are evaluated in this way except for the teacher certification students who are evaluated by the teachers supervising their methods courses. The instrument, which includes the supervisor rating of the intern that will be extracted and reported, was developed by the department faculty as a whole. Instruments used by other family and consumer sciences colleges and departments were reviewed in the development of the instrument. The attached instrument was designed to be generic for all programs in the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences that require this type of internship and is published in the Internship Handbook which serves as the textbook for the internship course (FACS 4369). The other programs that use this same form are interior design, fashion merchandising, and food service management.
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Employer/Supervisor Ratings At Least 3.5</b>  80% of business supervisors of family and consumer sciences interns will give the intern a rating of 3.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale and 80% of business supervisors will indicate that they would hire the intern given the availability of a suitable entry-level management position in the company.
<b>Finding</b>	<b>Employer/Supervisor Evaluation</b>  Of the six family and consumer sciences BA graduates for the 2012-2013 cycle, 100% received a rating of 4 or 5 (i.e., greater than 3.5) by the internship employer/supervisor. 100% of the supervisors stated that he/she would hire the intern for a suitable, entry-level position within the company or agency. Therefore, this criterion was met.
<b>Action</b>	<b>Employer/Supervisor Evaluation</b>  We modified the evaluation form this past cycle to include three options rather than two (yes or no) as there had been in the past. This time we divided the "yes" option into "yes, hire without reservation" and "yes, hire with reservation" in the hope of getting additional feedback for program improvement. However, although we received both "yes" responses, there was little feedback, so we plan to modify the process.

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Student Knowledge Of Content Area</b> 
	The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate General Family and Consumer Sciences majors who have an in-depth knowledge of the content areas of the major.
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Demonstration Of Content-Area Knowledge And Skills</b> 
	Students graduating from the family and consumer sciences program will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for entry-level management in family-and-consumer-sciences-related positions.
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills</b> 
	The Exit Survey for family and consumer sciences majors includes multiple-choice and short-answer sections that test retention of course material; it is graded on a pass/fail basis. (Each program area has multiple-choice, short answer and other questions that are specific to that program content.) To develop this instrument, faculty in the content area reviewed course and program objectives and chose questions from exams that reflected important concepts that students should retain. The test is used repetitively and the scoring is consistent. For security reasons, the "test" portion (multiple-choice questions, short essay questions, and case study) is not attached. However, this document is available in the chair's office.
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills</b>  
	90% of students who complete the family and consumer sciences program's Exit Survey will score a grade of Low Pass, Pass or High Pass on the content portions of the exam.
<b>Finding</b>	<b>Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills</b> 
	100% of students who completed the BA in Family and Consumer Sciences for the 2012-2013 cycle scored a grade of Pass (4 out of 6 or 66.7%) or High Pass (2 out of 6 or 33%) on the Exit Survey. Therefore, this criterion was met.
<b>Action</b>	<b>Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills</b> 
	Because 100% of students passed the Exit Survey, we are working with the idea of abandoning this instrument and instead using the scoring on fourteen professional skills identified as critical to professional success on the Performance Appraisal of Student Intern as completed by the Internship Supervisor.

---

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Computer Literacy</b> 
	The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate students who have performed satisfactorily in the area of computer literacy through computer-based assignments in courses that are required of all FCS majors.
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Computer Literacy</b> 
	Students will demonstrate computer literacy through specific assignments in FACS 2368 (word-processing assignment and a budget assignment using a spreadsheet) and in FACS 4362 (a presentation using PowerPoint). Satisfactory

completion of these three assignments will indicate achievement of basic computer literacy skills that students are projected to need as they graduate from FCS programs and enter the world of work.

**Indicator**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

There is a specific rubric for each assignment.

**Criterion**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑 🔑

90% of family and consumer sciences majors who take the courses FACS 2368 and FACS 4362 during the 2011-2012 academic year will score 3 or better on a 5-point scale with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest score on the three assignments that are required to meet this computer literacy competency. Examples of assignment sheets for these three assignments and rubrics for grading them are attached.

**Finding**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

Seven out of 8 students who completed the course in which the word-processing and spreadsheet projects were assigned made a grade of 5, and the other student made a grade of 2. Therefore, 87.5% of students scored a grade of 3.0 or better so this criterion was not met for these two areas. Two students who completed the course in which the PowerPoint presentation is assigned scored a 5 on that project (100%), so this criterion was met for this area of computer literacy.

**Action**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

With so few students, there is little significance to this finding yet the university requires that we measure and report results regarding computer literacy through this means. Overall, it is obvious that students are entering the university with good computer literacy skills and are further developing these skills during their time as undergraduate students.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

This program continues to do well. Students leave with both knowledge and practical skills needed for employment as event planners, professionals in non-profit and social service agencies, and various types of consumer-oriented businesses. As the business supervisor evaluation form is modified so that we are better able to collect information on areas where program improvement is called needed, the program will be better able to address weaknesses. Computer literacy is adequate for program graduates, but more work on database management is needed. A meeting will be convened of the faculty who teach the budget assignment to determine how student performance in this area can be improved. In general, however, employers and supervisors are very complimentary of the marketable knowledge and skills program graduates bring to their real world professional positions.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

Faculty who teach the spreadsheet assignment have seen improvement in student performance. Also, in response to student suggestions, we are offering a course specifically in event planning for fall, and the numbers are encouraging -- 24 students are already enrolled and we are a month out! Employers and supervisors continue to be very complimentary of the knowledge and skills students bring to the internship and which will be translated into "real word" assets as students go forward from the program.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

The plan for the coming year is to improve the assessment piece regarding content knowledge and skills through use of the fourteen professional skills identified on the internship supervisor evaluation form. Students from this program continue to do very well. We are working with Continuing Education to craft a certificate in event planning which should be a major boon to the program and also garner it well-deserved attention from the university community in general.

[Jump to Top](#)



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013

**Family And Consumer Sciences BS (Food Science And Nutrition)**


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---




**Goal** **Knowledge And Skills** 



To graduate students with the necessary foundation, knowledge, skills, and competencies outlined in the American Dietetic Association's (ADA) Commission for Accreditation of Dietetics Education (CADE) Handbook.

**Objective (L)** **Demonstration Of Knowledge And Skills** 


Food Science and Nutrition students will demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to meet the standards of the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics, the accrediting arm of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (formerly the American Dietetic Association).

**Indicator** **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 


The Exit Survey for food science and nutrition majors includes multiple-choice and short-answer sections that test retention of course material; it is graded on a pass/fail basis. (Each program area has questions that are specific to that program content.) To develop this instrument, faculty in the content area reviewed course and program objectives and chose questions from exams that reflected important concepts that students should retain. The test is used repetitively and the scoring is consistent. For security reasons, the test portion (multiple-choice, short-answer questions) is not attached. However, this document is available in the chair's office.

**Criterion** **80% Of Students Pass Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills**  


At least 80% of the students who complete the food science and nutrition program's Exit Survey will score a grade of Pass or High Pass on the content portion of the exam.

**Finding** **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 


Of the 18 students graduated from this program during the 2012-2013 cycle, 15 completed the Exit Survey. Of those 15, 100% scored a grade of High Pass on this instrument.

**Action** **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 


Although the results of the Exit Survey were very good, we will continue a greater effort to intercept students as they prepare to graduate before they receive their diplomas.

**Goal** **Becoming Registered Dietitians** 

To graduate students who will successfully complete dietetic internship programs and pass the national credentialing exam with the goal of becoming Registered Dietitians.

**Objective (L)** **Demonstrating Knowledge And Skills Required Of Registered Dietitians** 

Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for entry-level dietitians.

**Indicator** **Registration Examination In Dietetics** 

The information concerning passage of the credentialing exam can be verified by an annual report sent to program directors by American Council on

Education of Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND), the accrediting arm of the AND (Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, formerly the American Dietetic Association).

**Criterion**

**Registration Examination In Dietetics** 🔑

At least 80% of students will receive a passing score on the Registration Examination for Dietetics.

**Finding**

**Passage Rate On Registration Examination For Dietetics** 🔑

According to data from the ACT, 100% of students from this program who took the Registration Examination for Dietetics from this program passed the exam on the first try, an excellent record.

**Action**

**Registration Examination In Dietetics** 🔑

This objective duplicates what was written in the self-study that was submitted to ACEND in the Fall of 2012. As part of this accrediting body's requirement, we will continue to work for an 80% passge rate on the Registration Exam on the first time. This benchmark rate is a national standard.

**Goal**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate students who have performed satisfactorily in the area of computer literacy through computer-based assignments in courses that are required of all FCS majors.

**Objective (L)**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

To assure competency in this area, students will complete specific assignments in FACS 2368 (a written assignment requiring use of a word-processing program and a budget assignment requiring the use of a spreadsheet) and FACS 4362 (a presentation using PowerPoint). Satisfactory completion of these three assignments will indicate achievement of computer literacy skills that students are projected to need as they graduate from the Food Science and Nutrition Program and enter the world of work.

**Indicator**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

Students who graduate from undergraduate programs in the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, including the Food Science and Nutrition Program, will satisfactorily complete three assignments in courses required of all undergraduate majors in the department: a word-processed assignment and a budget prepared using a spreadsheet in FACS 2368 Consumer Education and a presentation involving use of PowerPoint in FACS 4362 Presentation Techniques. In addition, Food Science and Nutrition majors will do two additional computer literacy assignments that will be assessed. For FACS 3370, students will complete a PowerPoint assignment on a nutrition-related metabolic disorder, and for FACS 3339, students will submit a Review of Literature Analysis of Evidence related to a community nutrition problem. There are rubrics for each assignment.

**Criterion**

**Word-Processing, Spreadsheet And PowerPoint Assignments** 🔑 🔑

At least 90% of program majors who take the courses FACS 2368 and FACS 4362 during the 2012-2013 academic year will score 3 or better on a 5-point scale with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest score on the three assignments that are required to meet this computer literacy competency. Examples of assignment sheets for these three assignments and rubrics for grading them are attached.

**Finding** **Word-Processing, Spreadsheet And PowerPoint Assignments**

Fifteen students from this program were enrolled in the FACS 2368 course and completed the word-processing and spreadsheet assignments with a score of 5/5. Six students from this program were enrolled in the FACS 4362 course; five of them completed the PowerPoint assignment and made a score of 5, and the remaining students made a score of 3. Therefore, this criterion was met.

**Criterion** **Assignments In FACS 3370 And 3339**

All Food Science and Nutrition majors take FACS 3370 and 3339 as part of their program. Computer literacy assignments include a Review of Literature Analysis of Evidence (FACS 3339) and a PowerPoint presentation for a nutrition-related metabolic disorder or "hot topic" related to nutrition pathways (FACS 3370). 90% of students in these courses will score at least a 3.0 on these two assignments.

**Finding** **Assignments In FACS 3370 And FACS 3339**

Thirty-two out of the 35 students in FACS 3370 (91%) earned a score of 3 or above on the assigned presentation over a nutrition-related metabolic disorder or "hot topic" related to nutrition pathways. Twenty-three out of 25 (92%) of students earned a score of 3 or better on the Review of Literature Analysis of Evidence. Therefore, this criterion was met.

**Action** **Computer Literacy**

The university requires that we measure and report results regarding computer literacy, and these are the means and measures chosen for this reporting. This computer literacy measure is also required of ACEND, the accrediting body over the Food Science and Nutrition Program. Overall, it is obvious that students are entering the university with good computer literacy skills and are further developing these skills during their time as undergraduate students.

**Goal** **Dietetic Internship Programs**

To guide and direct well-qualified students toward admission into a dietetic internship program.

**Objective (P)** **Increase Percentage Of Didactic Program In Dietetics (DPD) Graduates Admitted To Dietetic Internship (DI) Programs**

Well-qualified students will be recruited to enter a dietetic internship program.

**KPI Performance Indicator**

**Graduates Admitted To Dietetic Internship Programs**

The program will increase the percentage of students graduating from the Food Science and Nutrition Program and applying to a Dietetic Internship Program who are successfully admitted. Over a two-year period, 30% of students who graduate from the Food Science and Nutrition Program will apply for, and be admitted to, a dietetic internship program.

**Result** **Graduates Admitted To Dietetic Internship Programs**

Of the seven program graduates who applied to Dietetic Internship Programs, five were accepted, for an acceptance rate of 71.4%; one of these two students has had an interview for a position and we do not yet know the results of this interview. The goal written for ACEND was a 30% acceptance rate, so this criterion was exceeded.

#### Action

#### Increase Percentage Of DPD Graduates Admitted To A DI Program

The DPD Director works individually with students to prepare their packets so that chances for admission are increased. Even though we met the goal, we want to increase the percentage of students applying for and being admitted to DI Programs.

#### Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

Dr. Valencia Browning-Keen came to this program after 10 years in clinical settings and 5 years in community and nutrition programs and with program director experience. For the past three years, she has been a strong advocate for this stringent and growing accredited program. There have been increases in numbers of students enrolled in the program, and also in the number of program graduates under her direction. This year saw a substantial increase in the number of program graduates admitted to Dietetic Internship programs (75% for 2011-2012 as compared to 46.6% for 2010-2011), an important marker for program success as seen by ACEND, the accrediting arm of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (formerly the American Dietetic Association). Areas needing improvement are in relation to administration of Exit Surveys for tracking successful attainment of knowledge and skills on an annual basis, and database management for the computer literacy criterion, although these program graduates, as a group, scored better than any other group of program graduates from the department in the area of computer literacy. Dr. Browning-Keen is working to develop more corporate bridges in food manufacturing and distribution and corporate donors in the food industry for scholarship and program resources. She is seeking more collaboration in coordinating knowledge requirements of DPD courses and is working toward identifying grants for ongoing research with student involvement. Her overall goal is to enhance cultural competency of DPD students throughout the DPD curriculum. This small program is seeing unprecedented success and is becoming well-known as a successful program for nutrition and dietetics in this region of the State of Texas.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

This program underwent a highly successfully self-study and re-accreditation process during the 2012-2013 cycle. We achieved the re-accreditation for the next 10 years, confirmed by a letter dated May of 2013. We plan to continue tracking Exit Surveys, tracking employers' responses to program graduates, and to continue the high quality of work that students from this program do in regard to computer literacy. The FACS 4373 course Cultural Foods was taught in the Summer of 2013, along with the addition of cultural competency in several other courses within the DPD curriculum. This small program is making an impact throughout the State of Texas and the nation.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

We are planning to work with Jeffrey Roberts of the Assessment Office to align the Plan for Continuous Improvement with the information supplied to the accrediting body (ACEND) in the self-study document. We plan to continue to work with students so that their packets will help them to be admitted to Dietetic Internship Programs and also to prepare them so that they will have the background to pass the Registration Examination in Dietetics and become well-prepared professionals in this area. The Didactic Program in Dietetics at Sam Houston State University is an inclusive program whose mission is to provide quality, scholarship and community service opportunities to a diverse student body in order to complete the knowledge requirements set by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND) so that graduates are competitive in the Dietetic Internship application process and eligible for a global marketplace meeting individual and family needs in the food or health care industry.




*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013


**Family And Consumer Sciences BS (Interior Design)**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)



---

**Goal**                      **Internship Supervisor Evaluation** 


The Interior Design Program will graduate students who meet the expectations of employers in the profession of interior design.

**Objective (L)**                      **Demonstration Of Applied Professional Competence** 


The students will demonstrate professional competence and the ability to apply what they have learned (egs., appropriate product knowledge, knowledge of business procedures, knowledge of industry systems) in various aspects of interior design.

**Indicator**                              **Employer/Supervisor Evaluation**  


The supervisor evaluation form for interior design interns evaluates three skill areas (personal skills, interpersonal skills, and professional skills including appropriate use of knowledge from the program content). Both questions from this form used as indicators are derived from supervisor ratings of the intern. One of them rates the interns on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest rating. The other is a "yes-no" indicator of whether the employer would hire the intern in the company for an entry-level design assistant position.

**Criterion**                              **Employer/Supervisor Evaluation 3.5+ And 80% Would Hire If Possible** 


80% of business supervisors of interior design interns will give the intern a rating of 3.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale and 80% of business supervisors will indicate that they would hire the intern given the availability of a suitable entry-level management position in the company.

**Finding**                              **Employer/Supervisor Evaluation Of 3.5+ And 80% Would Hire If Possible** 


Of the six interior design graduates for 2012-2013, 100% received a rating of 4 or 5 (i.e., greater than 3.5) by the internship employer/supervisor. 100% of supervisors stated that he/she would hire the intern for a suitable, entry-level position with the company. Therefore, this criterion was met.

**Action**                              **Employer/Supervisor Evaluation** 

We modified the evaluation form this past cycle to include three options rather two (yes or no) as it had been in previous cycles. This time, we divided the "yes" options into "yes, hire without reservations" and "yes, hire with reservations" in hope of getting additional feedback. However, although we received both "yes" responses, there was little feedback, so we plan to modify the process.

**Goal**                              **Student Knowledge Of Content Area** 

Students graduating from the interior design program will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for entry-level interior design positions.

**Objective (L)**                      **Demonstration Of Content-Area Knowledge And Skills** 

Students graduating from the interior design program will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for entry-level interior design positions.

**Indicator**

**Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 🔑

The Exit Survey for interior design majors includes multiple-choice and short-answer sections that test retention of course material and a case study that applies directly to interior design; it is graded on a pass/fail basis. (Each program area has multiple-choice, short answer, and other questions that are specific to that program content.) To develop this instrument, faculty in the content area reviewed course and program objectives and chose questions from exams that reflected important concepts that students should retain. The test is used repetitively and the scoring is consistent. For security reasons, the "test" portion (multiple-choice questions, short essay questions, and case study) is not attached. However, this document is available in the chair's

**Criterion**

**Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills - 90% Pass Or High Pass** 🔑 🔑

90% of students who complete the interior design program's Exit Survey will score a grade of Low Pass, Pass or High Pass on the content portions of the exam.

**Finding**

**Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 🔑

100% (six out of six) of students who completed the interior design program's Exit Survey scored a grade of Pass or High Pass on the content portion of the exam (50% scored a Pass and 50% scored a High Pass). Therefore, this criterion was met.

**Action**

**Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 🔑

Because 100% of students passed the Exit Survey, we are working with the idea of abandoning this instrument and instead using the scoring on fourteen professional skills identified as critical to professional success on the Performance Appraisal of Student Intern as completed by the Internship Supervisor.

**Goal**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate students who have performed satisfactorily in the area of computer literacy through computer-based assignments in courses that are required of all FCS majors.

**Objective (L)**

**Computer Literacy** 🔑

Students will meet university requirements for computer literacy through assignments in FACS 2368 and FACS 4362 that are required of all undergraduate majors in the department.

**Indicator**

**Computer Literacy Assignments** 🔑

Students who graduate from undergraduate programs in the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will satisfactorily complete three assignments in courses required of all undergraduate majors in the department: a word-processed assignment and a budget prepared using a spreadsheet in FACS 2368 Consumer Education and a presentation involving use of PowerPoint in FACS 4362 Presentation Techniques.

**Criterion**

**Computer Literacy Assignments - At Least 3.0** 🔑 🔑

90% of program majors who take the courses FACS 2368 and FACS 4362 during the 2012-2013 academic year will score 3 or better on a 5-point scale with 5 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest score on the three assignments that are required to meet this computer literacy competency. Examples of assignment sheets for these three assignments and rubrics for grading them are attached.

**Finding**

**Computer Literacy Assignments**

Three interior design students completed the course in which the spreadsheet and word processing assignments are assigned. All of these students received the highest score (5/5) on these assignments. Three students from the BS program in Interior Design completed the PowerPoint assignment in FACS 4362. All of them scored 5/5 on this assignment. Therefore, this criterion was met.

**Action**

**Computer Literacy Assignments**

With so few students, there is little significance to this finding yet the university requires that we measure computer literacy through this means. There SHOULD be a significant number of students for this measure for the coming cycle (2013-2014 based on the numbers we are seeing). Overall, it is obvious that students are entering the university with good computer literacy skills and are further developing these skills during their time as undergraduate students.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

We are keeping the Exit Survey criterion for next year before retiring it if the percentage remains as high. Instructors teaching in the area of budget management will be requiring additional assignments in the area of database management to improve this skill. We will be updating our Internship Handbook to reflect a revision of the Supervisor/Employer Evaluation form in order to glean more specific data to use for program improvement.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

The program received notice of CIDA accreditation during the Summer of 2012. This was a major accomplishment and positions this program for significant growth. Although we believe the number of majors declined during the two years when the accreditation preparation was the most intense, we are beginning to see an increase in the numbers in the lower-level courses.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

We are planning to evaluate the options for the "yes" and "yes, hire with reservations" response given by employers of student interns as part of the evaluation process. We are planning to use the fourteen professional skills noted on the evaluation instrument as a means of evaluating content area knowledge and skills.

The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences received some marketing funds from Enrollment Management and we worked with them to produce brochures, appropriate advertising specialties, videos and other marketing materials. We believe that some of the growth in this program is due to these marketing efforts, and we will be able to continue them with the materials that have been developed.

The Interior Design Program is participating with the Department of Art (that department is taking the lead) in



pursuing NASAD (National Association of Schools of Art and Design) accreditation. Dr. Laura Burleson, Program Director for Interior Design, has been involved in the writing of the interior design portion of the self-study document in anticipation of a site visit in October of 2013. This is a university-wide accreditation and must include every program within the university that offers art or design.

[Jump to Top](#)

**Department of Foreign  
Languages**



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**Spanish BA**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---

**Goal** **Skills Proficiency** 

Graduating majors will demonstrate skills proficiency.

**Objective (L)**

**Oral Proficiency** 

Graduating majors will demonstrate oral proficiency.

**Indicator**

**Capstone Presentation**  

Individual graduating majors will each give a ten-minute capstone presentation, followed by five minutes of questions from faculty, all in the target language, during the final semester before graduation.

**Criterion**

**Graduating Majors' Participation**  

Three faculty members will evaluate each capstone presentation, using the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL) levels, each student averaging intermediate mid or higher.

**Finding**

**Capstones**  

At least three faculty members participated in evaluating each graduating major's oral proficiency using the ACTFL rubrics in a capstone presentation during the final semester.

**Indicator**

**ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI)** 

All graduating majors will complete an ACTFL OPI during the final semester of classes.

**Criterion**

**OPI Evaluation** 

A Department of Foreign Language's officially trained ACTFL OPI Evaluator will interview each graduating major during the final semester. Students will be scored at intermediate, mid, or higher.

**Finding**

**OPI**  

Each graduating major was evaluated in an OPI using ACTFL standards by an FOL faculty member trained by ACTFL.

**Action**

**Oral Proficiency** 

Based on the capstone and OPI results of graduating majors, the common required student proficiency tasks for the first four levels of language acquisition are being adapted to maximize performance.

**Objective (L)**

**Writing Proficiency** 

Graduating majors will demonstrate writing proficiency.

**Indicator**

**Portfolio** 

During the final semester, all graduating majors will submit a portfolio of class assignments from SHSU classes to demonstrate writing proficiency.

**Criterion**

**Portfolio Contents**  

Portfolio will contain three assignments: one paper, one grammar exam,

and one of student's choice. The portfolio is scored by a faculty member teaching the course from which the assignment comes. Portfolios will be scored as meeting expectations or exceeds expectations.

### Finding

#### Graduating Majors' Portfolios

All graduating majors have submitted portfolios, which contain 3 assignments, most with one paper, one grammar exam, and one of student's choice.

The portfolios have yet to be scored by a faculty member teaching the course from which the assignment comes, as neither students nor faculty members have retained graded assignments. Portfolios have not yet been scored as meeting expectations or exceeds expectations as the rubric for expectations has yet to be finalized.

### Action

#### Graduating Majors' Portfolios

While the portfolios are being collected electronically to aid in evaluation, they do not necessarily contain the stipulated assignments, nor are those assignments graded.

No progress has been made on evaluation of the portfolios due to lack of like materials contained within in order to apply the ACTFL rubric(s) for writing proficiency.

### Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

Grammar for non-native speakers continues to be a major issue. For the native speakers, the diacritical markings tend to be lacking in their writing. Thus, we have to stress more intensively grammar rules and diacritical markings. We have a faculty member slated to be trained as an OPI evaluator in November. That should lessen the load for faculty. We are hoping that electronic portfolios will lessen the problem of standardizing the assignments submitted for the portfolio. We also need to standardize our response when first drafts are submitted rather than the final product.

We are consistently having all graduating Spanish majors complete the capstone presentation, the OPI evaluation, the portfolio and the questionnaire every semester, with at least the minimum three faculty participants, usually more, and using the ACTFL national standards for evaluation across students. Unfortunately, these are frequently done at the last minute to the inconvenience of the faculty due to students waiting until the last minute of their last semester to complete the requirements. We have now established one date per semester for the capstones. Part of the problem is that students do not declare their graduation plans until the last minute. We may need to consult with students regarding how to remedy these failings.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

We have now facilitated the training of two faculty members to be OPI evaluators. The electronic portfolio submission is still a work in progress, as the majority of our students do not seem to retain their associated work, especially in electronic form; nor do the majority of professors who teach such courses grade "on-line," which would facilitate accessing the work and submitting it electronically.

All graduating Spanish majors are doing a capstone presentation, an OPI evaluation, the portfolio and questionnaire every semester and we always have at least three faculty participants in the capstone, all using the ACTFL standards. We continue to have one date for capstones, although the number of graduating majors has become somewhat unwieldy for same. We continue to have the problem of last minute declarations and students who swear they have never heard of the requirements (plus what appears to be some lack of knowledge/resistance on the part of advisors outside FOL).

### Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed

**based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

We will need to standarize electronic collection of common portfolio materials over the potential four years of any given student's courses with FOL at SHSU, perhaps by faculty submission of final exams in the grammar and composition course and final research papers in other advanced classes.

[Jump to Top](#)

# **Department of History**



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**History BA**


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---




**Goal** **History Teacher Preparation** **DRAFT** 


History majors and minors who choose teaching as a profession will demonstrate knowledge and skills to be effective in the classroom.

**Objective (L)** **History Teacher Preparation** **DRAFT** 



Graduating students will demonstrate necessary knowledge and skills to be effective history teachers.

**Indicator** **TEXES Examination** **DRAFT** 


Teacher education students who major or minor in History will pass the TExES examination.  
 The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) was developed by the State Board of Educator Certification/Texas Education Agency as a multiple-choice criterion-referenced examination designed to measure a candidate's knowledge in relation to an established criterion rather than to the performance of other candidates. The History TExES has three domains: (I) World History, (II) U.S. History, and (III) Foundations, Skills, Research, and Instruction.

**Criterion** **Targeted Rates Of TEXES Passage** **DRAFT** 


80% of all teacher education students who major or minor in History will pass the TEXES history examination with at least a score of 70%.

**Finding** **Targeted Rates Of TEXES Passage** **DRAFT**  


82% (22 out of 27) of such students passed the TEXES history examination with a 70%-plus score in 2012-13 in terms of the Total Scale Score. In terms of the individual domain scores, 39 of 6681 (48%) of the scores were at least 70%. 100% of history majors (5 of 5) passed the Social Studies TExES.

**Action** **Targeted Rates Of TEXES Passage** **DRAFT** 



Education remains a field that students are wary to enter, on account of decreased funding and budgets. Our TExES cohorts are relatively small, but are significant enough to give us confidence that our history students entering the education field have the requisite knowledge.

**Goal** **Skills And Knowledge In History** **DRAFT** 

B.A. History graduates will be prepared for successful careers and productive citizenship through high quality knowledge and skills in all courses.

**Objective (L)** **Student Learning Outcomes** **DRAFT** 

During the course of the semester, students enrolled in history courses will demonstrate significant improvement in their understanding of the historical content covered in their respective courses.

**Indicator** **Pre/Post Testing US History Core Curriculum** **DRAFT**  

During the course of a semester, students enrolled in US history courses will demonstrate significant improvement in their understanding of American

history by taking pre and post-tests in that subject matter. The test instrument was locally constructed based upon CSCOPE materials from the Texas Education Service Center Curriculum Collaborative (TESCCC) pursuant to norms for the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills Exam (TEKS) with the aim of monitoring change over time in basic knowledge of the major themes covered in the American history survey curriculum. The State of Texas Core Curriculum Component Area guidelines were consulted before the creation of this testing instrument.

#### Criterion

#### US History Student Learning **DRAFT** 🔑

At least 20% of students enrolled in the US surveys will be given pre-post tests over content relevant to these courses. A statistical analysis of the results of this testing will demonstrate significant student improvement in knowledge of pertinent US history themes. Overall class improvement of at least 15% on the class average post-test score versus the class average pre-test score will indicate success.

#### Finding

#### US History Student Learning--2012-13 **DRAFT** 🔑

During Fall 2012, US history survey classes that included 387 HIST 1301 students (representing 23% of the total number of students taking HIST 1301) and 234 HIST 1302 students (representing 32% of the total number of students taking HIST 1302) took pre- and post-tests on an instrument that was developed by the department. HIST 1301 students averaged 51% correct on the pretest and 60% correct on the post-test. HIST 1302 students averaged 44% correct on the pre-test and 56% correct on the post-test.

During Spring 2013, 287 HIST 1301 students (49% of the total) averaged 50% on the pre-test and 52% on the post-test. In HIST 1302, 314 students (29% of the total) averaged 47% on the pre-test and 53% on the post-test.

#### Indicator

#### World History Student Learning **DRAFT** 🔑

During the course of a semester, students enrolled in world history courses will demonstrate significant improvement in their understanding of world history. The test instrument was locally constructed based upon CSCOPE materials from the Texas Education Service Center Curriculum Collaborative (TESCCC) pursuant to norms for the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills Exam (TEKS) with the aim of monitoring change over time in basic knowledge of the major themes covered in the world history survey curriculum. The State of Texas Core Curriculum Component Area guidelines were consulted before the creation of this testing instrument.

#### Criterion

#### World History Student Learning **DRAFT** 🔑

At least 20% of students enrolled in world history surveys will be given pre-post tests over content relevant to these courses. A statistical analysis of the results of this testing will demonstrate significant student improvement in knowledge of pertinent world history themes. Overall class improvement of at least 15% on the class average post-test score versus the class average pre-test score will indicate success.

#### Finding

#### World History Learning--2012-13 **DRAFT** 🔑

During Fall 2012, world history survey classes that included 85 HIST 2311 students (representing 32% of the total number of students taking HIST 2311) and 75 HIST 2312 students (representing 46% of the total number of students taking HIST 2312) took pre- and post-tests on an instrument that was developed by the department. HIST 2311 students averaged 43% correct on the pre-test and 43% on the post-test. HIST 2312 students averaged 44% correct on the pre-test and 67% correct on the post-test.

During Spring 2013, 61 HIST 2311 students (19% of the total) averaged 48% on the pre-test and 50% on the post-test. In HIST

2312, 38 students (31% of the total) averaged 63% on the pre-test and 62% on the post-test.

**Indicator**

**Senior Level Student Learning Outcome Assessments DRAFT**

During the course of the semester, students enrolled in 4000-level (senior level) courses will demonstrate significant improvement in their abilities in historical scholarship and writing, as determined by a panel of history faculty.

**Criterion**

**Senior Level Outcome Assessments DRAFT**

All students in senior level history courses will produce semester research papers. At least 20% of these papers from the total senior level course enrollment will undergo a quality and outcome assessment review by a panel of history faculty. The panel will not include faculty currently teaching senior level courses and will review the selected papers double-blind according to a 6-point rubric developed from norms promoted by the American Historical Association. At least 80% of all sampled papers will reach 18 points or higher on the 6-30 point scale of the rubric.

**Finding**

**Senior-Level Outcome Assessments DRAFT**

30 papers, or 22% of the total senior-level papers written in 2012-13, were evaluated by the panel of two evaluators. One evaluator gave scores averaging 21.8, and the other 20.8.

The most common deficiency concerned the rigor of historical source research, followed by felicity of expression. Students did best with respect to framing historical questions.

**Action**

**Student Learning Outcomes DRAFT**

We remain pleased that students generally are performing better on the post- than the pre-tests. The phenomenon is more marked for United States than World History. New departmental faculty in US and World History are committed to making our testing instruments more rigorous and more strongly normed.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

Undergraduate education is the heart and foundation of the Department mission. For that reason, the History Department has undertaken to enhance procedures and instruments for assessing and improving undergraduate learning outcomes. The department will continue to review and improve assessment testing. Perhaps more importantly, the department will increase emphasis on the critical thinking skills inherent to the discipline, making students aware of rubric objectives and strengthening their mastery of those objectives.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

In 2012-13 we submitted, to the University Curriculum Committee, a modification of our senior-level "capstone" course that will make the critical thinking and learning-outcome objectives still more clear to the students. 4000-level courses will now fall in more subject areas and create enhanced opportunities for the departmental faculty to discern the real learning outcomes of our undergraduates.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

Undergraduate education remains the principal realm of reform and enhancement in this Department. We are preparing to review our 3000-level curriculum, a review that will take place in fall 2013, so that specific tracks of

upper-level courses will help our students excel in not only United States but World history. We will also implement the reformed capstone course so as to give our graduated majors full experience in the modes of critical thinking and research.

[Jump to Top](#)



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013


**History MA**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)


---

<p><b>Goal</b></p>	<p><b>Advanced Knowledge And Skills In History DRAFT</b> 🔑</p> <p>M.A. History graduates will use the knowledge and skills obtained in their studies to enhance and improve their performance in their present employment, continue advanced studies toward other degrees, or move into other historical fields, such as teaching, public history, or writing.</p>
<p><b>Objective (L)</b></p>	<p><b>Research And Analysis DRAFT</b> 🔑</p> <p>M. A. History students will demonstrate competence in applying research methodologies; qualitative and quantitative analysis; literature review; and use of traditional and digital resources. The History Department will prepare its graduates to publish in their respective fields.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Comprehensive Exams DRAFT</b> 🔑</p> <p>All M.A. History graduates will demonstrate depth and breadth of knowledge by successfully completing written and oral exams in three field areas. This will be assessed by a survey of written examinations and oral examination reports.</p> <p>A panel of at least three graduate faculty will assess the quality of the written examinations to determine student mastery of the major historical themes and historiography within each of the three field areas. Students failing to demonstrate the required level of content mastery will be allowed, after consultation with the graduate committee and history chair, to retake the written exams. A second failure will result in termination from the program. Students successfully completing the written examinations will then take an oral examination before a panel of three graduate faculty members who will assess student mastery of the history and historiography in each of the three field areas. Students must pass or pass with distinction each content area. Students who fail to demonstrate sufficient competency in any of the three field areas will be allowed, after consultation with the examination committee and the departmental chair, to retake that portion of the oral examination that was not satisfactorily completed. A second failure will result in termination from the program.</p>
<p><b>Criterion</b></p>	<p><b>Written And Oral Examinations DRAFT</b> 🔑</p> <p>All M.A. graduates will achieve passing or passing with distinction ratings on a written and an oral examination covering three content areas. The department will direct special attention to evaluating comprehensive exam preparation and performance among on-line students.</p>
<p><b>Finding</b></p>	<p><b>Written And Oral Examinations--2012-13 DRAFT</b> 🔑</p> <p>In 2012-13, 26 masters candidates took the written and oral comprehensive examinations. 18 passed on the first attempt and 3 on the second. Five students failed and are preparing to take the exams again.</p> <p>In each case, the examination committee convened to discuss the performance of the students, taking into particular account those students whose program had been predominantly online. The ratio of students predominantly online to those not who failed on the first attempt was 75% (6 of 8). 85% of our graduate students in total are predominantly online.</p> <p>Based on this small statistical sample, members of the department concluded that there is no statistical pretext for presuming that our predominantly online students are coming any less prepared to their comprehensive exams than the predominantly on-campus students.</p>
<p><b>Action</b></p>	<p><b>Research And Analysis DRAFT</b> 🔑 🔑</p>


In 2012-13, the M.A. program in History underwent an external evaluation. Documents associated with this review were a preliminary report from the Department, a report from the evaluator, and a Departmental Response. The are attached and indicate the program of action the Department intends to embark upon in the next year.

**Goal** **Teaching Skills And Classroom Management Competence** **DRAFT** 


M. A. History students will demonstrate competence in teaching and preparations skills necessary to successful management of post-secondary teaching responsibilities.

**Objective (L)** **Teaching Skills** **DRAFT** 



M. A. students indicating career interests in teaching positions at junior and community colleges or in other post-secondary education will demonstrate enhanced abilities in lecture formulation and delivery, test generation, and evaluation of their students.

**Indicator** **Teaching Skills Preparation** **DRAFT** 


M. A. students expressing a desire to seek post-secondary teaching careers will show improved performance in lecture and classroom management skills by completing one or more of the following preparatory exercises: in-class teaching workshops and/or webinar presentations on college teaching.

**Criterion** **In-Class Teaching Workshops** **DRAFT** 

The Graduate Director will coordinate with faculty to make available to M. A. students teaching opportunities in live classes currently ongoing in an academic term. The M. A. students will prepare and deliver critical thinking workshops based upon the departmental history learning outcome assessment rubric and an appropriate syllabus topic to the class. The exercises will occur under the observation of the teacher of record and/or the Graduate Director. Post analysis will include a formal evaluation by observing faculty including consideration of feedback by students enrolled in that class.

**Finding** **Student Responses To Teaching Workshops** **DRAFT**  

In the fall of 2012, History Teaching Assistants conducted in-class teaching exercises for just over 470 undergraduates. As part of the assessment process, the undergraduates were surveyed. More than 90% agreed that the historical critical thinking skills workshops helped them improve both analytical and writing skills. Full results of student survey data are attached.

**Criterion** **Webinar Workshops** **DRAFT** 

The Graduate Director will arrange for web-based teaching instructional material to be available to M. A. students expressing interest in post-secondary teaching careers. Such web-based material will include: podcast discussions of teaching strategies; documentary and other media demonstrations of classroom management such as assignment generation or test generation; documentary or other media presentations on grading/evaluating students; documentary or other media support materials. The department will solicit graduate student assessment of the availability and suitability of these materials in a manner similar to student evaluation of classes (IDEA form). At least 50% of student responses rating this web-based support as "satisfactory" or better will indicate success.

**Finding** **Webinar Workshops** **DRAFT** 

These were tabled on account of a change in the Director of Graduate Studies as of October 1, 2012.

## Action

### Teaching Skills **DRAFT**

We have significantly expanded our Teaching Assistants' exposure to online undergraduate teaching. In addition, we are considering dedicating one of our graduate seminars to the area of pedagogy and course construction. Further actions in this regard are laid out in the reports referenced in the Research and Analysis Objective.

---

## Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

In the current environment of the History PhD crisis of overproduction, institutions focused on granting the MA are on the front lines of market trends. The American Historical Association has called professional historians to take a new look at the degree in all its aspects. Additionally, Bender et. al in *The Education of Historians for the Twenty-first Century* have found that enhanced history teaching training will continue to grow in importance to the marketability of degree holders. The History Department through its review of comprehensive exams, through its review of graduate student formation and especially teaching assistant experience, is moving to address these growing concerns of the profession at large.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

In 2012-13 the program went through a comprehensive external review (reports attached above) that laid out the way forward given current and prospective market and pedagogical trends.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

The plan for 2013-14 is to begin the judicious application of the findings of our 2012-13 comprehensive review.

[Jump to Top](#)

---



# **Department of Political Science**




***Online Assessment Tracking Database***


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*



**Political Science BA/BS**


**[View & Request Level Feedback](#)**



---


<b>Goal</b>	<b>Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics</b> 
	Build students' knowledge of government and politics, citizenship skills, and civic engagement


<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics</b> 
	Throughout their enrollment, students will explore the following themes in a national and international context: the structure and operation of various forms of government, political philosophies, informal and formal political organizations and actors, public policies, and political behavior

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Faculty Committee Review Of Upper Division Papers</b>  
	Each field of study will be assigned a team of 2 faculty members who have expertise in the particular field. Each semester the individual teams will receive and review 5 randomly selected papers from an upper division course in their respective fields. Faculty members from each subfield will evaluate the papers using the revised grading rubric for 2012-2013. The papers will be scored on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest.

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics</b> 
	We expect that: (1) Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct a literature review utilizing at least 5 resources. (2) Students will complete a plagiarism tutorial. (3) At least 70% of literature reviews will score a 3 or above. (4) At least 70% or students will complete the plagiarism tutorial.

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics</b> <b>DRAFT</b>  
	Using a scoring system of 1-5 to evaluate 5 random papers in our upper division offerings, faculty members evaluated 100 papers submitted by students during the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters. Faculty scores differed in 37 of the 100 (37%), however, the difference in scores only exceeded a single point on the 5 point rubric in one instance. The average score was 4.25 which was an improvement over the previous year's assessment of 4.09. The departments efforts to identify areas to focus in 2009-2010 have been fruitful as scores have consistently increased over the last 3 years. We exceeded our goal of over 70% scoring a 70% or higher.  The department was unsuccessful in implementing a standard assignment which included a literature review thus, there is no data on this objective. Individual faculty provided instruction on plagiarism during both semesters, however, the department faculty found a need for further student instruction regarding plagiarism.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics</b> <b>DRAFT</b> 
	Given the high scores on the current assessment, the faculty will revise the rubric for 2013-2014 by creating a two separate rubrics: one for writing style to including the assessment of student's ability to conduct a literature review; the second one solely on the content and student's ability to present an argument.

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Develop Students' Skills</b> 
	All political science majors are required to successfully complete POLS 3379. Upon

completing the course students will be able to analyze scholarly writing, interpret empirical data, discuss argumentation, and write clearly and correctly.

**Objective (L)**

**Develop Students' Skills** 

All political science majors are required to successfully complete POLS 3379. Upon completing the course students will be able to analyze scholarly writing, interpret empirical data, discuss argumentation, and write clearly and correctly.

**Indicator**

**Faculty Committee Review Of POLS 3379 Research And Writing Papers**



Faculty members teaching POLS 3379 Research and Writing will randomly select 5 papers from each course. All papers will be reviewed by the faculty members who teaching Research and Writing.

**Criterion**

**Acceptable Or Above** 

At least 70% of students will score a "3" (acceptable) or better.

**Finding**

**Develop Student Skills DRAFT**  

A panel of faculty who routinely teach POLS 3379 used a scoring system of 1 - 5 to perform a blind evaluation of 5 randomly selected papers from each section of POLS 3379. The resulting sample was 20 papers. Faculty scores differed in 11 out of the 20 papers sampled or in 55% of the papers. However, the difference in scores never exceeded a single point.

The average score was 3.43 which was lower than the 3.8 average from last year. The results also indicate that 70% of the papers scored a 3 (acceptable) or higher, just meeting our goal.

Although the findings indicate that we met our expectations for this particular goal, faculty teaching POLS 3379 courses believe students would benefit in the long run if faculty discussed ways to make the course content more consistent across all sections of POLS 3379 regardless of who is teaching the course. In addition, the faculty found that the department needs to measure research skills separately from writing skills.

**Action**

**Develop Students' Skills DRAFT** 

The rubric will be revised to focus on research related skills including assessing and analyzing resource documents, conducting a literature review, and analyzing data. The faculty teaching POLS 3379 will meet to make sections of POLS consistent.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

In order to address students' writing, faculty responsible for teaching POLS 3379 will develop a syllabus template for the course to be adopted in spring 2013 that emphasizes instruction in writing. In addition, the faculty agreed to revise the assessment rubrics for 2012-2013 to focus more on the content of the assignments and devise alternative writing assignments that focus on this content rather than grammar and formatting. The department will identify and implement a plagiarism tutorial for both POLS 3379 courses and all other upper division courses.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

The faculty that teach POLS 3379 placed a greater emphasis on writing skills in 2012-2013, but found that further

course development in this area is needed. The faculty struggle with student deficiencies in basic grammar and formatting skills to the extent that it makes it difficult to adequately assess the substantive content. While each professor that teaches POLS 3379 addressed plagiarism as part of the course curriculum, the department failed to implement a plagiarism tutorial as planned. The lack of technical expertise in loading such a tutorial is the biggest impediment.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

The department will focus on revising the assessment rubrics:

1. POLS 3379 will focus on research skills and writing skills separately
2. Upper division courses will focus on substantive content and writing skills separately.
3. Upper division courses will have different rubrics based on subfields (i.e., theory, International Relations/Comparative Politics, American politics).

[Jump to Top](#)




*Online Assessment Tracking Database*


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
2012 - 2013



**Political Science MA**


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)


---


<b>Goal</b>	<p><b>Written Comprehensive Exams</b> </p> <p>Students will gain knowledge and skills that are associated with advanced degrees in political science.</p>
-------------	--

<b>Objective (L)</b>	<p><b>Written Comprehensive Exams</b> </p> <p>Upon completion of the MA in Political Science program, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain the key features of methodology.</li> <li>2. Evaluate political theories and discuss the significant research in one of the program's subject areas: American government, public administration, comparative politics, or international relations.</li> </ol>
----------------------	--

<b>Indicator</b>	<p><b>Successful Completion Of Written Comprehensive Exams</b>  </p> <p>We utilize written comprehensive exams as a tool for measuring graduate students' knowledge and skills. Prior to graduation, students complete two written comprehensive exams in areas relevant to their coursework. Exam questions are written by faculty with expertise in the students' areas of study and the questions are based on the comprehensive exam reading lists and the content of the overview courses (see department level goal of revise written comprehensive exam process for more information on the reading lists and overview courses). Students' exams are graded by at least two faculty members (more when possible) who have expertise in the areas of study pursued by students. Exams are assigned one of the following scores: high pass, pass, and no pass. If the two faculty members issue conflicting scores (e.g., pass and no pass), a third faculty member will be asked to score the exams and issue a final ruling.</p>
------------------	---

<b>Criterion</b>	<p><b>Written Comprehensive Exams</b> </p> <p>We expect that at least 80% of our students will pass their exams on the first attempt and that 100% of the students who have to take the exam a second time will pass. Efforts noted in our 2008-2009 actions will be implemented; specifically, we require students to attend a comprehensive exam study skills session conducted by the graduate director and graduate faculty members. Utilizing a rubric developed in the spring of 2010, graduate faculty will determine low pass, pass, and high pass. We believe that this will produce at least 2 high passes for this year's cohort.</p>
------------------	---

<b>Finding</b>	<p><b>Written Comprehensive Exams DRAFT</b> </p> <p>Five students took written comprehensive exams in 2012-2013 in the areas of institutions and behavior. Three passed the exam the first time with high marks. Two students failed the first time, but passed on the second attempt with a mark of passed. Thus, our results are mixed in relation to our stated goals. We missed the 80% mark for passing on the the first attempt since only 3 of 5 (60%) passed initially. However, we met our mark of 100% passing on the second attempt. We also met our goal of having at least two high passes.</p>
----------------	---

<b>Action</b>	<p><b>Written Comprehensive Exams DRAFT</b> </p> <p>The faculty will emphasize improving students' comprehension of research design, data, and methods in each MA graduate course. We believe this will enhance student understanding of the core knowledge in each subfield and help improve the rate of passing on the first attempt.</p> <p>Due to the addition of new faculty members that will teach both MA and MPA</p>
---------------	--

courses, the graduate faculty will meet to discuss new expectations regarding student performance.

---

### **Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

**Conference Attendance:** In fall 2012 and spring 2013 the graduate director will begin collecting more detailed information about students' professional goals. Faculty members will design assignments appropriate to the students' professional goals and require students to complete one of the assignments prior to graduation. For example, if a student wishes to seek employment as a community college instructor, he or she would be required to submit a syllabus and a set of lectures

**Written Comprehensive Exams:** During the summer of 2012 MA faculty will develop exam questions that require students to demonstrate their knowledge of methods in the context of a subfield based question. The new exams will be implemented in fall of 2012. To address students' knowledge of the literature, syllabi for the overview courses in each subfield will be revised to include the seminal works in the field. Faculty will update the comprehensive reading lists annually.

**Oral Comprehensive Exams:** Oral exams are logistically problematic and thus we decided to rely on written exams.

### **Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

**Conference Attendance:** The graduate director found that the majority of the MA students wish to teach at the junior college and/or community college level. Students in MA courses have been given assignments related to preparing syllabi and presenting mock lectures as part of the course curriculum.

**Written Comprehensive Exams:** Students were not as successful on the first attempt of the written comprehensive exams as hoped. The faculty will continue to develop questions that required students to demonstrate the knowledge in the subfield as well as their knowledge of methods in the context of the subfield based question. The faculty found that updating the comprehensive reading list is an ongoing process and are confident that the students are acquiring the most seminal works in the field in their course work.

**Oral Comprehensive Exam:** The department did eliminate oral exams.

### **Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

In order to improve written comprehensive exam scores, the MA faculty will emphasize research design, data collection methods, and analysis as part of the curriculum for each substantive course. The faculty will also focus on developing teaching skills of the students as the majority have expressed their goal of teaching at the junior college/community college level.

The F13/S14 assessment year will focus primarily on discussion and data collection regarding the department's two graduate programs, the Masters in Political Science (MA) and the Masters in Public Administration (MPA). Actions based on F13/S14 discussions and data collection will occur in next assessment cycle (F14/S15).

We are focusing on graduate programs because our programs are scheduled for the 2015 audit and because we are already in discussions about our graduate programs.

**Goal:** Expand our assessment (at both the student learning objective level and the department performance objective level) of our two graduate programs beyond comprehensive exams.

**Actions:** Collect data on current and incoming graduate students for the purpose of creating profiles of MA and MPA students. The profiles will help us:

- a. Develop student exit surveys which will include questions, such as: How has the program contributed to your knowledge of the field? Do you believe the program improved your ability to perform your professional duties? Did the program contribute to your ability to obtain a promotion, salary increase, etc.?
- b. Document the economic impact of the graduate programs



**Department of Psychology  
and Philosophy**



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**Clinical Psychology PhD**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---

**Goal** **Effective Teaching**

Faculty demonstrate high levels of teaching effectiveness.

**Objective (L)** **Providing Effective Undergraduate Classroom Instruction**

Faculty demonstrate high levels of teaching effectiveness.

**Indicator** **Individual Developmental Education Assessment (IDEA)**

Students rate the Teaching Assistants using IDEA.

**Criterion** **PhD Students As Teaching Assistants**

A summary IDEA score at or above the institution mean is considered to be satisfactory. Consistent with IDEA recommendations, converted averages on IDEA evaluations that are in the gray box (middle 40%) are considered to be "effective teaching." All faculty have students evaluate each of their classes during the Fall and Spring semesters using the IDEA teaching evaluations. The IDEA system focuses on students' perceptions of learning 12 specific objectives, and the system solicits students' feedback on their own learning progress, effort, and motivation, as well as their perceptions of the instructor's use of 20 instructional strategies and teaching methods. In addition, the system surveys instructors regarding their overall goals and highlights for them in the analysis and report. The system adjusts evaluation scores for five areas beyond the instructor's control, such as class size, student motivation, effort and work habits, and disciplinary difficulty. The scores are then compared to national norms. Teaching effectiveness is assessed by: Overall Ratings and the average student agreement with statements that the instructor and class were excellent.

**Finding** **Effective Undergraduate Instruction**

There were eight sections of Introductory Psychology taught by doctoral students during the 2012-2013 academic year. In all sections, the TAs performed exceedingly well, scoring in or above the "shaded gray area" on the IDEA evaluations. On the 5-point scale for the total summary score, the range for the TAs was 4.2-4.5 with a mean of 4.35. The Departmental mean was 4.2. Thus, the doctoral TAs teaching Introductory Psychology did quite well with respect to instruction.

**Action** **Effective Undergraduate Instruction**

We are very proud of the job that was done by the doctoral TAs this past academic year. With a new group of TAs starting in the fall 2013 semester, we will require that they: 1. attend the University Teaching Conference prior to the start of the academic year; 2. meet bi-weekly with the coordinator of Introductory Psychology TAs to discuss issues and problems that arise. Also, TAs will be instructed to use activities in and out of class that show how what is being presented and learned is germane to the lives of the students taking the class. For each topic, we will come up with an assignment in which the materials presented can be used in the students' everyday lives.

Finally, we have, well the chair has, decided to change the rubric of performance assessment to be the t-score for the Summary Evaluation Compared to the Discipline." The goal will be to have each TA have a score of at least 50 for each of his or her sections.

**Goal Ability To Conduct Empirical Research**

To produce graduates with the skills to conduct meaningful research that adds to the current body of knowledge in psychology.

**Objective (L) Students Will Be Able To Evaluate And Conduct Psychological Research**

Students will demonstrate the ability to design, carry out, prepare, and submit for publication to scientific journals or for presentation at scientific paper sessions original research.

**Indicator Preparation Of Research Materials For Publication/Presentation**

Students will prepare manuscripts for publication in scientific journals or presentation at national conventions. Acceptance for publication or presentation will be the indicator.

**Criterion Research Materials Accepted For Publication Or Presentation**

At least 50% of the students beyond their first year will have materials accepted for publication or presentation at a national conference. First year students will be engaged actively in research projects sponsored by program faculty. Students will review feedback from journal editors or conference program individuals with their faculty research mentors to determine how to revise the manuscript or presentation proposal to address weaknesses and resubmit.

**Finding Second Year Students Research**

Presently, 94% of currently enrolled students second year and beyond have at least one publication in a refereed scientific journal or a presentation at a national conference, from 1998 when 61% had authored publications. 89% of first year students are funded as Research Assistants while all (100%) of the students in the program are actively involved in research projects with program faculty.

An area of concern is diversity of resesarch experience for our students.

**Action Empirical Research Actions**

Efforts have been successful in funding students who enter the program at the BA/BS level as Research Assistants. A number of program faculty are working with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to identify and apply for appropriate funding through various agencies and programs. This past year 23 students were funded to attend and present their work at the National American Psychology-Law Society convention. In an era of ever tightening budgets, additional efforts will be made to expand available travel funds for student presentations.

Additionally, to provide experience with diverse research, we will encourage students to seek mentors outside, as well as inside, the program faculty. Such experiences will provide a wealth of research projects and additional learning.

**Goal Broad Knowledge Of Psychology**

A broad-based knowledge of scientific psychology will include knowledge of psychology's history of thought and development, research methods, and applications.

**Objective (L) Broad-based Knowledge Of Psychology As A Science**

Students will demonstrate a core understanding of the scientific foundation of psychology, including biological, social, developmental, and cognitive/affective bases of behavior, history and systems of psychology, psychological measurement, research methodology, techniques of data analysis, and issues of cultural and individual diversity.

**Indicator**

**Comprehensive Examinations And The EPPP**

Students will demonstrate a broad-based knowledge of the scientific bases of behavior as measured by:

1. performance in preparing and defending either a Major Area Paper (MAP) or taking/passing Doctoral Comprehensive Examinations (DCEs);
2. performance on an external, standardized examination, the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP).

**Criterion**

**Passing Doctoral Comprehensive Examination (either MAP Or DCE) And Passing The EPPP For Licensure**

1. Students are expected to complete successfully the Major Area Paper (MAP) or Doctoral Comprehensive Exams (DCE). A committee of faculty will determine if a student has done this successfully. Topics for students' MAPs must be pre-approved by the Program Faculty and must cover at least 3 broad areas of psychology. The DCE gives the student 24 hours in which to analyze a clinical case and answer specific questions, as well as review a selected research article. An unsuccessful MAP requires a student to take the DCE. Unsuccessful completion of the DCE requires the student to retake it. The student has one attempt to retake the DCE; a second failure triggers program dismissal.
2. Students are expected to sit for and pass the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). Eighty percent of students who take the EPPP will pass it.

**Finding**

**Broad Based Knowledge**

1. During the past year, 2 students successfully completed a MAP. For the DCE, 100% (1/1) successfully passed.
2. According to the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), from 2007 - 2012, 32 of our graduates have taken the EPPP to date and 100% have passed.

**Action**

**Broad Based Knowledge Actions**

Program faculty were quite enthused with the results of the EPPP as we had one of the highest pass rates in the country. If less than 80% of students achieve licensure within 5 years of graduation, intervention would include faculty consultation and planning to address program deficiencies. External consultants (e.g., associated faculty, clinical supervisors, and DCTs from other accredited programs would be consulted as needed). At the present time, 90% of students who are 5 years beyond graduation hold state licenses.

**Goal**

**Effective Clinical Practice**

To produce graduates who have the knowledge and skills to excel in the practice of clinical psychology.

**Objective (P)**

**Acquire The Skills And Ability To Practice Clinical Psychology**

Students must demonstrate skills in the service delivery in broad and general clinical areas.

**KPI  
Performance  
Indicator**

**APA-Accredited Internship**

All students must complete a one-year pre-doctoral internship.

**Result**

**APA-Accredited Internship**

All students making application for internship in 2012 matched with APA-accredited sites. We are delighted with our students' success in obtaining APA-accredited sites, especially since we are aware that there are not enough such sites to meet national student needs, a weakness in the process. In 2012, only 79% of students nationally who applied matched and of those only 2/3 matched with APA-accredited sites.

**KPI  
Performance  
Indicator**

**Effective Clinical Practice**

Effective use of assessment, treatment planning, intervention, consultation, and supervision strategies.

**Result**

**Supervisor Ratings Of Performance**

Supervisors making ratings are either internal (individual faculty members) or external (practicum/internship site supervisors). Supervisors will rate the clinical performance using the three-point scale of competency ratings of clinician performance with 1=Novice, 2=Intermediate, and 3=Competent (See Omnibus Evaluation of Competency Development document, page 1, for definitions of 1,2, and 3). Following individual assessments, information will be presented to the entire program faculty to determine suitability for continuation in the area.

We had 100% pass rate for Capstone Assessment and Capstone Psychotherapy.

All students making application for internship in 2012 were rated Intermediate or Competent in critical areas. Of internship applicants, no one was rated at Novice level on any element; 100% were rated Intermediate or Competent. As mentioned, there was no particular area in which a plethora of students were lacking, i.e., receiving an "Intermediate" rating. Therefore, we had to identify individual weaknesses for individual students and handle those accordingly.

**Action**

**Effective Clinical Practice Actions**

We are assessing each student's clinical competence every semester. The group assessing the students is made up of program faculty chaired by the Director of Clinical Training and includes each person who has supervised the students' work during the semester.

We have no control over how many APA approved internships are available. Yet, we can make sure our students are so well prepared that they are able to impress internship directors with their skills and competence.

**Goal**

**APA Accreditation**

Maintain APA accreditation.

**Objective (P)**

**Retain APA Accreditation**

This program will retain APA accreditation by assembling all paperwork, submitting

an annual report, and responding to all questions/requests from APA Committee on Accreditation (CoA).

**KPI  
Performance  
Indicator**

**Submit Self-Study And Annual Report As Required** 🔑

Program faculty will submit both a complete self-study and an annual report to the APA Commission on Accreditation by the appropriate deadlines.

**Result**

**APA Accreditation** 🔑

APA awarded the program full accreditation. APA had five questions to which they required a response by September 15, 2012. Response was submitted addressing all areas.

**Action**

**APA Accreditation Actions** 🔑

In 2012, APA submitted two additional items and requested a specific response by September 1, 2013. In addition, the usual annual report will be submitted by that time.

Specific items:

- 1) Submit syllabi from courses taken by all students that require a literature review.
- 2) Revise Table B.2 to include aggregate data, both distal and proximal, evaluating progress on each of the official goals.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

With respect to our students demonstrating a broad and general knowledge of psychology, the data show that we have reached an acceptable level at the present time. However, in an effort to improve that level, we are now offering a number of our basic courses annually rather than biannually to reduce class size and increase individual attention.

Program faculty will seek additional funding to support student research and to ensure that students are able to partake in national conferences.

Teaching effectiveness was listed as reasonable. We do have some clear concerns and are dealing with those either on an individual basis or with changes to the entire system. We expect to improve the process by assessing more closely individual TAs. To this end, we have altered the organization so that the department chair is now charged with supervision of the TAs and the organization of the Introductory Psychology course. He will meet with each TA on a bi-weekly basis, addressing TA concerns and offering solutions to issues brought forth by students in the class. In addition, all TAs will be required to attend the annual College of Humanities and Social Sciences Teaching Conference. The TAs also will hand out mid-term evaluations to their students and address any concerns that may arise from those evaluations.

The APA Commission on Accreditation has recommended specific changes in program websites to assist prospective students in comparing programs. We are in the process of rearranging materials and post additional outcome data to increase transparency.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

Three required courses were moved to annual offerings to reduce class sizes and allow more individual attention:

PSY 7360 Multicultural Psychology

PSY 7362 Ethics in clinical Psychology

PSY 8360 Forensic Assessment I

The current fiscal year included severe budget restraints. We managed to maintain our level of travel funding for all of our doctoral students.

We have reorganized and updated our program website to be in compliance with CoA requirements. Both format and content are consistent with those of other APA accredited programs. Specific outcome data is now displayed in tabular form for the following variables over a seven year period:

- a) Time to program completion
- b) Program costs to the student
- c) Internship placement
- d) Program attrition
- e) Completion of licensure
- f) Student publications and presentations

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

1. We will be revising our graduate survey to include more specific outcome data.
2. We will be revising our annual program evaluation survey completed by current students to provide more insight into need for improvement.
3. We will seek additional grant funding to enhance our financial position.
4. We will be reducing our incoming cohorts by 2 students in a further effort to reduce class size and increase individual supervision and attention.
5. According to the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), between 2002 and 2012 (the last data available) 100% of our graduates taking the Examination of Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP; licensing examination) passed. Nationally, for that same period, the pass rate for all designated doctoral programs was 76.4%. We will strive to maintain our pass rate of 100%.
6. Since our program was accredited in 2006, 100% of our candidates have matched with an APA accredited internship. Nationally, the overall match rate has fluctuated between 74 and 79%, with only about 2/3 of those who did match matching with an APA accredited internship. We will strive to maintain this 100% match rate.
7. With our strong forensic emphasis, 14 of 22 (64%) of postdoctoral fellowships obtained by our students have a strong forensic emphasis; 32 of 46 (70%) of employment settings have a strong forensic emphasis. We will strive to maintain this rate of at least 70%.

[Jump to Top](#)













*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**Philosophy BA**

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

---

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Improving Critical Thinking And Analytic Reasoning</b>  Students completing the critical thinking and logic courses in our curriculum will develop a broad-based skills in critical thinking and formal logic.
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Demonstrate Critical Thinking Skills</b>  Critical thinking skills are an essential component of philosophical work. Students will be able to analyze arguments and draw conclusions from available information.
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Response Scores On TACTS</b>   All students who take PHIL 2303 will be tested on their critical thinking skills. All faculty who teach PHIL 2303 will administer the Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skill (TACTS)s, an externally validated test of critical thinking skills, in a pre-test/post-test format. The TACTS is a broad-based assessment of critical thinking skills that goes beyond the current scope of PHIL 2303. This will allow the faculty to determine areas that may be added to our current curriculum in the future. In addition, it allows for substantial flexibility in what is taught; thereby ensuring academic freedom for instructors to design individual sections around their own expertise and interests. A copy of the current TACTS is attached. A copy of the credited responses is attached. The Philosophy Program Coordinator, currently Dr. Fair, will be responsible for ensuring that all faculty who teach PHIL 2303 effectively administer the pre- and post-tests in every section of their course. One faculty member, currently Dr. Sanford, will be responsible for gathering pre- and post-test data from the faculty members who teach PHL 2303.
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Statistically Significant Improvement From The TACTS Pre-test To The TACTS Post-test.</b>  A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. The philosophy program expects to see a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.
<b>Finding</b>	<b>Significant Improvement From Pre-Test To Post-Test</b>   A paired two-sample t-test on our sample of 488 student scores, covering only those students who took both the pre-test and post-test, demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in their scores. Data and basic analysis are attached.
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Improvement In Calculating Probabilities</b>  The data from the team that developed the TACTS show that a knowledge gap exists with respect to decision making when an outcome depends upon the conjunction of two probabilistic events. Their data show that less than 20% of those tested correctly answered the following question: "George is waiting for two of his customers, Fuzzy Logic Computers, Inc. and Stalking Horse Designs, to pay their bills. If either of them pays before the end of the month, then George can pay his supplier. But if neither of them pays, then George will have to take out a bank loan. George estimates that the chance that Fuzzy Logic will pay in time is 70% and the chance Stalking Horse Designs will pay in time is 60%. Assuming that his estimates are correct and that the two events are independent, what is the chance that George will have to take out a bank loan? (a) 12% (b) 40% (c) 65% (d) 42% (e) 88%"" 2012-2013 will be the fourth year that the Philosophy Program will expect all faculty to evaluate this type of reasoning as part of the critical thinking course. We will consider this effort successful if there is at least a 75% improvement on this type of question from the pre-test to the post-test.

**Finding****Improvement In Calculating Probabilities** 🔍

The sample is limited to only those students who took both the pre-test and post-test. For students whose pre-test score was reported, 87 out of 488 (17.8%) correctly answered the question. On the post-test, 197 out of 488 (40.4%) correctly answered the question.

This represents a 127.0% improvement in the percentage of students who successfully answered the probability questions from the pre-test to the post-test. This is similar to the 126.2% improvement seen in 2011-2012, though both the pre-test and post-test rates were higher in 2012-2013. The 2012-2013 results compare favorably to the 85.6% improvement seen in 2009-2010 and 106.5% seen in 2010-2011; yet, it remains a challenge to improve even further. The sample is limited to only those students who took both the pre-test and post-test.

**Action****Ongoing Improvement In Calculating Probabilities** 🔍

Although our data showed a substantial improvement in calculating probabilities, it is expected that our faculty can improve on our performance.

All Philosophy Program faculty who taught PHIL 2303 during 2012-2013 will be invited to share their experiences with those who will teach PHIL 2303 during 2013-2014. Of particular note is Dr. Sanford's dissatisfaction with his choice to adopt a new textbook for 2012-2013, as this decision affects a large portion of the total sample. He has already begun sharing his experience with others in the Program. In addition, input will be sought from other faculty who have experience teaching probability-based content. The goal will be to identify ways in which pedagogy in this area can be further improved without cutting back on the successful core of critical thinking skills we have regularly taught. It is expected that faculty will implement and evaluate new approaches during 2013-2014.

**Goal****Understanding Of General Philosophical Concepts** 🔍

Ensure that students acquire a general understanding of basic philosophical concepts.

**Objective (L)****Demonstrate Basic Understanding Of Core Concepts In Philosophy** 🔍










As students progress through the Philosophy BA, they will acquire a basic understanding of metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory. This basic information, provided by our introductory courses serves as the foundation for student success in upper-division courses.

**Indicator****Statistically Significant Improvement Of Student Scores From Pre-test To Post-test (2361/2603)** 🔍

All students in PHIL 2361 and PHIL 2603 will be tested on their knowledge of basic concepts in metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory using a locally standardized pre-test and post-test for each course. Following a review of best practices for the teaching of these courses, a group of Program faculty chose the questions for the assessment. The questions asked cover the range of concepts that are taught in peer departments. Instruction on these concepts promotes a basic competence in metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory. The attached documents provide the assessment instruments for PHIL 2361 and PHIL 2603 as well as the credited responses for each.

**Criterion****Statistically Significant Improvement From The Pre-test To The Post-test (2361/2603)** 🔍

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students in both courses will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

<b>Finding</b>	<p><b>PHIL 2361 Pre-test/Post-test Results</b>  </p> <p>PHL 2361 students demonstrated a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test (M=6.4) to the post-test (M=10.4). Although statistically significant, the post-test mean is only 52% with 20 items. See the attached data. This is consistent with the 53.5% during 2011-2012, 54.5% during 2010-2011, and 51% during 2009-2010 on the post-test. Additional innovative strategies for teaching basic concepts in metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory are needed to ensure deep learning. The number of reported data points is significantly lower than expected due to missing data from both of Dr. Cording's PHIL 2361 sections during Spring 2013. Dr. Cording had serious medical issues that disrupted end-of-semester activities in his course and interfered with data collection.</p>
<b>Finding</b>	<p><b>PHIL 2306 Pre-test/Post-test Results</b>  </p> <p>PHIL 2603 students demonstrated a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test (M=10.2) to the post-test (15.0). While statistically significant, the post-test mean is only 60.0% of 25 items. These results are consistent with the 60.3% improvement in 2011-2012. See the attached data. Hence, basic concepts in metaphysics, epistemology, and moral theory must be addressed in inventive ways so that deep learning versus shallow learning is accomplished.</p>
<b>Indicator</b>	<p><b>Improved Student Knowledge Of Kant</b> </p> <p>Students will demonstrate increased understanding of Immanuel Kant's philosophy. Questions 10 and 12 on the pre-test and post-test were chosen to measure our Program faculty's ability to improve this targeted area.</p>
<b>Criterion</b>	<p><b>Improvement At Identifying Major Themes Of Kantian Philosophy</b> </p> <p>After comparing students' pre-test and post-test performance on questions 10 and 12 of those tests, the Program will consider this effort successful if the data indicate at least a 75% improvement in student performance on each question. Anything less will be taken as an indication that the Program must improve its performance in this area. Regardless of performance, the 2012-2013 data will serve as a baseline for measuring future performance.</p>
<b>Finding</b>	<p><b>Improvement In Students' Knowledge Of Kantian Philosophy</b> </p> <p>23.8% of students chose the correct answer for question 10 on the pre-test. This improved to 44.1% on the post-test. This represented an 85.3% improvement. Likewise, 26.3% of students chose the correct answer for question 12 on the pre-test. This improved to 49.1% on the post-test. This represented an 86.7% improvement. Though students demonstrated improved performance on both questions, the Program is not satisfied that this is the best that we can do in this area.</p>
<b>Indicator</b>	<p><b>Improved Student Knowledge Of The Death Penalty Debate</b> </p> <p>Students will demonstrate increased understanding of arguments related to the death penalty. Questions 19 and 20 on the pre-test and post-test were chosen to measure our Program faculty's ability to improve this targeted area.</p>
<b>Criterion</b>	<p><b>Improvement At Identifying Arguments Related To The Death Penalty</b> </p> <p>After comparing students' pre-test and post-test performance on questions 19 and 20 of those tests, the Program will consider this effort</p>

successful if the data indicate at least a 75% improvement in student performance on each question. Anything less will be taken as an indication that the Program must improve its performance in this area. Regardless of performance, the 2012-2013 data will serve as a baseline for measuring future performance.

**Finding****Improvement In The Recognition Of Arguments Relating To The Death Penalty**

18.8% of students chose the correct answer for question 19 on the pre-test. This improved to 36.1% on the post-test. This represented an 92% improvement. Likewise, 27.3% of students chose the correct answer for question 20 on the pre-test. This improved to 52.2% on the post-test. This represented an 91.2% improvement. Though students demonstrated improved performance on both questions, the Program is not satisfied that this is the best that we can do in this area.

**Action****PHIL 2361/2306 Improvement**

The Program will continue its targeted instructional effort aimed at improving student learning. In PHIL 2603, this effort will focus on improving students' knowledge of arguments related to the death penalty. In PHIL 2361, it will continue the focus on Kantian philosophy. Of particular interest will be demonstration of improved performance over the 2012-2013 baseline data. Additionally, as the Program will seek data from evaluation of the PHIL 3364/3365 sections with an eye toward identifying additional opportunities to improve the overall presentation of general philosophical concepts to our students.

**Objective (L)****Demonstrate Advanced Understanding Of History Of Philosophy**

Well-educated philosophy students will demonstrate appreciation for the arguments and positions of earlier thinkers. Because so much of what is written in philosophy is a reaction to the metaphysical and epistemological presuppositions of earlier thinking, it is the core of well-rounded philosophical education.

**Indicator****Pre-test Post-test Response Scores On Locally-Standardized Instruments (3364/3365)**

All students in PHL 3364 and PHL 3365 will be tested on their knowledge of general concepts in the history of philosophy. All faculty who teach these courses will administer a pre-test and post-test to all students. All Philosophy BA students are required to take PHL 364 (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy) and PHL 365 (Modern Philosophy). Together, these courses provide students with upper-level instruction covering the history of metaphysics and epistemology. Following a review of best practices for the teaching of these courses, a group of Program faculty chose the questions for the assessment. The questions cover the range of concepts that are taught in peer departments. Instruction on these concepts promotes a well-rounded understanding of the history of philosophy.

**Criterion****PHL 3365 Assessment**

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students in both courses will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

**Finding****Improvement In Students' Knowledge Modern Philosophy**

PHIL 3365 students demonstrated a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test (M=3.4) to the post-test (14.3). Average scores on the post test were 333% higher than the pre-test. While statistically significant, the post-test mean is only 43.3%

of the 33 items. As these results were obtained from a single section, the Program feels it is too soon to draw any conclusions, except that the students did demonstrate significant improvement.

These results will serve as a baseline for judging future performance.

**Criterion**

**PHL 3364 Assessment**

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students in both courses will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

**Finding**

**PHIL 3364 Improvement**

No data is available for the Fall 2012 section of PHIL 3364, the only section of PHIL 3364 that was offered during 2012-2013, due the the faculty member losing the folder containing the pre-tests and post-tests before reporting the data.

**Action**

**Ensure Appropriate Data Reporting For PHIL 3364/3365**

The Program will ensure that Dr. Fair, who is teaching PHIL 3364 during Fall 2013 records and reports pre-test/post-test data. Dr. Fair expects no difficulty, and has committed to take special precautions to ensure reporting of the data.

**Action**

**Ongoing Monitoring Of Progress In PHIL 3364/3365**

The Program will continue to monitor student learning in PHIL 3364/3365. It is essential that the Program record baseline data for the revised PHIL 3364 curriculum during 2013-2014 as was done for PHIL 3365 during 2012-2013. This will provide a means of assessing ongoing efforts to improve student learning.

**Supporting**

**Philosophy BA**

Items in this group support the goals of the **Philosophy BA** level.

**Objective (L)**

**Demonstrate Competence With Formal Logic**

Student's understanding of formal logic provides a foundation for rigorous analysis of arguments. All philosophy majors will demonstrate competence in propositional logic and predicate logic.

**Indicator**

**Response To Pre-test/Post-test Logic Questions**

All students who take PHIL 3362 (Introduction to Contemporary Logic) will be tested on knowledge of basic logical concepts, propositional logic, and predicate logic. All faculty who teach PHIL 3362 will administer a pre-test and post-test. These will serve as an indicator of student competence with the subject matter. Following a review of best practices for the teaching of this course, a group of Program faculty chose the questions for the assessment. The questions asked cover the range of concepts that are taught in peer departments. Instruction on these concepts promotes a an introduction to the concepts of formal logic, propositional logic, and predicate logic. The attached documents provide the sample questions similar to those used in the embedded assessments and the credited responses. Because some of these questions, particularly the logical proofs, have answers that could be memorized if the questions were known in advance, exam security requires that the actual questions not be posted in a public document. The Program faculty will use questions that are essentially similar but sufficiently distinct to limit the potential for academic dishonesty. A group of Program faculty has

reviewed the particular questions that will be embedded each semester.

### Criterion

#### Significant Improvement From Pre-test To Post-test

A paired two-sample t-test will be performed on the scores of all students who take the pre-test and the post-test. Students in both courses will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.

### Finding

#### PHIL 362 Pre-test/Post-test Results

PHIL 3362 students demonstrated a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test (M=.2) to the post-test (M=4.9). Although statistically significant, the post-test mean is only 35% with 14 items. See the attached data.

### Action

#### Improving Overall Student Performance On Logic Questions

As a result of a retirement, beginning in Fall 2013, the Program will employ two new faculty members to teach PHIL 3362. As part of this change, the Program is expecting both new members to work together to develop new strategies for improving overall student learning outcomes with respect to formal logic, propositional logic, and predicate logic. The faculty members teaching PHIL 3362 have been charged with developing an embedded assessment process that will satisfy both SACS and Core Curriculum assessment requirements. During Fall 2013, they will develop a preliminary assessment that will be used across all sections of PHIL 3362 during Spring 2014. Then, during Summer 2014, the Program will use the Spring 2014 results to fine tune the assessment process before full implementation during Fall 2014.

## Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

The Program will focus on improving deep learning by looking for ways to improve the links between PHL 2361/2603 and PHL 3364/3365. The goal will be to provide greater continuity between the introductory and advanced courses with an eye toward improving students' long-term outcomes as they proceed through the Program's curriculum. By linking the content and presentation of materials in the lower-level courses to what is expected in the upper-level courses, the Program expects to improve student outcomes and deep learning as measured by improved performance by students in PHL 3364/3365. As part of this ongoing effort, the Program plans to implement targeted effort at improving student learning outcomes in PHIL 2361/2603 and undertake a full review/revision of PHIL 3364/3365 for 2012-2013. It is expected that these changes will take approximately two years to begin showing significant results in the upper-level courses.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

#### Elements implemented:

The Program successfully implemented revised curricula in PHIL 3364/3365. Dr. Fair delivered a revised PHIL 3364 curriculum during Fall 2012, and Dr. Gurley successfully delivered a revised PHIL 3365 curriculum during Spring 2013.

The Program successfully implemented its targeted effort to improve student knowledge of the death penalty debate upon completion of PHIL 2306.

The Program successfully implemented its targeted effort to improve student knowledge of the Kantian philosophy upon completion of PHIL 2361.

#### Elements not implemented:

The Program failed to evaluate student performance in PHIL 3364 owing to the data on student outcomes being lost before reporting.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

The Program will continue its efforts to improve the links between PHL 2361/2603 and PHL 3364/3365. The goal will be to provide greater continuity between the introductory and advanced courses with an eye toward improving students' long-term outcomes as they proceed through the Program's curriculum. By linking the content and presentation of materials in the lower-level courses to what is expected in the upper-level courses, the Program expects to improve student outcomes and deep learning as measured by improved performance by students in PHL 3364/3365. Once the Program has data on the success of our new efforts in PHIL 3364/3365, we should be in a position to identify areas for improvement.

Revision of the PHIL 3362 curriculum and its assessment process is expected to be completed during 2013-2014.

Due to the influx of new faculty members and the concomitant expansion of perspectives concerning contemporary moral issues, the Program has convened a committee of faculty members to revise the expectations and assessment instrument of PHIL 2306. This committee has its first meeting scheduled for September 2013, and is expected to issue its findings in time for Fall 2014 implementation.

[Jump to Top](#)






*Online Assessment Tracking Database*


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*


**Psychology MA (School Psychology)**


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)


---


<b>Goal</b>	<b>Foundational Competence In School Psychology</b> 
	Students develop competence in the scientific, theoretical and conceptual foundations of professional school psychology.






<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Foundational Competency In School Psychology</b> 
	Students demonstrate competency in the scientific, methodological and theoretical foundations of professional school psychology.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II)</b> 
	The PRAXIS II School Psychology Exam is a nationally administered examination used to determine an individual's qualification for licensure to practice within the field. Candidate competency is evaluated with respect to the following test subcategories: 1. Data Based Decision Making (35%), 2. Research-based Academic Practices (12%), 3. Research-based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices (16%), 4. Consultation and Collaboration (12%), 5. Applied Psychological Foundations (13%), and 6. Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations (12%).

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Minimum Score</b> 
	A minimum score of 165 is required to obtain the credential of Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP), and thus a score of 165 or better has been established by the SSP Program as the criterion for this objective. In addition, candidates are expected to perform at or above the average range provided by the test developers for each of the six subcategories.

<b>Finding</b>	<b>National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II)</b> 
	Eleven SSP students took the PRAXIS II examination during the past academic year. Total scores ranged from 168 to 182 with an average score of 174. All students had scores directly reported to our Program which enables an analysis of subcategory performance. Ten of the eleven students (91%) scored at or above the average performance range for the areas of Data-Based Decision Making and Research-Based Academic Practices. Nine of the eleven students (82%) scored at or above the average performance range for the areas of Research-Based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices, Consultation and Collaboration, and Applied Psychological Foundations. Eight of eleven students (73%) scored at or above the average performance range for the area of Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations.

<b>Action</b>	<b>PRAXIS II Scores</b> 
	In the past our students have struggled with Research-Based Academic Practices. This past year we put especial interest into those areas and it appears to have paid off: 91% of the students scored above average this year as opposed to 67% last year. We will continue to stress this aspect of our training program. There was some concern about the category Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations, as only 73% of our students score at or above the average in that area. This fall, we will revisit that area and determine what steps could and should be taken to have a greater percentage of our students to well in that area.

Goal	Skill Application 
	Students develop competence in skill application of professional school psychology in a public school setting.
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<p><b>Skill Application </b></p> <p>Candidates in the school psychology program demonstrate knowledge and improving skill application commensurate with their level of training. Specifically, candidates in their final practicum placement and on internship, both held within the public school setting, will demonstrate appropriate application of professional school psychology skills in the areas of assessment, behavioral consultation, academic intervention and counseling.</p>
<b>Indicator</b>	<p><b>Rating Forms And Positive Impact Data </b></p> <p>(1) Satisfactory ratings from Field Supervisors  1(A) Ratings for Practicum II candidates (Year 2 of 3)  1(B) Ratings for candidates on Internship (Year 3 of 3)  On-site, or field, supervisors are asked to evaluate each candidate's performance in order to gauge their professional performance according to the 11 NASP Domains of Competence. These include: 1) Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability, 2) Consultation and Collaboration, 3) Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills, 4) Socialization and Development of Life Skills, 5) Student Diversity in Development and Learning, 6) School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate, 7) Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health, 8) Home/School Community Collaboration, 9) Research and Program Evaluation, 10) School Psychology Practice and Development, and 11) Information Technology.</p> <p>(2) Satisfactory ratings from Program Faculty  2(A) Faculty Rating Forms (FRF) for each of four Portfolio cases submitted  2(B) Procedural Integrity Rubrics (PIR) for each of four Portfolio cases submitted  Candidates completing the Internship Portfolio assessment will obtain satisfactory ratings from the Program Faculty on each of four cases submitted. These cases include: 1) an Assessment case, 2) a Behavioral Consultation case, 3) an Academic Intervention case, and 4) a counseling case. Two faculty members will evaluate each case, and the average of these two ratings on both the FRF and the PIR will be reported.</p> <p>Positive Impact Data  (3) Quantitative data gathered as part of the case intervention  3(A) Effect Size  3(B) Percent of Non-Overlapping Data Points (PND)  Candidates completing the Internship Portfolio assessment will submit quantitative data gathered as part of the case intervention monitoring for three of four cases submitted. These cases include: 1) the Behavioral Consultation case, 2) the Academic Intervention Case, and 3) the Counseling case. Effect size, percent of non-overlapping data points (PND), or other means of quantitatively evaluating candidates positive impact on the student(s) will be calculated.</p>
<b>Criterion</b>	<p><b>Skill Application  </b></p> <p>1A: Candidates are rated by field supervisors according to a three point scale including the following competency rating categories: Improvement Needed (1), Competent (Supervision Needed; 2), and Professionally Competent (No Supervision Needed; 3). Because candidates in their final practicum will be under supervision for two more years, they are expected to maintain an average rating of "2.0" for each of the 11 NASP Domains evaluated.</p>

1B: Candidates are rated by field supervisors according to a three point scale including the following competency rating categories: Improvement Needed (1), Competent (Supervision Needed; 2), and Professionally Competent (No Supervision Needed; 3). Because candidates completing their internship year will continue to be under supervision for one more year, they are expected to maintain an average rating of "2.0" for each of the 11 NASP Domains evaluated.

2A: Candidates completing their internship experience are required to submit four distinct Portfolio cases. Each case will be reviewed by two faculty members and assigned ratings on the Faculty Rating Form (FRF). These ratings will then be averaged across the two faculty raters. The FRF addresses all domains of practice related to the type of case being reviewed. Each item on the FRF includes the following competency rating categories: Pass (score 1), No Pass (score 0), Not Included (score 0), and Not Applicable (removed from the scoring calculation). Candidates are expected to achieve a minimum domain competency average of 85%.

In addition, candidates are given a single faculty rating for the overall case completion. This rating ranges from 1 (Very Poor) to 5 (Very Good). Candidates are expected to achieve a minimum average overall rating of 3 across the two faculty raters, which is equivalent to "average" work completed in the field.

2B: Internship portfolio case submissions are also scored by faculty using a Procedural Integrity Rubric, or PIR. Each case PIR includes critical procedures that must be performed as part of completing the case in order for the intern to be judged as following best practices within the field. Each item on the PIR can be scored as follows: 0 = Incomplete, 1 = Needs Improvement (task is completed, with some concerns), 2 = Completed Satisfactorily (Competency Met), and 3 = Exemplary Performance (task is completed at a level above expectations). Each PIR for the four cases submitted has an established cut score equivalent to achievement of at least 85%. Additionally, candidates are expected to obtain no ratings of "0" on any PIR.

3A: Based on the quantitative data included as part of the Behavioral Consultation, Counseling, and Academic Intervention Portfolio case submissions, the candidate's impact on student behavior and/or learning can be calculated in a variety of ways. Effect size allows for the comparison of the standard mean difference in student performance during baseline and treatment phases of intervention. An effect size of .8 is considered to be of moderate impact. Candidates are expected to demonstrate moderate impact through either effect size or PND calculation for two of the three quantitative cases submitted.

3B: Based on the quantitative data included as part of the Behavioral Consultation, Counseling, and Academic Intervention Portfolio case, the candidate's impact on student behavior and/or learning can be calculated in a variety of ways. Percent of Non-overlapping Data points, or PND, provides a comparison of the percentage of data points during the treatment phase that do not overlap with the most extreme baseline phase point. A PND calculation of 60% is considered to be of moderate impact. Candidates are expected to demonstrate moderate impact through either effect size or PND calculation for two of the three quantitative cases submitted.

## Finding

### Skill Application

Practicum II Field Supervisor Ratings: There were seven candidates who participated in the final Practicum experience during the Spring 2013 semester. Field supervisor rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the "Competent" range. All seven candidates (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 2.0. One candidate did receive below standard rating in two of eleven domains and his progress in these areas will be monitored during the internship year. The cohort

average rating within each of the 11 NASP domains met the criterion score of 2.0. (See Table 1A).

Internship Field Supervisor Ratings: There were 11 candidates who participated in the Internship experience during the 2012-13 academic year. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the "Competent" range. All 11 candidates (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 2.0. The cohort average rating with the 11 NASP Domains met the criterion score of 2.0. (See Table 1B).

Faculty Rating Form: Eleven candidates completed their internship portfolios this academic year. Each of four portfolio cases submitted were rated by two faculty members to obtain an average Faculty Rating Form (FRF) rating and an average Overall Case Rating. For the Academic Intervention case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating and an Overall rating of "3" or higher for the case. For the Assessment case, all eight students (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating and an Overall rating of "3" or higher for the case. For the Behavioral Consultation case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating and an Overall rating of "3" or higher for the case. Finally, for the Counseling case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating and an Overall rating of "3" or higher for the case. (See Table 2A).

PIR Portfolio Reviews: Each Portfolio case completed was evaluated by two faculty raters using the Procedural Integrity Rubric (PIR) in order to obtain an average PIR score. Additionally, candidates were expected to obtain no ratings of "0" on each of the PIR documents. For the Academic Intervention case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the "cut" score of 24, with no candidates receiving a score of "0" on these case ratings. For the Assessment case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the "cut" score of 39. With the Behavioral Consultation case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the "cut" score of 21 with no candidates receiving a score of "0" on these case ratings. Finally, for the Counseling case, all eight candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the "cut" score of 21 with no candidates receiving a score of "0" on these case ratings. (See Table 2B).

Positive Impact Data for Quantitative Intervention Cases: Candidates' impact on student learning during the Internship experience is evaluated quantitatively through intervention cases submitted as part of the Portfolio assessment. Three cases, Academic Intervention, Behavioral Consultation, and Counseling) involve intervention with students and include progress monitoring data. A candidate's positive impact on student functions is evaluated by calculating either an effect size or percentage of nonoverlapping data points. All eight internship candidates (100%) achieved at least a moderate impact on student learning for all three cases submitted. This met and exceeded the expectation of a moderate impact for two of the three cases submitted. (See Table 3AB).

## Action

### Skill Application

We are in the process of revising the supervisor rating forms. The revision is two-fold: 1 we are expanding the likert scale from 3 point to 5 point to allow the supervisors more flexibility in rating students; 2. we are now implementing new standards mandated by NASP. These will change supervisor rating and faculty ratings during the next academic year. Hopefully, these changes will allow us to compare supervisor and faculty rating with more specificity.

We also are having a supervisor workshop for all practicum and internship supervisors prior to the beginning of the upcoming year. Issues will be put forth, discussed, and any discrepancies in expectations will be addressed.

### **Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

We are so pleased with our students' competency achievement. Still there are areas to improve. The domain of research-based academic interventions was a weaker area on the national certification exam. We need to evaluate our curriculum to determine where we might include more emphasis in this area. In the skill applications, we need to address the discrepancy between on-site supervisors who view home/school community collaboration as a weakness and the program faculty who view weaknesses as apparent in information technology, and school and systems organization, policy development, and climate. Perhaps we can explore community engagement activities through the schools to provide instruction and experience in this area. The coursework regarding school and systems organization, policy development, and climate is taught in an interdisciplinary fashion through the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling. We will need to consult with the faculty teaching this particular area to share our concerns. In the skill application area, our weakest area is in the behavioral consultation case. The data indicate fairly consistently that this is a weaker area although data is within the average to above average range. To strengthen this area, we need to closely examine our expectations and students' understanding of those expectations to clarify any confusion.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

We are somewhat pleased with the results of the PRAXIS examination. Eleven students took the exam and all performed at an acceptable level. As can be noted, we did have concerns about the "Research-Based Academic Practices" category during the last cycle. The students appear to have responded to our handling of this concern: ten of the 11 students scored within the average performance range on this category; 9 of the 11 fell within the average performance range on "Research-Based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices" category. In all cases in which the student did not perform within the average ranges, they were only one point below what would be acceptable. With these results, we will continue to consult with faculty teaching courses germane to these areas and continue to stress the importance of these areas to the students.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

We are happy with the results of this year's students. During the coming academic year, we will increase our communication with supervisors to ensure that effective instruction/supervision is happening both on campus by faculty members and in the field by field supervisors. The plan at this moment is to host a workshop for all field supervisors in August 2013 so that issues, expectations, etc. can be brought to light and discussed to mutually-acceptable decisions. In addition to that, the coordinator for the School Psychology Program, along with the other core faculty members, will meet with incoming students to ensure that they understand what is expected of them and what is deemed important for their success. We also are changing our rubrics in our evaluation of the students, sites, and the program to reflect the new rubrics currently being put forth by NASP, The National Association of School Psychologists.

[Jump to Top](#)

---

# **Department of Sociology**



*Online Assessment Tracking Database*

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)  
*2012 - 2013*

**Sociology BA/BS**

**[View & Request Level Feedback](#)**

---



<b>Goal</b>	<b>Entry Level Sociological Competency</b> Students will understand the basic core concepts of the discipline.
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Demonstrate Sociological Competency: Entry Level</b> Students who take introductory Sociology classes that are included in the SHSU Core Curriculum will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the basic core concepts of the discipline.
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Comprehension Of Basic Core Concepts</b> A sample of students enrolled in the three introduction-level sociology classes in the SHSU Core Curriculum (SOC12319 in Component Area IV: Humanities and Visual and Performing Arts; and, SOC11301 and SOC11306 in Component Area V: Social and Behavioral Sciences) is chosen in the Spring semester for evaluation. Students responded to a five question evaluation instrument that measures their understanding of basic core concepts in Sociology. The selection of these indicators conforms to disciplinary standards for sociological research. This assessment was developed by the Department Undergraduate Committee and approved by the entire faculty.
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Comprehension Of Basic Core Concepts: Desired Results</b> At least 85% of evaluations should be rated 3 or better on the 5-point scale.
<b>Finding</b>	<b>Comprehension Of Basic Core Concepts: Findings</b> Component Area IV: 16 sections 87.6% of students (550 of 631) performed satisfactorily.  Component Area V: 10 sections 87.1% of students (362 of 413) performed satisfactorily.
<b>Action</b>	<b>Comprehend Basic Core Concepts: Action</b> In AY2013, the minimum criterion for this indicator was raised from 80% to 85% of students. The data indicate the desired result is exceeded regarding both component areas. The department will ensure that entry level students understand the basic core concepts of sociology.

---

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Exit Level Sociological Competency</b> Students will understand, apply, and communicate the core concepts of the discipline.
<b>Objective (L)</b>	<b>Demonstrate Sociological Competency: Exit Level</b> Sociology majors who complete the Sociology Program will be able to apply and communicate the core concepts of the discipline in a capstone research paper.
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Sociological Papers</b> A sample of six student papers is selected from SOC14399: Senior Seminar in Sociology in the Spring and Fall semesters for evaluation. The twelve papers are evaluated by the Department's Undergraduate Committee made up by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and other committee members appointed by the Chair. The papers are assigned a combined score from 1 to 5, where 1 is inadequate knowledge of sociology and 5 is excellent knowledge of

sociology. Employing their professional expertise in Sociology, faculty assign a maximum of five points based on four criteria: use of the sociological perspective, demonstration/application of sociological theory, demonstration/application of appropriate sociological methods, and demonstration/application of the link between theory and methods. The selection of these indicators conforms to disciplinary standards for sociological research. This assessment was developed by the Department's Undergraduate Committee and approved by the entire faculty.

**Criterion**

**Sociological Papers: Desired Results**

At least 80% of papers should be rated 3 or better on the 5-point scale.

**Finding**

**Sociological Papers: Findings**

In AY 2013, 75.0% of papers were rated 3 or better on the 5-point scale. Of the four indicators that were assessed, the weakest one was demonstration/application of the link between theory and methods.

**Action**

**Sociological Papers: Action**

The data indicate that the desired result was not achieved. Those students who did not perform satisfactorily did not meet the minimum evaluative criteria regarding demonstration/application of sociological perspective, demonstration/application of sociological theory, demonstration/application of appropriate sociological methods, and/or demonstration/application of the link between theory and methods. The department will continue to address changes in curricula and teaching to reduce the percentage of students who do not meet the minimum criteria.

**Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"**

The outcome of the entry-level evaluation indicates that students in introductory sociology classes are learning the basic core concepts at a level well above the minimum. Therefore, the Department will raise the comprehension of basic core concepts criterion to 85% in AY2013. We will explore ways to improve in the areas of sociological principles and social problems. The outcome of the exit-level evaluation indicates that a percentage of Sociology majors are not fully able to demonstrate/apply the link between theory and methods in their sociological papers. The Department will address this weakness through changes in curricula and teaching all upper-level undergraduate courses.

**Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.**

The Department raised the minimum comprehension of basic core concepts at the entry level to 85% of students. To better prepare students for writing in all upper-level courses, a new course SOCI 2399: Writing in Sociology was developed and proposed to the Curriculum Committee. It was approved. All Sociology majors will be required to complete SOCI 2399. As stated in the SHSU Undergraduate Course Catalog, this course is designed to teach students the writing skills needed for advanced courses in Sociology. Topics include: structure and style in writing; citations and American Sociological Association stylebook; how to conduct library and internet research as a basis for research writing; and specialized techniques for quantitative research papers, qualitative research papers, book reviews, compare and contrast papers and essay exams. Upon implementation in the Fall 2013 semester, the Department believes that it will see steady improvements in the quality of exit-level capstone papers in SOCI 4399.

**Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed**

**based on what you learned from your 2012 - 2013 Cycle Findings.**

The department will develop the assessment tool to evaluate the newly implented SOCI 2399 course. One or more performance indicators will then be created and added for the 2013-2014 cycle. Due to the fact that a relatively high percentage of students did not meet the exit-level evlauation criteria, the department will re-evaluate the objectives and/or the instructions of the writing assignments in the senior seminar course.

[Jump to Top](#)