



Sam Houston
State University

2013-2014

**College of Humanities &
Social Sciences**

**Department of
Communication Studies**















Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Communication Studies BA/BS

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	<p>Application Of Theory </p> <p>To develop student understanding and utilization of 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. Examples of communication theories include, but are not limited to, expectancy violations theory, social penetration theory, relational dialectics theory, social judgment theory, cognitive dissonance theory, cultivation theory, agenda-setting theory, face-negotiation theory, and standpoint theory.</p>
Objective (L)	<p>Applying Communication Theory </p> <p>Graduates will be able to apply communication theory to specific communication contexts.</p>
Indicator	<p>Student Application Of Theory  </p> <p>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 first component of this rubric is Evidence of Understanding of the Applicable Theory or Theories including the Effective Connection of Theory or Theories to Communication Behavior (see Supporting Document attached). The scale for measuring this degree objective will be the same throughout the department's set of objectives for BA/BS students.</p>
Criterion	<p>Student Application Of Theory </p> <p>An average grade of 3 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.</p>
Finding	<p>Student Application Of Theory  </p> <p>Two different sets of student papers (N = 20) were evaluated by faculty members. The combined mean of the evaluations was 4.3.</p>
Indicator	<p>Student Mastery Of Written Composition  </p> <p>The second component of this rubric is Control of the Mechanics of Written Composition (see Supporting Document attached).</p>
Criterion	<p>Student Mastery Of Written Composition </p> <p>An average grade of 3 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.</p>
Finding	<p>Student Mastery Of Written Composition </p> <p>Two different sets of student papers (N = 20) were evaluated by faculty members. The combined mean of the evaluations was 3.95 (tabled results shown in the attachment for Student Application of Theory).</p>
Action	<p>Application Of Theory </p> <p>Student application of theory was improved compared to last year. A new measure this year, mastery of written composition, yielded a satisfactory score. However, a review of student papers reveals several areas of writing skill (e.g., paragraphing, sentence structure, usage) which are surprisingly deficient. The faculty will develop and implement a written composition guide for use in its upper level classes.</p>

Goal	<p>Communication Presentations 🔑</p> <p>To train students (majors and nonmajors alike) to make a variety of effective communication presentations in different professional, educational, and social contexts. These presentations include informative and persuasive speeches, group decision making discussions, and interviews.</p>
-------------	---

Objective (L)	<p>Communication Presentations 🔑</p> <p>Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of oral communication situations</p>
----------------------	--

Indicator	<p>Student Presentations 🔑 🔑</p> <p>We will measure attainment of Goal 2 first through an annual evaluation of a sample of recorded final student presentations given in such courses as Public Speaking and Speech for Business and the Professions. The <i>components of this rubric</i> include the following: Evidence of Content Mastery and Evidence of Mastery of Delivery including Visual Aids (see Supporting Document attached).</p>
------------------	--

Criterion	<p>Student Presentations 🔑</p> <p>An average grade of 3 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.</p>
------------------	--


Finding	<p>Student Presentations 🔑 🔑</p> <p>A larger number of student presentations (N = 32) were evaluated this year than in previous years to improve validity of the measure. The mean student score for the presentations was 3.53.</p>
----------------	---


Indicator	<p>Student Speech Outlines 🔑 🔑</p> <p>We will measure attainment of Goal 2 secondly through an evaluation of the student speech outlines accompanying the recorded final student presentations. The <i>components of this rubric</i> are adherence to standard outline form and proper reference citation form (see Supporting Document attached).</p>
------------------	---


Criterion	<p>Student Speech Outlines 🔑</p> <p>An average grade of 3 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.</p>
------------------	--


Finding	<p>Outlines For Presentations 🔑</p> <p>The mean student score for the presentation outlines was 3.09 (tabled outline scores are included in the attachment for Student Presentations).</p>
----------------	---



Action	<p>Communication Presentations 🔑</p> <p>While scores on student presentations were acceptable, there is clearly room for improvement. The faculty will meet in a workshop setting to discuss ways of raising these scores. Scores on student speech outlines exceeded the criterion only minimally, and inspection of the outlines reveals several areas which need improvement (e.g., full sentence form, formatting details, source citations) and for which the faculty will develop and implement guidelines for the preparation of outlines for use in each class.</p>
---------------	--


Goal	Research And Computer Literacy 
	To develop student competencies in locating, understanding, assessing, and reporting communication research findings. This includes training in the use of print and electronic database sources and focuses attention on published scholarly research. It also includes training in the use of computer software appropriate for the word processing of reports and the use of online research sources.


Objective (L)	Research And Computer Literacy 
	Graduates will be able to assess and report the results of communication research found in refereed scholarly journals as well as in electronic and online databases.


Indicator	Student Research And Computer 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 <i>first component of this rubric</i> is Evidence of a Comprehensive Knowledge of a Confined Research Area and is the same as for Goal 1 Indicator 1. Included in this rubric is an assessment of each student's mastery of Microsoft Word and the use of Communication Abstracts and similar online databases.


Criterion	Student Research And Computer Literacy 
	An average grade of 3 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.

Finding	Student Research And Computer Literacy  
	The mean student score for research and computer literacy was 3.7 (see Supporting Document attached).

Indicator	Student Mastery Of Written Composition II 
	The second component of this rubric is mastery of written communication (see document attached to Goal 1 Indicator 1).

Criterion	Student Mastery Of Written Composition II 
	An average grade of 3 is the criterion for satisfying the target outcome.

Finding	Student Mastery Of Written Communication II 
	The mean student score for mastery of written communication II was 3.6 (see Supporting Document for Student Research and Computer Literacy).

Action	Research And Computer Literacy 
	Student research and computer literacy and mastery of written composition, the latter a new measure this year, show acceptable scores, and the results for this goal are better than for either of the other two goals. However, the faculty will share the writing guidelines developed for Goal 1 with the classes measured for this goal in an effort to improve writing even more.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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.

Student performance scores were improved compared to last year, and new measures of writing reveal satisfactory student performance. The department explored ways of accessing online student performances, so that they could be evaluated but continued to find hardware/software problems with doing this.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

The primary focus for improvement in the coming year will be the development of student guidelines for writing and for outlining. This will address weaknesses noted in the findings for Goals 1, 2, and 3 for this year and will prepare the department for anticipated university-wide changes in the expectations for writing-enhanced courses. To accomplish this, the faculty will: 1) discuss the components of good outlining and writing, 2) develop guidelines for outlining and writing, and 3) distribute these two sets of guidelines to undergraduate students in each of our classes.

[Jump to Top](#)

Department of English






Online Assessment Tracking Database


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014



English BA


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

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 holistic scoring done by Department of English faculty. 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	Goal Of 70 Percent Passing The Criteria Was Met DRAFT 
	During Spring 2014, 125 students were enrolled in 4000-level English classes. An end-of-semester writing sample (essay or research paper) was collected from every third or fourth student (depending on class size) on the roster of each 4000-level class. Thirty-four (34) papers were submitted for the holistic evaluation by eleven professors of English; hence, our goal of collecting more papers than in the spring of 2013 was met. The reading was carried out collectively on May 7, 2014. Each essay was read by two professors, and essays received scores on the scale of 2-8. Interrater reliability was high: only two essays had to be read by a third reader. The results follow:

Score	N
2	0
3	1
4	7
5	9

6	9
7	5
8	3
34	

Twenty-four (24) percent (N=8) of essays (N=34) were assessed as failing; they received the combined score of 4 or under. Seventy-six (76) percent (N=26) of the essays (N=34) passed with a score of 5 or higher. Our goal of seventy percent was exceeded.

Action

Writing Senior-level Research Papers Will Be Emphasized DRAFT

In all 4000-level writing-enhanced classes, the importance of writing academic research papers will be emphasized. All professors will require a major research paper in their classes.

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

Measuring Knowledge Of Sophomore Literature Objectively Was Unsuccessful DRAFT

Even though the idea of measuring students' knowledge of literary terms and major writers was worth exploring, it turned out that implementing the objective test across twenty-three (23) sections of ENGL 2342 (World Literature II)--taught by eight (8) different professors during AY 2013-2014--provided several logistic problems. Until the objective test is adopted more widely across sophomore instructors, the Department of English will abandon the idea of measuring knowledge of literary terms and facts of major authors objectively.

Finding

Revisiting Results Of 2012 Pre- And Post-tests DRAFT

234 students of World Literature II were given a pretest of literary terms in the beginning of spring semester 2012. The same test was presented to 190 students in the spring to measure any possible improvement. The major finding was the attrition of 44 students (19 percent of the initial student population). For the students who remained in the class, the finding was obvious: the number of those scoring low went down (from 46% to 35%) and those scoring relatively high went up (from 5% to 16%). The number of those scoring highest (90-100% correct answers) remained at one percent from January to May.

Action

Objective Testing Of Sophomore Goals Will Be Abandoned DRAFT

An objective test to measure students' knowledge of literary terms and major authors was developed two years ago. For four semesters, the Department of English tried to implement this testing in World Literature II classes, with little success. Using a test would constrain the vast area of literature that can be covered in this class (any major world and multicultural piece of literature after 1700) and unnecessarily unify, restrict, and centralize the variation that students can now enjoy. This does not mean that central concepts are not taught; controlling that they be taught via an objective test would, however, be too simplistic. This seemed to be the consensus of the sophomore professors. The test is still available for all those who wish to use it.

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

Goal Not Met; World Literature I Students Continue To Perform Better Than World Literature II Students DRAFT

Previous years, a comparison between English sophomore and senior writing has been 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 during the previous evaluation period (AY 2011-12), i.e, two years ago. We found that only within one year, a jump from 50-percent acceptance rate to a 62-percent acceptance rate had taken place. We attributed this to consciousness-raising of what sophomore writing should consist of. Also, the new sophomore curriculum could be credited for higher writing ability. In order to see whether this trend has continued or not, we carried out a similar assessment in May 2014.

Table 1 shows the numbers of the student population in both of our sophomore courses, ENGL 2332 (World Literature I) and ENGL 2342 (World Literature II), during Spring 2014. Both of these courses satisfy the requirements of Core Component (Language, Philosophy,

and Culture). Table 1 also shows the numbers of the collected sample essays:

	Sections	Students	Essays Evaluated
2332 (World Lit I)	10	365	22 (6%)
2342 (World Lit II)	11	202	66 (33%)
Total	21	567	88 (15.5%)

Table 1. Number of students in ENGL 2332 and 2342 sections and sample population. Spring 2014.

As during the past years, in the spring of 2014, an electronic mail was sent to all English faculty teaching sophomore courses, with instructions to collect mechanically the last substantial essay assignment from every third student for evaluation purposes. The four large non-writing-enhanced World Literature I sections were not targeted, which explains the smaller percentage in Table 1 (above) of essays submitted from ENGL 2332 students (6%). The sample of essays from ENGL 2342 sections was 33%. The entire sophomore sample size consisted of 88 essays (15.5% of the entire sophomore population of 567 registered students). The sample consisted of more essays than last year (an increase from 57 to 88 essays), but the percentage was smaller (a decrease from 20% to 15.5%). We still consider this percentage as representative of sophomore writing. The reason for the change was the larger number of students enrolled in the two English sophomore classes during AY 2013-2014.

On May 7, 2014, a volunteer group of eleven professors gathered to evaluate the essays. Instructions to evaluators are attached. See Table 2 (Comparison between scoring results in 2012, 2013, and 2014) for scoring results from 2012 to 2014 (attachment).

Interreader reliability was very high; only three essays required a third reader (tie-breaker).

Discussion: From the year 2013, the difference in 2014 between failing and passing essays (in terms of the established departmental criteria; see attachment) is smaller (48% fail; 52% pass). In fact, it is almost back to the level of the even split of 2012.

There continues to be a discrepancy in the scores between the two sophomore courses, ENGL 2332 (World Literature I: Before the Seventeenth Century) and ENGL 2342 (World Literature II: Seventeenth Century and After) (see attachment of Table 2, Comparison of writing scores between ENGL 2332 and ENGL 2342 students).

It is interesting to note that while 68 percent of World Literature I (ENGL 2332) students write in a passable manner (an improvement of last year's 62 percent), only 47 percent of World Literature II (ENGL 2342) students do so (down from the 53 percent last year). Last year's trend has not only been repeated; it has become stronger as the gap has grown. We will continue to follow up, and will explore reasons for this discrepancy.

The goal of only thirty (30) percent or fewer of our sophomore students not passing the departmental writing criteria was not met. Thirty-two (32) percent of World Literature I students failed to meet these criteria, and over half (53 percent) of World Literature II students failed.

Action

Realistic Feedback To Students **DRAFT**

As student writing is not at the recommended level, students must be informed early on about the English Department's high writing standards. Grade inflation is to be avoided, and professors will be encouraged to work with struggling writers.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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.

Nota bene: In the previous section (Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement," third line from the bottom, "expectation" should read "expectations."

Last year's discrepancy between the writing skills of World Literature I and World Literature II students was partially a coincidence (a result of a smallish sample); however, the same trend continues: World Literature I students, on an average, write better than World Literature II students. In May 2014, a discussion was held during the grading session to explore reasons for the discrepancy. The faculty consensus was that both courses must be as demanding.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

- 80% of English seniors in 4000-level writing-enhanced classes will meet the departmental criteria for academic writing that reflects critical thinking and good editing.

METHODS OF GETTING THERE:

- Two years ago, a rule was implemented that English majors and minors must receive a C or better in all courses that count toward their English major or minor. We anticipate the effects of this rule to start showing up soon as more reflective writing. It has been too early to measure this until now.
- The English Department and MFA program will publicize the monetary award that we have established for students who write an essay about the Bearkat common reader.
- Good writers will be nominated by faculty for the Academic Success Center writing awards in the spring of 2015.
- All 4000-level professors will share with their students the departmental criteria (attached) that are used to evaluate senior-level writing.

- 60% of sophomore students in ENGL 2332 will meet the departmental criteria for academic writing that reflects critical thinking and good editing.

METHODS OF GETTING THERE:

- All 2000-level instructors will share with their students the departmental criteria (attached) for sophomore writing.
- Students will be encouraged to submit their essays for the Bearkat common reader contest for the monetary award established by the department for the coming year.
- We regard sophomore courses as our recruitment courses. Active recruitment efforts will commence. Every sophomore class will be visited by a recruiting professor. The side effect should be better consciousness of what English values: plenty of critical reading and reflection on the reading through writing.

- 50% of sophomore students in ENGL 2333 will meet the departmental criteria for academic writing that reflects critical thinking and good editing.

METHODS OF GETTING THERE:

- See above. In addition:
- ENGL 2333 students will be presented, again, the departmental list of literary terms. This, we expect, will provide the 2333 students the tools to discuss their readings in reflective writing.
- Visits to Newton Gresham Library and the Academic Success Center will be encouraged. Struggling writers

will be sent to the Academic Success Center to get additional help in developing better sophomore-level essays early during the semester.

- 100% of World Literature I and II students will receive realistic feedback of their writing skills early during the semester. Especially World Literature II professors will emphasize the importance of knowing the standards of academic writing.

METHODS OF GETTING THERE:

- All sophomores will be given the departmental essay criteria, and these will be discussed in detail during the beginning of the semester.

- A meeting will be organized with all sophomore professors to discuss means of raising the level of students writing. The perils of grade inflation will be addressed.

- Essays will be collected from 20% of the students in both World Literature I and II to ensure comparable data. In previous years, the validity of the sample has been a problem.

[Jump to Top](#)



Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

English MA

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal**Academic Writing 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

Results Of Holistic Assessment Of English Graduate Student Writing

On July 23, 2014, a committee of eight English graduate faculty from across a wide range of areas--literature, linguistics, professional writing, and creative writing--undertook the holistic review of graduate student writing for the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee reviewed fifteen essays chosen without prejudice from seven graduate courses in literature, language, and writing disciplines. Two committee members read each essay and rated it on the scale of 1-4 described above; the combined scores are as follow:

Score of 7 (excellent): 2 essays
 Score of 6 (acceptable): 3 essays
 Score of 5 (acceptable): 7 essays
 Score of 4 (unacceptable): 2 essays
 Score of 3 (unacceptable): 1 essay

Eighty percent of the essays were deemed excellent or acceptable. This number falls short of the ninety-two percent target.

Action

Developing Students' Writing Abilities


Critical writing continues to be an important requirement for graduate students in English, not only because it demonstrates their critical thinking and researching abilities and the breadth of their knowledge but also because it trains them practically for professional researching and writing of their own and for teaching research and writing skills to undergraduates and secondary students.


Outlining an action for improving student writing is difficult: Professors in graduate English courses often presume that their students come to them with sophisticated critical thinking and writing skills in hand. Although they sometimes provide models of good writing in the field, rarely do they devote time--nor do the restrictions of a busy term allow them to devote time--to teaching writing in their classes.


After the last reporting cycle, the Graduate Director consulted with Dr. Carroll Nardone, Director of Writing in the Disciplines, who revised the assessment rubric for the holistic review. The Graduate Director plans to send this rubric to all graduate professors and students in Fall 2014.



The professor assigned to teach the research and methods course (ENGL 5330) required of all incoming English graduate students in Fall 2014 will also give substantial attention to critical researching and writing, especially by providing creditable models from both peer and professional writing. (A qualification: The catalogue description of the research and methods course allows professors to take different approaches. Some treat it as a scientific approach to gathering information and editing; others treat it as an introductory course in graduate writing and critical approaches. The department decided several


years ago that it could not mandate that the professor for this class specifically teach writing.)

Goal	Demonstration Of Breadth Of Knowledge 
	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.

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 
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Criterion	Written Comprehensive Examination Pass Rate  
	<p>At least 90% of examination essays will pass (with a grade of pass or high pass).</p> <p>An examination grading rubric and sample pass, fail, and high pass essays are attached.</p>

Finding	Results Of Written Comprehensive Examinations 
	<p>During the reporting year 2013-2014 (including Summer 2014), MA candidates in English wrote sixty-two comprehensive examination essays; this number includes retakes of essays that had previously failed. The results follow:</p> <p>Total number of passing essays: 50 (81%) Total number of failing essays: 7 (11%) Total number of high passes: 5 (8%)</p> <p>Eighty-nine percent of the total essays passed (with a grade of pass or high pass).</p> <p>Conclusions about finding: While this result falls just short of the 90% target, it is substantially better than last year's 82%. It is also probably better representative of our graduate students' abilities and preparation because there was a much larger sample this reporting period (sixty-two essays, as compared with last year's</p>

thirty-three).

Because the pass rate has risen steadily over the past three reporting cycles, from 69% for 2011-2012 to 82% for 2012-2013 to this year's 89%, measures implemented to help students prepare for the written comprehensive examination may be yielding results.

(An informal survey suggests, for example, that most of the students whose essays passed had attended one or more of the Graduate Director's exam preparation sessions.). However, we need to continue to monitor the pass rate over the next two or three cycles before drawing any firm conclusions.

Action

Preparing Students For The Written Comprehensive Examination

Because the pass rate has risen over the past three reporting cycles, we seem to be achieving some success in preparing students for the exam. As much as anything else, this may be a matter of impressing upon the students the importance of sound preparation. We will continue to help students prepare:

1. The Graduate Director will continue to publish an exam prep booklet and to conduct biannual sessions, during which he discusses the exam process, suggests strategies for preparing and for addressing exam questions, and presents exemplary questions and responses.
2. Although the comprehensive examination is expressly separated from graduate coursework, some graduate faculty continue to use typical exam questions for midterm and final examinations, as a way of accustoming students to comprehensive exam expectations and circumstances.
3. Faculty continue to give advice about the exam to students who approach them. Despite some discussion at a recent department meeting, the suggestion that faculty be assigned as mentors to a certain number of students has not yet been implemented.

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

Results Of Oral Examinations 🔍

During the reporting year 2013-2014 (including Summer 2014), twelve students sat for oral comprehensive examinations; six students sat for oral defenses of their theses. Sixteen students earned passes, and two students earned high passes (one each for the oral comprehensive exam and thesis defense).

One hundred percent of the students passed the oral examination during the reporting period. This number exceeds the ninety-two percent target.

Conclusions about findings: In last year's assessment of the oral examination, we suggested that the oral defense of thesis and the oral comprehensive examination are unequal measures of our candidates' abilities to demonstrate critical thinking skills: Thesis students know the subjects of their projects as well as, sometimes even better than, the examining faculty and have a much narrower range of material; the thesis defense sometimes becomes an exercise in congratulations upon a job well-completed. (One other important factor is that supervising faculty do not allow a thesis defense until the candidate is ready to defend her or his project; while the non-thesis student is required to take the oral comprehensive exam immediately after passing the written exam, then, the thesis student has greater scheduling flexibility.) Non-thesis students, who sit for the oral comprehensive exam, must show mastery of a much wider range of topics in literature, linguistics, and writing disciplines; have less control over the questions asked and the direction of the discussion; and are sometimes examined by faculty experts whom they have not met before the examination.

Faculty continue to express disappointment with the performances of students in the oral comprehensive examination. During this cycle, however, one student who sat for the comprehensive exam was awarded a high pass (with one student also being awarded a high pass for the thesis defense). Although the number is statistically insignificant, it does suggest that students can meet a standard of excellence in the oral comprehensive exam (see the attached rubric).

Action

Preparing Students To Make Oral Arguments 🔍

One hundred percent of students who have sat for the oral defense of thesis or oral comprehensive exam in the last five reporting cycles have passed. There are still complaints among examining faculty, however, that students taking the oral comprehensive examination respond with weak arguments and inadequate knowledge.

In our statement of action for the last reporting cycle, we stressed that the oral examination should not be the only measure of a student's ability to express critical thinking skills and breadth of knowledge orally. It is, however, one of the few uniform measures, since not all graduate classes require oral presentations.

In a department meeting specifically about graduate matters, the issue of the oral exam was raised briefly, without much further discussion or consensus, since most attention was focused on the written examination (also one of the few uniform measures of our students' critical thinking abilities and breadth of knowledge).

Although an oral component is not yet required in any graduate courses, the professor assigned to teach the mandatory research and methods class (ENGL 5330) to incoming students in Fall 2014 has agreed to include a formal unit on oral presentations.

Beginning in August 2014, during the comprehensive examination prep

sessions, the Graduate Director will also incorporate suggestions for preparing for the oral comprehensive examination. (A qualification: Students are not required to attend the prep sessions.)

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

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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 of English implemented the following elements of the 2013-2014 plan for continuous improvement:

1. The graduate faculty undertook a thorough review of comprehensive examination reading lists, to assure that they reflect the expectations for breadth of knowledge and currency in the field. This review was completed during the late spring, and updated lists (current 1 August 2014) have now been posted on line.
2. The graduate faculty resumed the holistic review of students' class writing. The results of that evaluation appear above.

Other elements of the plan for continuous improvement from the last reporting cycle were raised in a departmental meeting set aside last spring specifically for graduate program business: (1) a thorough review of comprehensive examination questions, (2) the challenges of incorporating an oral component into classwork, and (3) the possibility of establishing a faculty mentoring system. The graduate faculty decided collectively to postpone these issues until the coming year, especially because much discussion revolved around the nature and the effectiveness of the current written and oral examination system. A committee of five graduate faculty members was formed to review the exam system and make recommendations for future examinations.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

In responding specifically to the findings for the three objectives above, we propose the following plan for continuous improvement in the 2014-2015 assessment period:

1. A committee of five graduate faculty members appointed during Spring 2014 will meet to discuss the written and oral comprehensive examinations, considering specifically how effective they are in measuring the students' critical thinking and writing skills and their breadth of knowledge.
2. The graduate faculty will undertake a thorough review of comprehensive examination questions. This task was postponed from the previous plan for improvement because it depended, in part, on the review of reading lists, which was finally completed in late spring. One persistent concern among graduate faculty is that some students are skirting the requirement that they read all works on an area list and are still managing to pass the exam because too-general questions allow too much flexibility in the responses. In order to assure greater rigor, graduate faculty have suggested more specificity in the questions. The plan for improvement will address this concern.
3. While faculty generally agree upon expectations for the quality of graduate student writing, it is difficult to reach a consensus about specific, measurable standards, in part because of the variety in the kinds of writing expected in various classes: critical term papers, linguistic analyses, papers about pedagogical methods and practices, annotated bibliographies, and expository papers. As one step toward reaching a consensus, the Graduate Director will distribute the recently revised rubric for the holistic assessment of writing to both faculty and students.
4. The graduate faculty will resume the discussion of appointing faculty members as mentors to students. While the Graduate Director will continue the general advisement of students, the faculty mentors would be available to their advisees to discuss class researching and writing assignments and to help them prepare for written and oral examinations.

[Jump to Top](#)

**Department of Family and
Consumer Sciences**









Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Dietetics MS

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	<p>Knowledge And Skills Development </p> <p>Develop knowledge and skills to meet accreditation standards as a Registered Dietician (RD).</p>
Objective (L)	<p>Develop Knowledge And Skills Necessary To Provide Entry Level Services </p> <p>Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills associated with the standards of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (AND).</p>
Indicator	<p>National Registration Examination For Dietetics (RD Exam) </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>
Criterion	<p>80% Passing On First Administration </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>
Finding	<p>RD Exam Results </p> <p>The RD exam changed exam venues from ACT to Pearson Vue on January 1, 2014. The official results of the cohort that graduated in December 2013 will not be available until September 1, 2014. Of the 10 students that have graduated, 9 have self-reported passing the RD exam within the last seven months. Based on the self-report, the pass rate is 90% for this most recent group of graduates, greatly exceeding the 80% goal. The five year first time pass rate from 2009 to 2013 is 81%, also exceeding the 80% goal.</p> <p>The finding was based on the official RD exam five year summary report for those that took the exam between 2009 and 2013. The report shows our students' averages in two areas (Nutrition and Foodservice) as well as the national average.</p>
Action	<p>Addressing Identified Weaknesses </p> <p>At this point, this criterion appears to have been met for 2013-2014. For the past three years, the pass rate has consistently been above 80%. This is reflected in the five year summary report which is over 80% for the first time since the 2006 to 2010 report. 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 are continuing to provide case studies, journal articles, and class discussions/lectures specific to the area of Medical Nutrition Therapy, Food Service Management, and Community Nutrition to help increase knowledge and application of material. In addition, interns must take an approved RD exam review course and complete a mock RD exam with a score of 80% or better prior to graduation.</p>

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 the 2012-2013 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. Interns will not be placed in clinical rotation their first semester in the program. The FACS 5079 course taken by interns their first semester will provide clinical information necessary to prepare students for clinical rotations.

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 10 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 their clinical nutrition base can be strengthened.

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.

A Nutrition Assessment course (FACS 4371) has been added to the Fall schedule for undergraduate nutrition majors. A goal for the DI program in the next two years is to have interns take this course for graduate credit in place of one of their research classes. This class is geared to strengthen clinical skills necessary for clinical nutrition practice and will be of great benefit to the interns.

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 10 students graduating in December of 2013 successfully completed their rotations and the exit survey.

90% 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 and the lowest satisfaction was with their community rotations.


Action **Progression/Successful Completion** 

All 10 students of the cohort completed the program by December 2013. New clinical sites have been added to the rotation schedule to enhance student experiences. The activities and projects completed at these rotations are being revised to improve the experience the intern receives. If a site is unable to meet the standards of the program, the site will no longer be used by the program.



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

Goal **Knowledge And Skills Development** 


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

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) **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) **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 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.

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 DI Director met with the interns every two weeks during the Fall semester and taught the FACS 5079 internship practicum course in the Spring semester. The course allowed the DI Director to meet with the students weekly and provide additional case studies to strengthen student's clinical knowledge. Feedback from past interns was used to reduce Foodservice Management rotations to 10 weeks for the current cohort. In addition, the minimum hours per week for rotations was standardized to 24 (previously was 21 to 28 hours depending on rotation). A new senior living community was added to strengthen student's experiences in the area of clinical nutrition.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 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 2014. The GRE scores for the new cohort are comparable with the group that graduated December 2013. The GRE score continues to be an excellent predictor of successful passage of the RD Exam.

New sites are currently being obtained for clinical rotations for the upcoming year. Finding a new site and getting a contract signed takes 3 to 6 months. New preceptor sites allow 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)
2013 - 2014

Family And Consumer Sciences BA/BS

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	Employer/Supervisor Feedback The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate general Family and Consumer Sciences majors who perform well in employment positions within the field
Objective (L)	Demonstration Of Applied Professional Competence 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.
Indicator	Employer/Supervisor Evaluation 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.
Criterion	Employer/Supervisor Ratings At Least 3.5 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.
Finding	Employer/Supervisor Evaluation Of the 21 students who graduated with a degree in Family and Consumer Sciences (BA or BS), 4 were in the FCS/Teacher Certification Program, so they were not subject to a business supervisor's evaluation through the department's internship program. Of the 17 students were subject to that evaluation, data was available for 12 of them. Of the 12, 10 (83%) received a rating of 5, 1 (8%) received a rating of 4, and 1 (8%) received a rating of 3. Therefore, this criterion was met since 91% of students received a rating of 3.5 or higher. The portion of whether or not the supervisor would hire the intern was not included in this year's analysis because the numbers for the last several years have been so high that it is believed that the supervisors are not wanting to give any answer other than they would hire the interns.
Action	Employer/Supervisor Evaluation The main action that is needed for the coming year, based on this statistic

alone, is another way of assessing program effectiveness. We are working on a rubric whereby we can receive input from students' logs that will lead to curriculum changes that will result in more effective programs.

Goal **Student Knowledge Of Content Area** 🔑
 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.

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

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

Criterion **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 🔑 🔑
 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.

Finding **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 🔑
 Of the 21 students who received the BA or BS in Family and Consumer Sciences in August, December and May of 2013-2014, there were only 14 for whom an Exit Survey score was available. Of these 14 students, one (7%) scored a High Pass, nine (64%) scored a Pass, three (21%) scored a Low Pass, and one (7%) Failed this Exit Survey. Therefore, this criterion was met.

Action **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 🔑
 In recent years, we have struggled with how to handle this Exit Survey. It is difficult to remember to update the survey every time a change in the curriculum occurs (programs and courses in the department must continually be updated because they are pre-professional programs that serve fields that are constantly in flux), so we get to the point of administering it and realize that it is needs updating. Dr. Laura Burleson is working on a rubric whereby we would access students' logs during the internship process to determine effectiveness of course content as students applied it to the internship activities and problems. We are going to try it for a cycle with the expectation that it will lead to curricular changes and improved program effectiveness.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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.

Students in this program continue to do well, often receiving position offers through the internship. However, last year's plan was not carried out to completion. Rather than use of the fourteen professional skills identified on the internship supervisor evaluation form, Dr. Laura Burleson is working on a rubric whereby the students' logs written during the internship would be used to determine the effectiveness of the various courses in the curriculum.

We need to get back with Continuing Education regarding the certificate in event planning.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

One of the things we can see through the 2013-2014 cycle findings is that each program needs a specific person charged with its oversight. In the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences we have a large proportion of adjunct faculty and they tend not to take responsibility for program oversight, for obvious reasons. They are paid to teach a specific course or courses. Period.

It appears as though we have lost the opportunity to work with Continuing Education to craft a certificate in event planning which would have been a boon to the department, but perhaps we can re-open that door.

We will continue to request faculty positions so that we will have adequate faculty and staff for program oversight.

[Jump to Top](#)











Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014


Family And Consumer Sciences BA/BS (Fashion Merchandising)

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)



Goal	Employer/Supervisor Evaluation  The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate Fashion Merchandising students who perform well in positions of employment within the fashion industry.
Objective (L)	Demonstration Of Applied Professional Competence  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 fashion merchandising.
Indicator	Employer/Supervisor Evaluation Data   The supervisor evaluation form for fashion merchandising 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 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 fashion merchandising students are evaluated in this way. 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/fashion merchandising 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 (FCS 469). The other programs that use this same form are interior design, general family and consumer sciences (without a teaching certificate), and food service management.
Criterion	80% Employer/Supervisor Rating 3.5 Or Better  At least 80% of business supervisors of fashion merchandising 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 Data  Of the 23 graduates who received undergraduate degrees (BA/BS) in Fashion Merchandising, employer/supervisor evaluation data is available on 20. Of the 20, nine (45%) received a rating of 5, the highest score; eight (40%) received a rating of 4; 2 (10%) received a rating of 3, and one (5%) received a rating of 2. Therefore, 85% received a rating of 3.5 or higher on a 5-point scale, so this criterion was met.
Action	Employer/Supervisor Evaluation Data  This benchmark continues to work well for measuring the effectiveness of the Fashion Merchandising program. The student who received the rating of 2 really deserved it, in my opinion. I also had observed the same sense of "putting in time to get the diploma" that the supervisor mentioned as I spoke with her about this student. We should continue to use this particular evaluation as one measure of program effectiveness.

Goal **Student Knowledge Of Content Area** 



The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences will graduate Fashion Merchandising majors who have an in-depth knowledge of the content area of the major.

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


Students graduating from the fashion merchandising program will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for entry-level management in fashion retailing/merchandising positions.

Indicator **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills**  


The Exit Survey for fashion merchandising majors includes multiple-choice and short-answer sections that test retention of course material and a case study that applies directly to retail apparel merchandising; 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.

Criterion **90% Passing Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills**  

At least 90% of students who complete the fashion merchandising 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** 

Of the 23 students who graduated with degrees in Fashion Merchandising (BA/BS), exit survey data is available on 13 students. Of the 13, 3 (23%) scored a rating of High Pass; 8 (62%) scored a rating of Pass; 2 (15%) scored a rating of Low Pass. Therefore, this criterion was met.

Action **Exit Survey - Knowledge And Skills** 

In recent years, we have struggled with how to handle this Exit Survey. It is difficult to remember to update the survey every time a change in the curriculum occurs (programs and courses in the department must continually be updated because they are pre-professional programs that serve fields that are constantly in flux), so we get to the point of administering it and realize that it needs updating. Dr. Laura Burleson is working on a rubric whereby we would access students' logs during the internship process to determine effectiveness of course content as students applied it to the internship activities and problems. We are going to try it for a cycle with the expectation that it will lead to curricular changes and improved program effectiveness.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

The two items targeted for improvement have to do with program assessment. One of them is to abandon the Exit Survey and instead focus on the fourteen professional skills outlined in the Internship Supervisor Evaluation Form. The other item has to do with the computer literacy assignment and the particular assignment that was targeted for the assessment. Both of these items will be modified for the coming year's assessment.

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 computer literacy assessment is no longer needed. The computer literacy skills with which students now enter the university are superior to what they were even five years ago. Therefore, that assessment has been eliminated.

Rather than focus on the fourteen professional skills outlined in the Internship Supervisor Evaluation Form, we are considering another approach for assessment, although we will continue to use the overall score on the evaluation form (see Business/Supervisor Evaluation above).

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

In recent years, we have struggled with how to handle the various program Exit Survey data. It is difficult to remember to update the survey every time a change in the curriculum occurs (programs and courses in the department must continually be updated because they are pre-professional programs that serve fields that are constantly in flux), so we get to the point of administering it and realize that it needs updating. Dr. Laura Burleson is working on a rubric whereby we would access students' logs during the internship process to determine effectiveness of course content as students applied it to the internship activities and problems. We are going to try it for a cycle with the expectation that it will lead to curricular changes and improved program effectiveness.

[Jump to Top](#)



Online Assessment Tracking Database


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Family And Consumer Sciences MS


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal **Student Knowledge Of Content Area** 



Students enrolled in the MS in Family and consumer Sciences, will graduate with an in-depth knowledge of the content area of interest.

Objective (L) **Knowledge And Skills** 


Students graduating from the MS in FCS program will demonstrate adequate knowledge and skills necessary for upper-level employment positions in their selected fields including teacher education in family and consumer sciences, interior design, fashion merchandising, and nutrition.

Indicator **Knowledge And Skills** 


Comprehensive exams for Family and Consumer Sciences covers all major and minor course areas undertaken by each student; scores are assigned on a High Pass, Pass, or Fail basis. These exams are scored holistically, and must cover content of specific course work taken for the degree. The answers are written into "blue books" and are scored by the faculty under whom the work was completed. Any student who does not score a High Pass in every area is required to take an oral exam over every area where a score of High Pass was not awarded.

Criterion **80% Of Students Scoring At Least Pass On Knowledge And Skills**  


At least 80% of the students who complete the master's program in FCS will score a Pass or higher on each area of the comprehensive exam AND/OR will pass a follow-up oral exam.

Finding **Knowledge And Skills** 


Only one student took the comprehensive exams and graduated with the MS in General Family and Consumer Sciences during the 2013-2014 academic year. This one student was the first person to totally finish this degree in the online format. Because she was not able to come to campus for her comprehensive exams, the format of the exam questions was changed so that the questions were appropriate for administration online. We were pleased and excited with the results, not only of her responses (she passed each area of the exam), but also with the process and its suitability for the online format of the program.

Action **Knowledge And Skills** 

As questions are drafted that are especially suited for the online format (more program planning, more synthesis of information rather than relying on recall), these questions are being stored in a way so that the department will build a bank of questions to be used for comprehensive exams in that are open book, open note, but a limited time frame for completion.

Goal **Increase Enrollment** 

The MS program in Family Consumer Science will increase enrollment with the goal of producing graduates during the coming academic year (2013-2014).

Objective (P) **Increase Program Enrollment** 

Increase numbers of students enrolled in the Master of Science in Family Consumer

Sciences Program at Sam Houston State University

**KPI
Performance
Indicator****Increase Enrollment In MS In FCS** 🔑

An increase in the number of declared majors and graduates in Master of Science in Family Consumer Sciences Program.

Result**Increased Enrollment** 🔑

There is definitely increased enrollment in this online program, a result of marketing it to a population that is working full time and is seeking a program with a content base in Family and Consumer Sciences in the online format. Aside from the student who graduated this past December, there are two more who graduated in August and two more who are slated to graduate in December. Four more students are in-process and there is a list of students wanting to be admitted as soon as the Graduate Director returns from an international conference in the first half of August.

Action**Increase Enrollment** 🔑

Recruitment for this program will continue, along with admission of qualified applicants (there are nine on a list that need to be evaluated for Fall 2014 admission). Again, the population that is being targeted is people who are currently working full-time in family and consumer sciences and who are seeking an online program. Others will be accepted who are living within commuting distance and can serve as graduate teaching assistants.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

In order to sustain this remarkable growth, it is imperative that more faculty with full graduate faculty status be developed/hired. At the present time, Dr. Valencia Browning-Keen's dossier is before the group of associate deans who monitor movement from associate to full graduate faculty status, and that group has not met in some time, due in part, I believe, to the transition of some of the responsibilities for recruitment from the Office of Graduate Studies to the Office of Enrollment Management. Dr. Keen is willing to assume the role of Graduate Director providing that we are able to hire a person to be the Director of the undergraduate Didactic Program in Dietetics (Food Science and Nutrition, an accredited program) for the department.

Secondly, we must continue our recruitment efforts at every opportunity. One of the ways we are seeking to do this is by assigning a graduate assistant the responsibility for keeping the website up-to-date. We will also cooperate with the Hobson's Notification system as we follow through with our recruitment efforts. We will emphasize the benefits of the on-line format.

Thirdly, we must continue to request new faculty positions. We cannot sustain growth in the graduate program without them, and we cannot rob the undergraduate programs, two of which are accredited, of well-qualified faculty in order to maintain the graduate program.

Finally, two more courses are planned, one in the area of administration of family and consumer sciences programs and how those programs have requirements that are different from other types of programs, and another one in the area of nutrition and dietetics that is for the general FCS major.

This is an ambitious plan but all of the elements within the plan are necessary for the ultimate success of this program.

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 2013-2014 academic year, Dr. Keen was approved by the group of associate deans to serve the department as Graduate Director. She has fulfilled her duties in that role, learning the programs associated with graduate admissions and working with Mary Pascarella in Graduate Admissions. The department still is searching for a person to fill the role of Director for the undergraduate Didactic Program in Dietetics (Food Science and

Nutrition, an accredited program).

Efforts at recruitment continue. We have hired a graduate assistant who has worked this summer on updates to the website. We continue to emphasize the benefits of the online format for students enrolled in the MS in FCS.

We have requested new faculty positions, and are not where we would like to be in regard to this faculty recruitment. We HAVE hired a new department chair/teacher educator who is slated to come on board July 1, 2015. She will come with tenure. We are seeking a Ph.D., RD as another faculty position who would be able to teach in either graduate program, and that search continues. Additionally, Dr. Keen has put the FACS 5367 Consumer and Biotechnology course into an online format during the Summer 2014 session, therefore allowing for three solid populations for this course: Students from the MS in Dietetics, students enrolled in the MS in FCS, and students in a new (and online) Agriculture MS program that is geared toward the "hobby farm" and "specialized products" niche markets.

For the course in the area of administration of family and consumer sciences programs, progress was made but the course still is not ready to be offered, primarily because the person who is slated to teach it needs a course release in order to have a spot in her schedule. The Consumer and Biotechnology course offered online is now available for the general FCS major.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

The course in administration of program in family and consumer sciences is planned to be offered under the 5079 ("Special Topics") designation for the Spring 2015 semester. A graduate teaching assistant in the FACS 1330 course will allow the time for the faculty member to carry an overload and therefore accomplish that task.

Recruitment will continue, as will partnerships with programs where we can "borrow" courses that are relevant and appropriate for our students in departments such as Communication Studies (Family Communication) and Health (Consumer Health Education).

Recruitment to fill the open position will also continue as will updates to the website.

Overall, this program is showing sustained growth and is obviously appealing to this population of working professionals in the field of family and consumer sciences.

[Jump to Top](#)

**Department of Foreign
Languages**



















Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Spanish BA

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	Language Skill Mastery DRAFT 
	Graduates of the Department of Foreign Languages will have practical working skills in the language of study.
Objective (L)	Practical Language Speaking Skills DRAFT 
	Graduates of the Department of Foreign Languages (FOLG) should demonstrate speaking mastery of their language of study.
Indicator	Oral Proficiency Panel DRAFT  
	All graduating majors will demonstrate practical language speaking skills through examination: a 15-minute oral capstone to a faculty panel and an oral proficiency interview with one faculty member.
Criterion	Oral Proficiency Passage Rates DRAFT  
	Capstone presentations and Oral Proficiency Interviews will be judged intermediate high or better according to rubric standards of the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).
Finding	Oral Proficiency Passage Rates DRAFT  
	Nine of the eleven graduating majors who gave a capstone presentation in the fall semester 2013 and 13 of the 13 graduating majors who gave a capstone presentation in spring 2014 achieved the advanced low level or better. FOLG instituted a three-level ACTFL/NCATE evaluation with a simplified rubric beginning with spring 2014, though the eight-level ACTFL standards/rubric was used for fall 2013.
Action	Graduating Senior Capstone Presentations DRAFT  
	The Spanish faculty will meet before the capstone presentations to discuss capstone topic proposals by graduating majors and faculty mentors' preparation with graduating majors in order that said majors score consistently at intermediate high or above.
Objective (L)	Practical Language Writing Skills DRAFT 
	Graduates from the Department of Foreign Languages should demonstrate writing mastery of their language of study.
Indicator	Senior Student Writing Portfolios DRAFT  
	All graduating seniors will present portfolios of specified written work (SPAN 3361 final exam/project, two research papers or other assignments) to be judged by a panel of faculty according to the Ten-level American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) rubric.
Criterion	Senior Student Writing Portfolios Expected Passage Rate DRAFT 
	90% of the submitted portfolios will contain the required elements and be judged adequate for writing skills according to ACTFL standards.
Finding	Portfolio Submission And Application DRAFT  

Eleven of eleven graduating majors in fall 2013 and 13 of 13 graduating majors in spring 2014 submitted portfolios but none included the required final exam from SPAN 3361 Grammar & Composition. The Spanish section has not formally evaluated these portfolios as yet.

Action

Evaluation Of Portfolios DRAFT 

A three-person Spanish faculty committee will meet to 1. adapt the ACTFL rubric for written work for an evaluation score sheet and 2. to evaluate portfolios (unacceptable, adequate or exceeds requirements) within a semester after submission each semester. The next step will be recommendations for curricular reform as a result.

As the vast majority of students and/or faculty do not retain 3361 exams beyond the minimum legal time for whatever reason and thus, students are unable to include those required exams in their final portfolios, FOLG will require those teaching 3361 Grammar & Composition to submit all final exams each semester and they will be scanned into files for future use in portfolios, especially for the use of those majors who either declare late, so they have not saved these and/or have not requested copies from professors at the time (and who later discard them).

Goal

Language Teacher Preparation DRAFT 

The Department of Foreign Languages routinely graduates students intent upon teaching language in the public schools. Graduates will have the language and classroom skills to excel in this profession.

Objective (L)

Teaching Capabilities DRAFT 

Students intending to teach foreign language in the public schools will demonstrate not only language mastery but specific preparation for the teaching task.

Indicator

Methodology Course DRAFT  

The Department of Foreign Languages will assess a sample of written work from students in CISE 4364 (Methods of Teaching in Secondary Schools) via a sample submitted in the required SPAN 4370 Teaching Methodology course.

Criterion

Rating Teaching Candidates DRAFT  

Students' submitted sampled material will be rated adequate or better by the Methodology course instructor, according to the NCATE rubric.

Finding

Teaching Candidate Evaluations DRAFT  

Four teaching candidates in the fall and two in the spring took the teaching methodology course and were evaluated as adequate by the faculty member during their practicum. All six presented Department capstones, did Department Oral Proficiency Tests with a faculty member and submitted portfolios of written work, as well as taking the official American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages' Oral Proficiency Test by phone through arrangements with University Testing service and met the minimum standards or better.

Action

American Council Of Teachers Of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Test DRAFT 

A three-person teaching committee will prepare an evaluative report and

make recommendations on the teaching candidates' additional requirements for graduation: 1. take the teaching methodology course, 2. be evaluated by at least one faculty member during their practicum, 3. take the official American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages' Oral Proficiency Test by phone through arrangements with University Testing service and both the 4. practice exams and 5. the state exams for certification (like all graduating majors, the teaching candidates present Department capstones, do a Department Oral Proficiency Test with a faculty member and submit portfolios of written work). The teaching committee faculty will also explore ways to train other faculty to consistently apply rubrics, given different evaluators.

Objective (L)

Oral Teaching Proficiency DRAFT 

Students intending to teach foreign language in the public schools will demonstrate appropriate spoken language proficiency through specific tasks during the final semester before graduation.

Indicator

Teacher Candidate Oral Proficiency DRAFT  

All students graduating with the intent of teaching language in the public schools will complete a 15-minute capstone presentation before at least three faculty members, an oral proficiency interview (OPI) with an FOLG professor and an ACTFL OPI by phone.

Criterion

Pass Rate By Faculty Panel DRAFT 

90% of students' capstone presentations and both Oral Proficiency Interviews will be judged intermediate high or better by a faculty panel of at least three, according to rubric standards of the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), by an FOLG OPI evaluator and by an ACTFL OPI evaluator, according to the ACTFL OPI rubrics.

Finding

Pass Rate DRAFT 

Six of six teaching candidates were judged intermediate high or better according to the fall ACTFL rubric and according to the three-level evaluation with a simplified rubric as of spring.

Action

Future Use Of Rubric DRAFT  

The Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Committee will evaluate the classroom preparation tasks in language acquisition courses, especially 1411, 1412, 2311, 2312, 3368-9 (conversation) for concordance with the ACTFL NCATE rubric in order to better prepare majors to demonstrate oral proficiency on the related final semester evaluative tasks.

Objective (L)

Written Teaching Proficiency DRAFT 

Students intending to teach foreign language in the public schools should demonstrate appropriate written language proficiency.

Indicator

Texas State Examination Of Written Language Proficiency DRAFT 

All students preparing to teach language in public schools in the State of Texas must take a state examination.

Criterion

Pass Rate DRAFT 

At least 50% of graduating majors who are candidates for teaching will achieve the minimal passing rate or better on the first attempt at the state exam.

Finding

Minimal Passing Rate DRAFT  

Seven of ten students who attempted the LOTE (state exam) during

2013-14 passed: four of the seven passing achieved the minimal passing rate or better on the first attempt. One of the seven passed on the second attempt and another of the seven passed on the 7th attempt. Two did not pass on the first attempt and one did not pass on the 5th attempt. These three non-passing students have not yet made another attempt. Therefore, the 40% pass rate on the first attempt did not meet the criterion of 50%.

Action

Preparation For The Exam And Grading Rubrics DRAFT 

The Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Committee will meet with the College of Education in order to explore ways to evaluate and remediate candidates BEFORE they take the state exam for the first time. FOLG will formulate an across-the-board rubric evaluation of teaching candidates' skills in the practice exam, as well as formulate recommendations for a cycle of graders of the practice exam with follow-up review/remediation for students as necessary.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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.

FOLG instituted electronic submission of portfolios and, as of summer 2014, now requires that faculty teaching the SPAN 3361 Grammar & Composition Course submit all the final exams for that course, which we will file so, that all portfolios contain the required grammar and composition element.

The Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Committee will evaluate portfolios within one academic year of submission to in order to make recommendations about curricular reform to prepare our graduating majors to achieve oral and written proficiency at the ACTFL intermediate high or better level.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

The student learning experience will be most impacted by 1. establishing an Undergraduate Teaching Faculty committee of at least three Spanish faculty members in applied linguistics with professional preparation and scholarly interests in teaching, 2. who will set at least two by-semester meetings at the beginning and end of the semester to address problems with graduating majors' required tasks, how to conduct them, use them for best results, etc. The charge to the committee is to make specific content recommendations about training sessions for faculty to evaluate ALL graduating majors' tasks by applying rubrics more evenly across the board; 2. actually evaluate the past semester's graduating seniors' portfolios in order to make recommendations about curricular reform; 3. consult with the College of Education and make recommendations about how to more effectively prepare/remediate especially those teaching candidates whose preparation is weak in order that they perform more adequately on the state exams in fewer attempts. A large component of this initiative will address how to handle the practice exam for the state exams, including review efforts and grading practices (a rubric and application of same).

Anticipated results of these actions include more consistent evaluations for oral proficiency on the capstones and of identifying curricular change needed for writing proficiency for all majors. Better preparation methods for teaching candidates for the state exam for teaching and higher pass rate in fewer attempts are goals.

[Jump to Top](#)

Department of History



Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

History BA/BS

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal **BA Graduate Preparation DRAFT** 

History BA graduates often seek to teach. In addition, all History BA graduates should possess certain analytical skills best evinced by the historical research process. As appropriate, the department will monitor student preparation for teaching certification and, in general, student mastery of history-thinking skills.

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

In Texas, would-be public school history teachers must pass a state examination.

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 **TExES Examination 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 **TExES Examination DRAFT** 

53% (20 of 38) of History students passed the TExES examination with an Overall Scaled Score of 70%-plus. In terms of Domain scores, 38% were at 70% or above.

Action **Revamping TExES Preparation DRAFT** 

Our scores this past year were well below target. Perhaps this occurred because the exam was significantly modified. In one instance, the exam was changed such that students could take either the 7-12 or 8-12 exam, the former with an additional domain (in Texas history). In another instance, the emphasis in each domain and the relative weights of each were changed. There is now more world history and less coverage of non-political, "top-down" history.

We are addressing this in two ways. First, we changed the requirements for the undergraduate BA such that beginning with the Fall 2014 catalog, our major will mirror the exam. There is new weight in the major requirements on world and premodern history, and the American history section will no longer compel students to take the sequence of political history courses (these courses having first been required years ago on account of the TExES emphasis then). These changes, we are confident, will in no way prejudice History students who will not be pursuing education as a career.

This catalog will mainly be in force for next year's freshmen and beyond, but we expect to see some reflection in improved TExES scores next year.

Next, we will be rewriting our practice exam for the TExES in view of the changes the actual test has undergone. The current practice test was composed years ago and took into account now obsolete emphases. This will be an initiative of our Undergraduate Committee in 2014-15.

Objective (L) **History Research And Thinking Skills DRAFT** 

History students best demonstrate specific history thinking and research skills through the writing of finished history research projects.







Indicator	<p>Senior Level Student Learning Outcome Assessments DRAFT </p> <p>During the course of the semester, students enrolled in 4000-level (senior level) courses will demonstrate mastery of historical scholarship and writing skills, as determined by a panel of history faculty.</p>
Criterion	<p>Research Paper Outcomes DRAFT </p> <p>The department developed a research-paper assessment rubric for use with a panel of faculty and a large sample of the 4000-level research papers. The rubric specified four areas of student attainment in a research paper: Thesis; Evidence; Documentation; and Organization. In 2013-14, the department made a priority of enhancing the first of these two criteria in the research classes.</p>
Finding	<p>4000-level Assessments DRAFT </p> <p>A panel of two senior faculty reviewed 17 papers against the attached rubric. Up to 5 points each were given for thesis, evidence, documentation, and organization. The 17 papers (about a fifth of total) gained scores between 10 and 20. The mean score was 16.26 and the median between 16 and 17. Scores were marginally higher for Thesis and Evidence than for Documentation and Organization.</p> <p>A sample assessment document is attached.</p>
Action	<p>History Research Skills DRAFT </p> <p>This first year of offering the new capstone HIST 4399 will provide data that we shall analyze against the historical experience of the 4000-levels prior to this year.</p>

Goal	<p>Skills In And Knowledge Of History DRAFT </p> <p>B.A. History graduates will be prepared for successful careers and productive citizenship by gaining ample knowledge and skills in departmental courses.</p>
-------------	---

Objective (L)	<p>Learning Outcomes: Tests DRAFT </p> <p>Students will acquire relevant historical knowledge and the ability to put it to use.</p>
----------------------	--

Indicator	<p>Pre-Post Testing In History Core Curriculum DRAFT </p> <p>Students enrolled in lower-level US history courses, by far the largest enrollments in the department's curriculum, will demonstrate an enhancement in historical knowledge over the course of the term. The department, consulting Texas norms, has devised pre-and post-tests based for this purpose.</p>
------------------	---

Criterion	<p>Pre-Post Tests DRAFT </p> <p>The department devised a new instrument (attached) of 25 questions, based on the norms the state of Texas has expressed for the introductory history courses mandated for every public university student. The department expects measurable improvement in the post-test results versus the pre-test, of at least 10%.</p>
------------------	--

Finding	<p>Pre-post Test Outcomes DRAFT </p> <p>In six sections representing about 1000 students total (a fifth of all lower-level enrollments), the pre-post test results were higher in the post in five cases than the pre. The score in these six sections, pre-post, were as follows: 35%/65%; 58%/60%; 42/48%; 55%/52% 55%/59%; and 54%/58%. In aggregate, the average on the pre was 50.0% and the post 55.8%, an increase of just over 10%.</p>
Action	<p>Skills And Knowledge Of HIstory DRAFT </p> <p>The Undergraduate Affairs committee will begin a process of rewriting and renorming the pre- and post- tests.</p>
Objective (L)	<p>Learning Outcomes DRAFT </p> <p>To expose students, especially during their lower level classes, to various methods of teaching and intellectual stimuli all promoting key historical thinking skills.</p> <p>Students will have multiple pedagogical experiences designed to ascertain which forms produce best results.</p>
Indicator	<p>Self- And Instructor Evaluations In History Core Curriculum DRAFT </p> <p>Students will have multiple pedagogical experiences designed to ascertain which forms produce best results.</p> <p>In the Fall of 2013, two sections of HIST 1301 were employed in an experiment. Using one section as a control, a comparison was made to an identically populated related section. (This was repeated in Spring 2014 using HIST 1302.) The following methods were used in the test section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction of lecture in favor of interactive student research activity. 2. Frequent promotion of small-group and team co-operative learning. 3. Use of Jeopardy-style gaming to promote information rehearsal. <p>Changes in assessments were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shift from memorization performance to researched essay responses. 2. Increased emphasis in grading expectations on appropriate use of critical thinking and analysis skills in addition to content recitation. 3. Provision of a consistent critical thinking and writing analysis rubric in preparation for all exams. <p>The traditionally taught course consisted of lecture and power point delivery assessed through short-answer and multiple-choice testing as is commonly practiced in freshman sections.</p> <p>Success would be indicated by enhanced assessment performance from students in experimental sections.</p>
Criterion	<p>Modulation In Instruction Comparison DRAFT </p> <p>Testing outcomes will be compared. Success would be indicated by enhanced assessment performance from students in experimental sections. Because this is a new program objective, the specific amount of desired demonstrable performance is difficult to estimate.</p>
Finding	<p>Evaluations In History Courses DRAFT </p> <p>For the Fall 2013 HIST 1301 sections, the IQR differences were:</p> <p>Exam 1: +16%</p> <p>Exam 2: +12%</p> <p>Exam 3: +3%</p>

For the Spring 2014 HIST 1302 sections, the IQR differences were:

Exam 1: +26%

Exam 2: +21%

Exam 3: +12%

The average of all the differences was +15%

Action

Learning Outcomes **DRAFT** 

We shall run a similar study the fall term and seek to broaden its use in the spring.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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.

1. We underwent a review of undergraduate program requirements. The Undergraduate Affairs Committee proposed a plan for new degree requirements holding that every student should have coursework in American, pre-modern, world, and European history. The department as a whole discussed the proposal and after slight modification it was implemented for the fall 2014 catalog.
2. The capstone course of 4399 gained its full approval and future instructors have begun planning the course, scheduled now for the first time in 2014-15.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

The first challenge is to monitor the new degree plan and how it alters the culture and performance of the undergraduate major. This will be undertaken by the Undergraduate Affairs committee.

Also, we must monitor the quality of undergraduate teaching by the best instruments we can find, paying particular attention to the experience of our several EWCAT sections this year.

[Jump to Top](#)



Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

History MA

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	<p>Advanced Knowledge And Skills In History DRAFT 🔑</p> <p>Successful study of history increases knowledge of human affairs but also skills in written/oral communication, logic, and critical thinking. Such outcomes improve students' performance in their present employment, continued advanced studies toward other degrees, or moves into other historical fields, such as teaching, public history, or writing.</p>
Objective (L)	<p>Research And Analysis DRAFT 🔑</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.</p>
Indicator	<p>Comprehensive Exams DRAFT 🔑 🔑</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 written oral examinations.</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>In 2013-14, the department developed a common assessment document for each examining professor in the comprehensives. This document is attached.</p>
Criterion	<p>Written And Oral Examinations DRAFT 🔑</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>
Finding	<p>Written And Oral Examinations DRAFT 🔑</p> <p>19 masters candidates took comprehensive exams, written and oral, and 18 passed.</p> <p>12 of these students were predominantly online students, 7 predominantly face-to-face. In all, 37 components of the comprehensive exam were completed. 11 of the 12 online students took and passed both the writtens and the orals, the 7 face-to-face passed both. One online student who failed the writtens and has just taken the second-chance exam, with one failing grade on that exam as well.</p> <p>The graduate director and the chair spoke with the faculty who taught this case of a double-comps-failure from our predominantly online cohort, and all are in agreement that termination is appropriate.</p> <p>We are aware that our master's program is one of the few that</p>

requires written and oral comprehensive exams for every non-thesis MA. We believe that these exams not only embed the experience and knowledge gained in the program of study in each student's mind, but provide an additional credential certifying the quality of each graduate and the program in general.

Finding

Example Of Written Comp DRAFT  

The attached are examples of oral and written exam questions, student responses, and faculty assessments in the case of a 2014 graduate.

Action

Developing Advanced Knowledge And Skills In History DRAFT 

As the program has grown, potential reforms of the comprehensive exams have become apparent. During the year, the department shall regularize the scheduling of comps such that students must apply for them at one of three times a year, for a date in the forthcoming term. In this way, we hope to appportion faculty most effectively across all the exams and provide the student the soundest basis for preparation.

We also plan to review the efficacy of having the oral exam at the end of the student's degree plan. We shall consider moving it to the 15th-hour mark, so as to assess the student's progress before a panel of history faculty and make recommendations for the best plan of completion of the degree.

We are also introducing forums that can aid in community-building on the online portion of the program, beginning with a historical film and discussion forum held on go-to-meeting once a month.

Goal

Gaining Skills In The Digital Himanities DRAFT 

Modern-day historians must be prepared to work and publish in the digital environment.

Objective (L)

Teaching Skills DRAFT 

M. A. students indicating career interests in teaching and other positions emphasizing digital content will demonstrate enhanced abilities in this area.

Indicator

Teaching Skills Preparation DRAFT 

Creation of a successfully faculty-reviewed historical website made available for the internet public will demonstrate successful digital historical skills.

Criterion

In-Class Teaching Workshops DRAFT 

History faculty will run seminar classes whose purpose is to populate a major historical website and smartphone app with appropriate graduate-level historical literature and resources. The MA students will prepare and deliver content for the site and app in concert with the other course requirements. The instructor will assess these products by means of an assessment document and either judge them acceptable or lead the student through a remediation/editorial process.

100% student success will achieve this indicator.

Finding

Site And App Product DRAFT  

Students provided content for easttexashistory.org, a website, with an attendant smartphone app. Students developed 17 major content areas for this site in 2013-14. Examples of the work may be

found at the site, especially under "Stories," and examples of the instructor's assessments are attached.

All students participating in the 2014 digital history seminar successfully completed the preparation of digitally published materials.


Action

Gaining Skills In Digital Humanities DRAFT 

The East Texas History app should grow in size and extent and become a regional if not national model. We also are considering launching another historical app for a different region of the country.

Spring term, we shall for the first time offer two methods seminars (HIST 6394), one of them a seminar in collating, archiving, hosting, and making collection-level descriptions of a major trove of unique of primary source documents that were bequested to the department. (These documents concern the history of economic policy.) Thus we expect our students to acquire not only research skills, but those associated with supplying historically usable sources on the web.

Goal

Enhancing Student Experience DRAFT 

M.A. students will regard the graduate program in History as stimulating, rewarding, and useful.

Objective (P)

Student Satisfaction And Usefulness Of The Degree DRAFT 

M.A. students will be satisfied with their program and have confidence in the usefulness of their degree.

**KPI
Performance
Indicator**

End-of-program Student Views DRAFT 

M.A. students will demonstrate satisfaction in the program and the usefulness of the degree as they exit the program, as determined by an interview scaled to a common form developed by the department.

Result

Assessment Outcomes DRAFT  

We have interviewed with our instrument the cohort of students graduating in the summer of 2014. In the previous fall and spring, graduating M.A.'s were interviewed without the instrument. The finding is that students are generally pleased with their experience and confident about their prospects with the degree.

One way, a major one, in which predominantly online students differ is that they expressed an interest in there being more of a sense of community in their experience of the graduate program.

Samples of the completed innstrument are attached.

Action

Enhancing Student Experience DRAFT 

We shall have several rounds' worth of exit interviews and shall take steps toward refinements according to these interviews' good suggestions. One action will be hosting a virtual monthly historical and documentary film night.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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

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 following steps were taken in 20113-14 to address action items in the program review:

1. Three new tenure-track line hires.
2. Regular meetings between the departmental graduate director and the university graduate studies office
3. The formulation of a needs committee, whose recommendations guided the three successful tenure-track searches.
4. The formalization of graduate-student exit interviews.
5. The compensation of the graduate director with a stipend.
6. The extended use of embedded librarians in courses
7. Mentorship of new graduate faculty.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

We shall:

1. Review the processes of the comprehensive exam, assessing the efficacy of the exams and their timing within the program
2. Assemble and analyze data from our exam forms and exit interviews
3. Implement an enrollment management plan
4. Take efforts to improve the sense of community in the online cohort

[Jump to Top](#)

**Department of Political
Science**




Online Assessment Tracking Database


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Political Science BA/BS



[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal **Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics** 


Build students' knowledge of government and politics, citizenship skills, and civic engagement

Objective (L) **Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics** 



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

Indicator **Grading Rubric For Upper Division Courses**  


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 attached rubric. The papers will be scored on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest.

Criterion **Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics** 


We expect that at least 75% of the essays will score a 3 or above. This will represent an increase of over 5% from the previous year.

Finding **Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics**
DRAFT  

Using a scoring system of 1-5 to evaluate 5 random papers in the department's upper division courses for the AY 2013-2014, faculty members evaluated 55 papers submitted by the students. Faculty scores differed in 18 of the papers (~33%). It should be noted that the differences in scores only exceed one point in all but one of the cases. The average score was 3.95, which is a decrease over the previous two years (4.25 and 4.09 respectively). We did, however, exceed our goal of 70% scoring a 3 or better (85%).

Action **Develop Students' Knowledge Of Government And Politics** 

The department will continue using the current procedures for evaluating students' knowledge of government and politics. However, plans for addressing weaknesses in students' knowledge and skills have not been implemented or administratively enforced in the past. There are several reasons for this failure: not all faculty were involved in discussions about what actions could be taken to improve students' knowledge and skills, actions designed to improve students' knowledge and skills were vague, and not enough attention was given to using campus resources for how best to improve students' skills, specifically writing skills.

Goal **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.

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. Faculty members will evaluate the papers using the attached rubric. The papers will be scored on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest.

Criterion

Acceptable Or Above 

At least 75% of students will score a "3" (acceptable) or better. This represents an increase of 5% over the previous year's expectation.

Finding

Develop Student Skills DRAFT  

The faculty that routinely teach POLS 3379 used a scoring scale (see attached rubric) of 1-5 to evaluate 5 randomly selected papers from the POLS 3379 courses for the AY 2013-2014. In the sample of 20 papers, faculty scored the essays differently in 10 (50%) cases, however, the difference in scores only exceeded one point in a single case.

The average scored was 3.925 which was an improvement from AY 2012-2013 (3.43) as well as AY 2011-2012 (3.8). The results also indicate that 80% of the sample exceeded a 3 or better eclipsing our goal of 75%.

Action

Develop Students' Skills 

The department will continue using the current procedures for evaluating students' knowledge of government and politics. However, plans for addressing weaknesses in students' knowledge and skills have not been implemented or administratively enforced in the past. There are several reasons for this failure: not all faculty were involved in discussions about what actions could be taken to improve students' knowledge and skills, actions designed to improve students' knowledge and skills were vague, and not enough attention was given to using campus resources for how best to improve students' skills, specifically writing skills.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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).

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 F13 an interim chair was appointed to the department and a new chair was appointed in F14. The transition in the chair of the department disrupted the work flow and prevented the following elements from being implemented: separating research skills and writing skills development in POLS 3379, separating substantive content and writing skills development in upper division courses, and developing different evaluation rubrics for subfields.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

Goal 1: Develop Concrete Plans for Improving Students' Knowledge and Skills: The current method is useful for evaluating students' knowledge and skills. However, the method has failed to result in concrete actions designed to address weaknesses in students' knowledge and skills. In AY 2014 - 2015 the following actions will be taken to resolve the problem:

1. All faculty have consistently agreed that students' writing and data analysis skills need improvement. POLS 3379 Research and Writing is a required course that addresses writing and data analysis skills. However, students tend to take the course during their last semester in the program. The department will begin taking steps to require that all majors take POLS 3379 as one of their first upper division courses.
2. Officials from the Professional and Academic Center for Excellence (PACE) will be asked to give a presentation to faculty addressing best practices for improving students' writing skills.
3. Faculty will be encouraged to make better use of SHSU resources, such as the Writing Center.

Goal 2: Students Knowledge of Civic Engagement and Social Responsibility: One goal of the department's five year strategic plan is to create a climate that encourages civic engagement. In F14 faculty teaching American Government and Texas Government courses as well as all ACE courses will be asked to develop an agreed upon definition of civic engagement, introduce learning material into their courses related to civic engagement, and develop and implement a tool for measuring students' knowledge of civic engagement.

[Jump to Top](#)










Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Political Science MA

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	<p>Written Comprehensive Exams </p> <p>Students will gain knowledge and skills that are associated with advanced degrees in political science.</p>
Objective (L)	<p>Written Comprehensive Exams </p> <p>Upon completion of the MA in Political Science program, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain the key features of methodology. 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.
Indicator	<p>Successful Completion Of Written Comprehensive Exams  </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>
Criterion	<p>Written Comprehensive Exams </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>
Finding	<p>Written Comprehensive Results </p> <p>Three students completed their comprehensive exams. All three students passed on their first attempt. Two students received high passes and one student received a pass. Thus, we exceeded our expectations.</p>
Action	<p>Written Comprehensive Exams </p> <p>As noted in the department level section of the report, the director duties for the MA in political science and the MA in public administration will be divided between two individuals rather than one individual. In fall 2014 and spring 2015 the new director will, in consultation with MA faculty, begin discussions about how to improve the written comprehensive exam process (i.e., how to better prepare students for exams).</p>

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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

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.

Two contextual challenges prevented the department from implementing all elements of the previous cycle's improvement plan. First, an interim chair was appointed in F13 and a permanent chair was appointed in F14. The changes in chairs disrupted the workflow. Second, one person was assigned the duty of directing both the Masters in Political Science program and the Masters in Public Administration. That person was also serving as interim chair in F13. The workload proved too much for a single individual.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

In fall of 2014 a new chair was appointed and the department adopted a five year strategic plan. As a result of these changes, the department's plan for continuous improvement has changed.

Goal 1: Expand Assessment of Student Learning and Department Performance:

(1) Develop and administer entrance and exit surveys that are designed to provide information about student learning and economic impact of the degree programs. Possible survey questions might include: 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.?

Goal 2: Improve the Comprehensive Exam Process:

(1) Revise the comprehensive exam process so as to offer graduate students more preparation for the exams. The MA director, in consultation with faculty from the disciplines subfields, will develop a database of exam questions and set an agreed upon schedule for when students begin preparing for exam and when exams are administered.

Goal 3: Improve Graduate Student Writing Skills and Implement an Early Warning System for Students Who are at Risk

(1) At the beginning of each semester the MA director will send all graduate faculty the names of students new to the program. Faculty will be asked to alert the director to any new student whose first written assignment indicates weak writing skills. Students with weak writing skills will be referred to the Writing Center.

(

[Jump to Top](#)

**Department of Psychology
and Philosophy**










Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

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 	
	<p>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.</p>	
Finding	Effective Teaching DRAFT 	
	<p>There were ten sections of Introductory Psychology taught by five doctoral students and one section each of Human Sexuality and Learning taught by one doctoral student during the 2013-2014 academic year. With respect to IDEA forms, on the 5-point scale for the total summary score, the range for the TAs was 3.8-4.6 with a mean of 4.25 for the fall semester and 3.6-4.8 with a mean of 4.13 for the spring semester. In looking at the t-scores for Summary IDEA scores compared with the discipline, teaching ability for the fall semester ranged from 42-57 with a mean of 51.33 and for the spring a range of 33-61 with a mean of 48.83. To an extent, the low means were due to one individual TA. It is unfortunate but she did not do well with respect to her teaching. If we eliminate her score for the fall, the mean goes from 51.33 to 53.2 and for the spring, from 48.83 to 52.00.</p>	
Action	Effective Teaching DRAFT 	
	<p>We are happy with the job that was done by the doctoral TAs this past academic year. With a new group of TAs starting in the fall 2014 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.</p>	
	The faculty member in charge of the TAs will attempt to spend more time with	

them to try and ferret out any problems and issues before they arise.

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, 100% 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. 78% 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 research 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, 31 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, 3 students successfully completed a MAP. For the DCE, 100% (2/2) passed the Research portion and 50% (1/2) passed the clinical portion.
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 (most recent data available).

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

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 2013 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.

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 2013 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.

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.

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 two additional items and requested a specific response by September 1, 2013. Response was submitted addressing these items.

Action**APA Accreditation Actions** 🔑

In 2014, APA submitted a request for two areas which need a narrative response by September 1, 2014. In addition, the usual annual report will be submitted by that time.

Specific items for response:

- 1) The program is asked to clarify how it adequately engages in program self-study and makes necessary programmatic changes based on the data provided, and which specific section(s) of the comprehensive exam are relevant to measuring student competency.
- 2) Provide additional distal data that demonstrate the program's achievement of its goals and objectives, consistent with Domain F.1(a) of the *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation* and Implementing Regulation (IR) C-32.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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%.

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.

1. We revised our annual survey of graduates to include ratings of how well their doctoral training prepared them for conducting psychological assessments providing psychological treatment, conducting forensic assessment, conducting research, evaluating and using research to inform their work, providing clinical supervision Consulting with colleagues/agencies, working in a multicultural environment, and engaging in legal risk management.
2. Our annual survey was modified to increase student input regarding areas of improvement. Our survey asked them to identify strengths and weaknesses of our masters-level courses, doctoral-level courses, research opportunities and mentorship, clinical training and supervision, program administration, and the training program environment. We have added separate items asking for specific suggestions or recommendations related to masters and doctoral course, research mentorship, and clinical training.
3. Two faculty members have secured grants in the past year. Dr. Schmidt received a grant for \$19,250.00 from the Hogg Foundation (funded one doctoral student) and Dr. Cramer received a grant for \$6,566.00 from the Griffith School of Criminology and Criminal Justice Visiting Scholars Program.
4. This year we reduced our offers of admission from nine to seven, which should enhance research and training opportunities, and will reduce class sizes.
5. Unfortunately, the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) has not updated their data regarding Examination of Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) pass rates since 2012. Our program was at 100% at that time. Our annual survey of graduates revealed 100% of respondents (N = 29) who had taken the EPPP had passed the exam.
6. Our APA-accredited internship match rate for 2014 was 100%
7. Of our graduates who have pursued postdoctoral fellowships, 73% have trained at sites that have a heavy forensic emphasis. Also, 85% of our graduates are employed in settings with a heavy forensic emphasis.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

1. We will continue to seek additional grant funding to enhance our financial position.
2. We will strive to maintain a match rate of 100% for predoctoral internships at APA-accredited sites.
3. Strive to maintain our pass rate of 100% for the Examination of Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP; licensing examination).
4. We strive to maintain a rate of at least 70% with respect to graduates pursuing postdoctoral training and employment in settings with a strong forensic emphasis.

[Jump to Top](#)











Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014

Philosophy BA

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	Improving Critical Thinking And Analytic Reasoning 1  Students completing the critical thinking and logic courses in our curriculum will develop a broad-based skills in critical thinking and formal logic.
Objective (L)	Demonstrate Critical Thinking Skills  Critical thinking skills are an essential component of philosophical work. Students will be able to analyze arguments and draw conclusions from available information.
Indicator	Response Scores On TACTS   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.
Criterion	Statistically Significant Improvement From The TACTS Pre-test To The TACTS 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. The philosophy program expects to see a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test.
Finding	Statistically Significant Improvement From Pre-Test To Post-Test   A paired two-sample t-test on our sample of 540 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.
Criterion	Improvement In Calculating Probabilities  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, 97 out of 536 (18.1%) correctly answered the question. On the post-test, 228 out of 536 (42.5%) correctly answered the question.

This represents a 134.8% 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 127.0% improvement seen in 2012-2013 and 126.2% improvement seen in 2011-2012. Recent 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 At Calculating Probabilites 

Although our data showed a significant improvement at calculating probabilities, it is expected that our faculty can improve on our performance. All Philosophy Program faculty who taught PHIL 2303 during 2013-2014 will be invited to share their experiences with those who will teach PHIL 2303 during 2014-2015. 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 2014-2015. Finally, the Program has plans to include expectations for teaching Core Curriculum classes in all hiring decisions during 2014-2015.

Goal

Understanding Of General Philosophical Concepts 1 

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 PHL 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.

Finding	<p>Statistically Significant Improvement From The Pre-test To The Post-test (2306)  </p> <p>PHIL 2306 students demonstrated a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test (M=10.2) to the post-test (15.2). While statistically significant, the post-test mean is only 61.0% of 25 items. These results are consistent with the results from 2011-2013. 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>
Finding	<p>Statistically Significant Improvement From The Pre-test To The Post-test (2361)  </p> <p>PHIL 2361 students demonstrated a statistically significant improvement from the pre-test (M=6.4) to the post-test (10.4). While statistically significant, the post-test mean is only 61.0% of 25 items. These results are consistent with the results from 2011-2013. 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>
Indicator	<p>Improved Student Knowledge Of Kant </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>
Criterion	<p>Improvement At Identifying Major Themes Of Kantian Philosophy </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>
Finding	<p>Improvement In Students' Knowledge Of Kantian Philosophy </p> <p>20.4% of students chose the correct answer for question 10 on the pre-test. This improved to 46.9% on the post-test. This represented an 129.9% improvement. Likewise, 24.3% of students chose the correct answer for question 12 on the pre-test. This improved to 48.2% on the post-test. This represented an 98.4% 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>
Indicator	<p>Improved Student Knowledge Of The Death Penalty Debate </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>
Criterion	<p>Improvement At Identifying Arguments Related To The Death Penalty </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 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>

Finding	<p>Improvement In Students' Recognition Of Arguments Relating To The Death Penalty</p> <p>19.2% of students chose the correct answer for question 19 on the pre-test. This improved to 42.6% on the post-test. This represented an 121.9% improvement. Likewise, 23.5% of students chose the correct answer for question 20 on the pre-test. This improved to 56.2% on the post-test. This represented an 139.1% 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>
Action	<p>PHIL 2361/2306 Improvement</p> <p>The Program will continue its targeted instructional effort aimed at improving student learning. In PHIL 2306, 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. In addition, the Program will implement a revised pre-test/post-test for PHIL 2306 that addresses faculty and student concerns about the wording of question 19 on the current instrument. Finally, the Program has plans to include expectations for teaching Core Curriculum classes in all hiring decisions during 2014-2015.</p>
Objective (L)	<p>Demonstrate Advanced Understanding Of History Of Philosophy</p> <p>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.</p>
Indicator	<p>Pre-test Post-test Response Scores On Locally-Standardized Instruments (3364/3365)</p> <p>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.</p>
Criterion	<p>PHL 3365 Assessment</p> <p>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.</p>
Finding	<p>Improvement In Student's Knowledge Of Modern Philosophy</p> <p>A paired two-sample t-test on our sample of 14 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.</p>

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

Improvement In Students' Knowledge Of Ancient And Medieval Philosophy

A paired two-sample t-test on our sample of 9 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.

Action

Responding To The 2013-2014 Findings

The Program will continue to assess PHIL 3364/3365 using our current instrument. Given the small sample size of this new data set, it is of limited use; however, we plan to combine it with the data from 2014-2014 in an effort to establish a baseline from which to plan for and measure improvement moving forward. These efforts will be headed by Dr. Fair and Dr. Gurley as long as they continue to teach these courses.

Goal

Revision Of PHIL 3362 And Development Of A New Assessment Tool

In Fall 2013, PHIL 3362 will be taught by two new faculty members who have been asked to revise both the content of the course and the assessment instrument. The Program's goal is to establish a new standard for teaching PHIL 3362.

Objective (P)

Creation Of Revised On-line And In-person PHIL 3362 Courses

The Program plans to implement revised versions of PHIL 3362 in on-line and in-person formats that take advantage of the talents of our new faculty for 2013-2014.

KPI Performance Indicator

Delivery Of On-line And In-person PHIL 3362 Sections

The Program will meet this objective if it is able to offer students revised versions of PHIL 3362 in on-line and in-person formats.

Result

2013-2014 PHIL 3362 Offerings

In both Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, the Program offered PHIL 3362 in both on-line and in-person formats.

KPI Performance Indicator

Development Of A New Assessment Tool For PHIL 3362

Upon completion of their course revisions, Dr. Diaz and Dr. Brommage, who will be teaching PHIL 3362 for the foreseeable future are tasked with development an appropriate assessment technique for PHIL 3362. We will consider these objectives successful when the assessment protocol has been finalized.

Result

Partial Completion Of Assessment Protocol

Dr. Diaz and Dr. Brommage agreed that the best method for assessing PHIL 3362 will be use indicator questions embedded in the final exam of each course to measure student outcomes. The Philosophy Program

agreed with this assessment method. Unfortunately before Dr. Brommage and Dr. Diaz finished identifying the appropriate questions to embed and the expected student success rates for the questions, Dr. Diaz departed for a new position. Dr. Brommage and Dr. Sanford, SACS Coordinator for the Program, agreed that the choice of questions should be delayed until Dr. Diaz's replacement was given a chance to provide input. David Wright, M.A. will succeed Dr. Diaz for 2013-2014. He and Dr. Brommage are expected to make a recommendation on the final assessment protocol to the Program prior to the start of the 2014-2015 academic year.

Action

Implementation Of PHIL 2352 Assessment

The Program will finalize the assessment protocol and successfully implement it in all sections of PHIL 2352, the revised course number for PHIL 3362, starting in Fall 2014.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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.

With the successful revision of PHIL 3364/3365, the Program has made progress on solidifying the core of the philosophy major. In 2014-2105, we will gather data on both overall student performance and performance on individual assessment questions in PHIL 3364/3365 in an effort to identify opportunities to improve our lower-level course support for the upper-level core of our major.

The Program successfully offered in-person and on-line versions of PHIL 3362, and has nearly completed the assessment protocol for these courses. We expect that it will be finalized and available for implementation in all Fall 2014 sections.

The Program did not fully accomplish its goal of revising the PHIL 2306 pre-test/post-test. Owing to multiple disruptions (maternity leave, sick leave, faculty member resignation, etc.) the committee was unable to come together and develop a full revision of the instrument. However, the committee did agree on a revision to the current instrument that addressed the one weakness that was unanimously identified. After consultation between Dr. Botero, the committee Chair, and Dr. Sanford, the Program's SACS Coordinator, it was decided that the Program would move forward during 2014-2015 with the revised instrument and delay the full revision of the assessment protocol until the 2015-2016 academic year. The primary reason for this delay is the the Program expects to hire 2-3 new faculty who will teach in this area, and we would like to insure the that instrument is tailored the teaching interests and expertise of the Program faculty.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

The Program will gather data indicating student performance on individual questions in PHIL 3364/3365 as a

means of identifying areas for improving both those courses and the student preparation provided for those courses by PHIL 2306/2361.

The Program will begin gathering data on student outcomes in PHIL 3362 as a means of continuing our efforts to assess and improve student learning related to logic and critical thinking.

The Program will begin investigating the need for establishing expected learning outcomes for PHIL 2303, 3364, and 3365 that go beyond statistically significant improvement from pre-test to post-test.

[Jump to Top](#)




Online Assessment Tracking Database


Sam Houston State University (SHSU)


2013 - 2014


Psychology MA (School Psychology)


[View & Request Level Feedback](#)


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


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

Indicator	National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II) 
	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%).

Criterion	Minimum Score 
	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.

Finding	National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II) 
	Seven SSP students took the PRAXIS II exam during the past academic year. Total scores ranged from 171 to 185, with an average score of 176. All students had scores directly reported to our Program, which enables an analysis of subcategory performance. All seven students (100%) scored at or above the average performance range for ALL areas assessed, including Data-Based Decision Making, Research-Based Academic Practices, Research-Based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices, Consultation and Collaboration, Applied Psychological Foundations, and Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations.

Action	PRAXIS II 
	All members of the cohort scored at or above the acceptable range on the PRAXIS II exam and on each of the subcategories within the exam. We will continue instructing the next cohort of students in the methods that resulted in their success and continually check on how they are progressing toward that goal. In addition, we have opened a search for a new faculty member in the School Psychology Program and will stress during the interviews the importance of maintaining our current level of success.

Goal	Skill Application 
	Students develop competence in skill application of professional school psychology in a public school setting.

Objective (L)**Skill Application** 

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.

Indicator**Rating Forms And Positive Impact Data** 

Ratings Forms

(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 NASP Standards for the Domains of Competence. These Standards include: II) Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability, III) Consultation and Collaboration, IV) Direct and Indirect Services at the Student Level {includes 4.1: Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills and 4.2: Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills}, V) Direct and Indirect Services at the Systems Level {includes 5.1: School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning and 5.2: Preventive and Responsive Services}, VI) Direct and Indirect Services to support Family-School Collaboration, VII) Foundations of School Psychologists' Service Delivery: Diversity, and VIII) Foundations of School Psychologists' Service Delivery: Research, Program Evaluation, Legal, Ethical and Professional Practice {includes 8.1: Research and Program Evaluation and 8.2: Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice}

(2) Satisfactory ratings from Program Faculty

2(A) Faculty Rating Forms (FRF) for both of two Portfolio case submitted

2(B) Procedural Integrity Rubrics (PIR) for both of two Portfolio cases submitted

Candidates completing the Internship Portfolio assessment will obtain satisfactory ratings from the Program Faculty on each of two cases submitted. These cases include the candidate's choice among: a Behavioral Consultation and Intervention case, an Academic Assessment and Intervention case, and 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.

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 the candidates positive impact on the student(s) will be calculated.

Criterion**Skill Application**  

Skill Application

1A: Candidates are rated by field supervisors according to a five-point scale including the following competency rating categories: Major Area of Concern (Additional, Intensive Supervision Required) {1}, Improvement

Needed (Additional Supervision Required) {2}, Meets Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {3}, Exceeds Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {4}, Professionally Competent (No Supervision Needed) {5}. Because candidates in their final practicum will be under supervision for two more years, they are expected to maintain an overall average rating of "3.0" for all of the NASP Domains evaluated.

1B: Candidates are rated by field supervisors according to a five-point scale including the following competency rating categories: Major Area of Concern (Additional, Intensive Supervision Required) {1}, Improvement Needed (Additional Supervision Required) {2}, Meets Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {3}, Exceeds Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {4}, Professionally Competent (No Supervision Needed) {5}. Because candidates completing their internship year will continue to be under supervision for one more year, they are expected to maintain an overall average rating of "3.0" for all of the NASP Domains evaluated.

2A: Candidates completing their internship experience are required to submit two 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 and Intervention, Counseling, and/or Academic Assessment and 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 both of the cases submitted.

3B: Based on the quantitative data included as part of the Portfolio case submissions, 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 both of the cases submitted.

Finding

Skill Application  

Skill Application

1A: Table 1A: Practicum II Field Supervisor Ratings

There were ten candidates who participated in the final Practicum experience during the Spring 2014 semester. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the "Competent" range. Eight of the ten candidates (80%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 3.0. One candidate's rating document was copied onto PDF missing the even numbered pages, so this candidate's scores will be added once an accurate copy is received. The other candidate did receive below standard ratings in four of ten Standard areas, with two additional areas rated wholly as "Not Observed." Her progress in these areas will be monitored closely during the internship year. The cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0.

1B: Table 1B: Internship Field Supervisor Ratings

There were seven candidates who participated in the Internship experience during the 2013-2014 academic year. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the "Competent" range. The electronically submitted rating for one candidate could not be read for data entry purposes, and the Program Director is in the process of accessing the hard copy record. The remaining six candidates (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 3.0. The cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0.

2A: Data Tables for FRF Portfolio Reviews

Eleven candidates completed their Internship Portfolios this academic year. Two 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 ten candidates (100%) graduating in May 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 of ten candidates currently rated (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating and an overall rating of '3' or higher for the case. The faculty continue to complete these final portfolio reviews, with one candidate remaining to be evaluated prior to graduation in August.

2B: Data Tables for PIR Portfolio Reviews

Each of four Portfolio cases 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 ten candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 24, with nine of the ten candidates

(90%) receiving no scores of '0' on these case ratings. For the Assessment case, all ten candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 39, with no candidates (100%) receiving any scores of '0.' For the Behavioral Consultation case, all eight candidates reviewed (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 21, with no candidates (100%) receiving a score of '0' on these case ratings. Finally, for the Counseling case, all eight candidates reviewed (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 21, with no candidates (100%) receiving a score of '0' on these case ratings.

3A-B: 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. Two cases (i.e., Academic Intervention and Behavioral Consultation) involve intervention with students and include progress monitoring data. A candidate's positive impact on student functioning is evaluated by calculating either an effect size or percentage of nonoverlapping data points. All ten internship candidates (100%) achieved at least a moderate impact (see definition above) on student learning for one case submitted. All candidates either met or exceeded the expectation of a moderate impact for one of the two cases submitted.

Action

Skill Application 🔑

We did not quite achieve the 100% success record on Skill Application for which we had hoped. The program faculty and the chair will meet this coming fall with the external supervisors to welcome them again to the program and to thank them for their past inputs and their past help. During that meeting, we will again stress the needs of the program and the specific needs of the students so that we may get closer to our goal of 100%. We also will more closely monitor the progress of each student while they are at their external sites.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

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.

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 core faculty of the SSP program and the Chair of the Department met with the external supervisors and went through our expectations and issues that they may have experienced with our students. The meeting was a day-long conference and appeared to have had a positive impact with nearly all of our students meeting criterion. Thus, our "Previous Plan for Continuous Improvement" appears to have had positive results. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, the core faculty, the chair, Dean Zink, and Dean Tayebi met to discuss the future of the program and came up with various strategies for increasing diversity and moving portions of the program to the Woodlands Center. Those issues are addressed in the "Plan for Continuous Improvement" below.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

The SSP Program works to continuously improve the services and training provided to students in a number of ways. Listed below are the major agenda items for continuous improvement of the Program over the next 12-month period:

1. Program faculty have been working to revise the Program Assessment System following NASP's adoption of new Standards for Training and Practice. Building upon the work completed last year, this year the faculty will review

and update the Faculty Review Form utilized during Internship Portfolio review for behavioral intervention, academic assessment and intervention and counseling cases;

2. Also related to the Program Assessment System, the faculty will be working this year on the development of a Practice Log document in Excel that will allow students to record their hours of practice in the field during various courses throughout their program of study. This log document will be used by the student during all three years they are enrolled in the Program, and will provide cumulative details of hours spent in a variety of professional roles and experiences;
3. The Program and the Department are dedicating both time and resources to expand recruitment efforts. It is hoped that the expanded quality applicant pool will increase the number of qualified admissions to the Program;
4. The Program continues to work to strengthen relationships with local school districts. It is the licensed professionals in the field who provide extremely valuable practical experiences and supervision to our students. Without these individuals, our Program's quality would decline substantially. A professional development workshop is being planned for this coming January. It is hoped that an event of this type can become an annual occurrence;
5. The Program would like to develop as detailed a database of graduates as possible, dating back to the year of first NASP Program approval. Having contact information of our graduate would support our ongoing contact with them in the form of a semi-annual Program newsletter. This is something we would like to put into place in collaboration with our student organization;
6. The Program would like to develop both an Exit Survey for graduating students as well as a Survey of Program Graduates that would be given randomly to graduates and their employers. These tools would be used to gauge both the impact of the Program based on our graduates as well as trends in the field.

[Jump to Top](#)

Department of Sociology






Online Assessment Tracking Database



Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2013 - 2014


Sociology MA



[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Goal	Sociological Research Competency 	
<p>Graduate students who complete the MA program in Sociology will demonstrate the appropriate array of sociological research skills.</p>		

Objective (L)	Sociological Competency In Research And Analysis 
<p>M.A. Sociology students will demonstrate competence in advancing sociologically informed arguments by producing a research paper that achieves the following: identification of patterns of social behavior; discernment of the three major sociological theoretical paradigms (structural functionalism, conflict, and symbolic interactionism); utilization of one or both of the two major sociological methods (positivism and interpretive).</p>	

Indicator	Professional Paper  
<p>All MA sociology students enrolling prior to spring 2014 were required to write the professional paper.</p> <p>M.A. Sociology students writing the professional paper enrolled in SOCI 6098 Professional Paper Practicum bringing with them a self-chosen candidate paper from a previously taken class. That paper was presented to the director of graduate students for certification of eligibility for use in SOCI 6098.</p> <p>Student papers deemed proficient by graduate director review were then made the official object of student SOCI 6098 participation and forwarded to the SOCI 6098 professor of record for the given semester.</p> <p>At the end of participation in SOCI 6098, students failing to demonstrate the required level of content and writing mastery were to be assigned one of two courses of action: (1) work independently to complete the professional paper; and (2) to re-enroll subsequently in SOCI 6098.</p>	

Criterion	Professional Paper 
<p>All participating MA candidates will demonstrate proficiency as defined by the associated 4-point grading rubrics. Minimum acceptable proficiency is defined by scoring an overall average of 2.0 of all graded rubric items as determined by a committee of SOCI faculty. Committee members will not have been professors of record for SOCI 6098 in the semester under evaluation.</p>	

Finding	Professional Paper  
<p>Over the 2013-2014 academic year, fifteen students enrolled in SOCI 6098 Professional Paper practicum; 13 students (86.7%) completed the Professional Paper.</p> <p>Subsequently, the papers were evaluated double blind by a panel of two SOCI faculty (neither of whom were professors of record for the students). The results of this review were as follows (reference attached data sheets):</p> <p>Sheet 1 shows overall reviewer ratings of the format (F) and quality of research (P) and averages of both reviewers' scores.</p> <p>Sheet 2 shows the same scores but separated into the two paper categories: literature review and research. Three of six review papers failed to meet criteria for quality. Two of the seven research papers failed to meet criteria for quality.</p>	

Sheet 3 shows inter-reviewer reliability scores. Reviewer responses were separated by .14 for format and by .12 for research content. These scores justified a high confidence in reviewer reliability.

Sheet 4 shows scores for two selected indicators each for methods and theory. These scores showed that six of thirteen papers did not meet criteria for methods. Only one of thirteen did not meet criteria for theory.

Sheet 5 shows the same data from Sheet 4 but separated by group: research papers and literature review papers. Four of the seven research papers did not meet the minimum criteria for methods, with an overall average below the 2.0 minimum. Two of the six review papers did not meet the minimum criteria for methods, although the average for this group did exceed the minimum.

For theory, only one of the thirteen papers was deficient and the averages for both groups were well above the 2.0 minimum. The faculty conclude that students are well-versed in sociological theory.

The exercise revealed a focused weakness in research methods, well beyond any other issue presented by the papers.

Action

Sociological Competency 🔑

MA students are required to submit a complete draft of the professional paper the semester before students anticipate graduating. Students failing to comply with this requirement are not allowed to enroll in the Professional Paper Practicum class.

Per the Plan for Continuous Improvement for 2014-2015, the department will respond to these findings by implementing comprehensive exams (excepting thesis students), adding a graduate qualitative methods class (SOC1 5313), and requiring successful undergraduate SOC1 methods and statistics credits as prerequisite for admission.

Goal

Comprehensive Exams DRAFT 🔑

SOCI MA students will sit for comprehensive examination as a powerful tool for demonstrating overall student learning outcomes.

Objective (L)

Comprehensive Exams DRAFT 🔑

MA SOCI students will demonstrate competence in applying sociological theory, sociological research methodologies (postivism and interpretive analysis); and research literature review of a selected, substantive sociological field.

Indicator

Comprehensive Examination 🔑

M.A. Sociology degree candidates will complete a written comprehensive exam.

The specialty area will be assessed by an in-depth exploration of sociological literature on a topic of the students choosing, written answers to questions pertaining to sociological theoretical perspectives and appropriate research methodologies. In each case, an examination committee will be convened to discuss the performance of the students. A panel of at least two graduate faculty per each of the three examination areas will assess the quality of the written examination to determine student sociological mastery. Students failing to demonstrate the required level of content mastery will be allowed, upon the advice of the evaluating committee, to either revise and resubmit the

portion of the exam not satisfactorily completed or retake the entire exam. A second failure will result in termination from the program.

Criterion

Comprehensive Exam 🔑

Possible examination grading outcomes are: fail, conditional pass, pass.

All M.A. candidates taking the comprehensive exam will pass all components of the examination.

Finding

Comprehensive Exam 🔑 🔑

Spring of 2014 was the first offering of comprehensive exams since prior to 2011 (see Finding of Goal 1: Sociological Research Competency).

In spring 2014, eight students took the written comprehensive examinations. One student passed all sections of the exam on the first submission; five students were asked to revise and resubmit various questions; two students did not pass the exam and are in the process of preparing again for the program exit requirement.

Indicator

Thesis Option DRAFT 🔑

Select SOCI MA candidates will be allowed to substitute successful completion of a thesis project for the comprehensive exam process.

Criterion

Thesis Parameters DRAFT 🔑

A successful SOCI MA thesis will be not less than 50 and not more than 100 printed pages of referenced, original SOCI research or a meta-analysis of existing research literature including primary and/or secondary data analysis.

Finding

Thesis Completion DRAFT 🔑

The thesis option was first offered in January of 2014. Through 2013-2014 no students requested this option.

There are no actions for this objective.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

Based upon what we learned in AY2013, the department will finalize the evaluation rubric for SOCI 6098 Professional Paper Practicum. In addition, the Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Issues committee will revamp the assessment tool for incoming graduate students.

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 rubrics were finalized for the SOCI6098 Professional Paper assessment (see attachments under Professional Paper - Finding above). The three rubrics are: Paper Format; Research Paper; and Review Paper. The Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Committee conducted a survey of students enrolled in the SOCI MA Program to identify the level of knowledge regarding sociological theory, sociology research methods, and social statistics. Based on information gathered in the survey, the department decided to require undergraduate research methods and statistics as pre-requisites for admission to the program.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2013 - 2014 Cycle Findings.

Having now run the SOCI MA program in its present form since fall 2011, the SOCI chair, graduate director and graduate committee will begin preparations for a comprehensive program performance review slated for 2016-17. As a start to this process, the SOCI faculty will review student recruitment, entry credentials, and outcomes in relationship to each other.

For the academic year 2014-2015, the department will begin a phase-out of the professional paper project in favor of having all non-thesis students exit the program via comprehensive examination. While it is true that SOCI faculty successfully led students in necessary skill acquisition, after participation for 4 semesters in the professional paper project faculty became concerned that most students would be better served by breadth of knowledge than over-specialization. That minority of students seeking focused research experience will still be able to apply for the thesis track and/or prepare for doctoral SOCI studies.

As reported above, the comprehensive exam process was piloted in spring of 2014. The department will build on that process by creating comps performance rubrics (in each of the three dimensions: theory, methods, and literature review/substantive area) to assist students in preparing for exams. Faculty will also receive feedback from the comps process to assist them in modifying curricular content and pedagogy in further aid to students.

In addition, with the reinstatement of the thesis track option the department will create and implement a thesis rubric specifically designed to detect thematic or recurrent weaknesses in student research capacities. The department will subsequently make continuous amendments to pedagogy and curriculum to address detected weaknesses.

[Jump to Top](#)