The College of Arts and Sciences

Mission Statement

- Offers a liberal arts education as well as professional specializations at the undergraduate and graduate levels through excellence in teaching, research, creative activities, and service.

- Stimulates discovery, informed critical thought, and creative activity in the arts, humanities, mathematics and natural sciences, social sciences, and interdisciplinary efforts.

- Fosters cultural pluralism, respects diverse opinions and worldviews, and promotes values, skills, and knowledge important in regional and global communities.
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I Mission Statement
The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at The University of Toledo is dedicated to understanding and improving social life. More precisely, its mission and learning objectives are as follows.

A. Mission Statement
The Sociology Program seeks to produce, disseminate, and apply knowledge obtained by the systematic and objective study of human society and social interaction. Research and participation with the broader profession produces more informed and insightful teaching and engagement with the community. The department values academic freedom and the production of well informed, critical thinking individuals.

The research mission of the Sociology Program is to further the understanding of social interaction and society through the production of new knowledge and the application of new and existing sociological knowledge to issues that arise in communities. The program encourages its faculty and students to use both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. Sociologists should disseminate their findings using appropriate professional and community outlets.

The teaching mission of the Sociology Program is to introduce students to sociological theories, social research methods, and statistical techniques that are employed in most of the substantive areas of our discipline. Through course offerings and research activities, students will be able to examine social phenomenon and do applied work. The program is committed to enabling students (majors and non-majors alike) to see beyond their limited view of the world to society as a whole – the values and ideas shared by its members, the groups and institutions that compose it, and the forces that changes it--(understanding “The Sociological Imagination”). Undergraduate sociology majors are prepared to enter graduate school or pursue careers in a variety of fields, including professional sociologist, public administration, criminal justice, business, law, education, and public health. Our graduate program prepares graduate students, who do not wish to go beyond the Master degree, to develop careers in several fields. Masters students are prepared to pursue additional graduate work at the PhD level.

Service to the department, college, university, and community are central to the mission of the department and integral to faculty governance. We seek to apply the methods of sociological inquiry to address the problems of the institution and the community. Members of the department are encouraged to take part in service in concert with their professional knowledge and interests.

B. Learning Objectives
For Sociology Undergraduates, the learning objectives are to:

- Provide a strong liberal arts education;
• Provide students with knowledge of sociological theory, research methods, and social statistics;
• Expose students to a variety of sociological specialties;
• Prepare students for entry-level positions in social services, government agencies, and businesses; and
• Prepare students for graduate study in sociology or professional fields, such as law or medicine.

The learning objectives of the graduate sociology major are to:
• Provide students with the ability to apply sociological theories to specific areas of interest;
• Provide students with the methodological and statistical ability to conduct social research;
• Prepare students for positions in social services, government agencies, and businesses; and
• Prepare students for advanced graduate study in sociology at the Ph.D level.

The objectives of the undergraduate anthropology program are to:
• Provide a sound liberal arts education
• Provide our majors with an introduction to the various subfields of anthropology
• Introduce our students to the historical development of the discipline, as well as current theory and methodologies of various specialties
• Provide our majors with critical and analytical and problem-solving skills
• Provide students with fieldwork experience through a study abroad program or internship
• Prepare students for graduate study in anthropology, law, medicine and positions in business and local and national governmental agencies

II Assessment Structure
The assessment will be carried out entirely by those faculty members of the Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology who have been appointed to the Department’s Assessment Committee. Currently, those persons are:

Patricia Case
Barbara Coventry
Dwight Haase
Willie McKether
Angela Siner
Jerry Van Hoy
The Assessment Committee always consists of both Sociologists and Anthropologists. No other special resources or staff support will be needed.

III Assumptions
The primary assumption is that the impact of a Sociology or Anthropology degree is multifaceted; no single assessment measure alone is sufficient to gauge the value of this degree. Ergo, we rely on several indicators related to intellectual growth, development of skills, career attainment and personal satisfaction. Regarding these indicators, we assume they can be measured objectively and accurately, and that they primarily are attributable to the Sociology and Anthropology Department, not other factors. We also assume that some of these measures, such as personal satisfaction, can be accurately self-reported. Finally, we assume that any benefits from a Sociology or Anthropology degree begin to accrue during one’s school years, thus we should be able to observe those benefits longitudinally.

IV Methodology
The assessment data will come from three main sources: (1) competency exams, (2) coursework portfolios, (3) surveys, (4) theses/internships, and (5) alumni tracking.

A. Competency Exams
The competency exams are only for undergraduate students; they take them once in the 2000-level pro-seminar and once in the 4000-level pro-seminar.\(^1\) This means each undergrad student will take the competency exam twice during his/her time with UT, so we can see how their knowledge changes with more coursework. There are separate competency exams for sociology and anthropology majors. Dual majors will take both tests.

B. Portfolios
In addition to competency exams, each student is required to maintain a portfolio of course papers and essays. By his/her graduation, each student’s portfolio will consist of:

- **Grad Students**
  - Early Paper (from first semester in grad school)
  - Theory Paper
  - Methods Paper
  - Statistics Paper
  - Late Paper (from the last semester, or a thesis chapter)

- **Undergrad Students**
  - Entrance Essay
  - Early Paper (from freshman or sophomore year)
  - Late Paper (from senior year)

---

\(^1\) The pro-seminar courses orient students to their discipline and help them begin planning their careers.
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Resume

The purpose of an early paper and a late paper is to see how writing and analytical skills and knowledge have changed over time. The undergraduate papers help to assess the quality of the students’ liberal arts education; the graduate papers help to monitor the specialization of students’ interests. The undergraduates’ entrance and exit essays are brief statements on how they define their own discipline and how they assess their own educational experience in the program.

Each paper in every portfolio will be assessed according to its reasoning, style, organization and research merit. A matrix outlining those criteria is attached.

C. Surveys
We have four surveys to help assess students’ satisfaction with their education experience here at UT, as well as their career attainment: (1) the Undergrad Survey, (2) the Grad Student Survey, (3) and the Alumni Survey.

We will conduct the Undergraduate Survey once in the 2000-level pro-seminar and once in the 4000-level pro-seminar. This means each undergrad student will take the survey twice during his/her time with UT, so we can see how opinions change.

The graduate students also will be surveyed twice – once in the graduate orientation seminar and again during the student’s last semester. Again, the idea is to see changes in students’ opinions. We will wait until the current new cohort is in their last semester to begin administering the second survey.

The Alumni Survey will be administered every five years; the next time we plan to do it is in 2011.

Each of the four types of survey is attached.

D. Theses/Internship
Sociology graduate students have three options: thesis, internship (including a paper about the experience), or coursework. For those students who chose the first or second options, their advisors and committee members assess the thesis/internship paper using the same criteria mentioned above for portfolios - reasoning, style, organization and research merit.

E. Alumni Tracking
In addition to the aforementioned alumni survey, alumni voluntarily keep the Department abreast of their post-UT education and careers. This information is continually updated as alumni send in new developments.

V Feedback Loop
The feedback loop consists of analyzing the data, disaggregated by type of student, and presenting findings to faculty and students.

A. Process for Analyzing Data
The data will be analyzed in three separate groups: (1) Sociology graduate students, (2) Sociology undergraduate students, and (3) Anthropology undergraduate students. However, these three separate analyses will be presented together in one undergraduate report, and another separate report for graduate students. This approach will allow the Assessment Committee to ascertain overall trends among all students, as well as differences between majors or levels of education.

B. Implementing changes based on findings
In addition to presenting its findings to the College of Arts and Sciences, the Assessment Committee will share its conclusions with the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. First the full report will be distributed to all faculty members; then the Assessment Committee will solicit feedback from the faculty in the next monthly departmental meeting. This dialogue will set in motion any necessary policy changes to improve upon any shortcomings the Assessment Committee addressed.

C. Providing feedback to students
The aforementioned pro-seminars and orientation – both at the graduate and undergraduate levels – will serve as venues to disseminate the findings of the Assessment Committee and to solicit students’ reactions to the Committee’s findings.

VI Action Plan
Since no report was submitted last fall, this year’s timeline plans for two reports – the AY 2007-8 evaluation in the spring and the AY 2008-9 evaluation in the fall.

A. Timelines
Data for the AY 2007-8 report already have been gathered and Committee members currently are in the process of analyzing it. All data analysis will be completed and presented to the Department and students by April 10th, and the finalized report will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences by May 4th.

Data for the AY 2008-9 report currently are being gathered. Committee members will analyze the data during the summer. The findings will be presented to the Department and students by September 15th. The finalized report will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences by the end of September.

B. Responsible Persons
Dwight Haase is the chairperson of the Assessment Committee. He will submit the Committee’s report to the College of Arts and Sciences, under the supervision of the Department Chair, Barbara Chesney.
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Appendix A: Anthropology Competency Exam

NAME _______________________

ASSESSMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM IN ANTHROPOLOGY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology with feedback about student learning in the core courses in anthropology. You will be asked a series of background questions, followed by questions about anthropology. We ask that you answer each question as well as you can. Thank you for participating in assessing the anthropology undergraduate program.

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What is your class rank?
   a. Freshman
d. Senior
   b. Sophomore
e. Graduate Student
c. Junior   f. other ___________

2. When do you expect to graduate from UT?
   a. Spring 2008
d. Spring 2009
   b. Summer 2008
e. Summer 2009
   c. Fall 2008
f. Fall 2009
g. Spring 2010

3. Are you anthropology major?
   a. yes
h. other ___________
   b. no

4. Are you anthropology minor?
   a. yes

5. Which of the following classes have you taken or are currently taking at UT? (Circle all that apply).
   Human Society Through Film (ANTH 2100)
   Human Evolution (ANTH 2700)
   World Prehistory (ANTH 2750)
   Cultural Anthropology (ANTH 2800)
   Peoples of the World (ANTH 3850)
   Medical Anthropology (ANTH 4760)
   Social Statistics (SOC 3290)
Ethnographic Art (ARTH 2200)
Topics in Ethnographic Art (ARTH 3270)
Folklore (ENGL 3730)
Linguistic Principles (LING 3150)
6) The Multiregional theory of human evolution is associated with:
   A) I. Tattersall  B) C. Stringer  C) M. Wolpoff  D) S. Gould

7) The Visual Hypothesis for the origin of primates was proposed by:
   A) M. Cartmill  B) R. Sussman  C) F. Szalay  D) R. Asmussery

8) The punctuated equilibrium theory of evolution change is associated with:
   A) A. Thorne  B) C. Loring Brace  C) N. Eldredge  D) D. Frayer

9) The co-discoverer of Darwin's theory of natural selection was:
   A) William Paley  B) Charles Lyell  C) Alfred Wallace  D) Jean B. Lamarck

10) Australapithecine fossils have been found in all the following locations except:
    A) Kenya  B) Gibraltar  C) Tanzania  D) Ethiopia

11) Which of the following is NOT true of Historical Particularism?
    A) It is associated with Franz Boas.
    B) It argues that since each culture has a particular history, no comparisons can be made between cultures.
    C) It argues that some cultures are better than others because they have been around longer.
    D) It is linked with the idea of cultural relativism.

12) Who coined the phrase "Total Social Fact"?
    A) Karl Marx  B) Margaret Mead  C) Marcel Mauss  D) E.B. Tylor

13) Which of the following terms is especially associated with post-structuralist anthropology?
    A) Holism  B) Subjectivity  C) Class  D) Etics

14) Which of the following anthropologists in NOT a British Social Anthropologists?
    A) Max Gluckman  B) E.E. Evans-Pritchard  C) Raymond Firth  D) Margaret Mead

15) Which of the following pairs of anthropologists and concepts is incorrect?
Appendix B: Sociology Competency Exam

ASSESSMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology with feedback about student learning in sociology courses. You will be asked a series of background questions, followed by questions about sociology. We ask that you answer each question as well as you can. Thank you for participating in assessing the sociology undergraduate program.

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What is your class rank?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate Student
   f. other _____________

2. When do you expect to graduate from UT?
   a. Spring 2008
   b. Summer 2008
   c. Fall 2008
   d. Spring 2009
   e. Summer 2009
   f. Fall 2009
   g. Spring 2010
   h. other ___________

3. Are you a sociology major?
   a. yes
   b. no

4. Which of the following classes have you taken or are currently taking at UT? (Circle all that apply).
   Sociology of the Internet (SOC 2010)
   American Society (SOC 2100)
   The Changing Family (SOC 2150)
   Women’s Roles (SOC 2500)
   Race, Class, and Gender (SOC 2640)
   African American Culture (SOC 2900)
   Sociology of Sport (SOC 2980)
   Social Research Methods (SOC 3270)
   Social Statistics (SOC 3290)
   Social Inequality (SOC 3640)
   Social Psychology (SOC 3800)
   Classical Theory (SOC 4040)
   Community Organizing & Devel. (SOC 4100)
   Social Gerontology (SOC 4190)
   Population and Society (SOC 4340)
   Science, Technology, & Social Change (SOC 4580)
   Gender and Work (SOC 4620)
   African Americans in the US (SOC 4670)
   Criminology (SOC 4710)
   Deviant Behavior (SOC 4720)
   Issues in Crime (SOC 4740)
   Legal Issues (SOC 4750)
   Juvenile Delinquency (SOC 4760)
   Development in the Third World (SOC 4800)
   Social Movements (SOC 4830)
   Any other Sociology classes NOT listed:
SOCIOLOGY QUESTIONS

5. Which of the following is **not** considered a characteristic of Functionalist theory?
   a. Equilibrium  
   b. Biological analogy  
   c. Conflict  
   d. Consensus

6. Sociologists are most inclined to explain behavior in terms of:
   a. individual personality characteristics.  
   b. roles and social structures.  
   c. the biological differences between people.  
   d. individual differences.

7. An informed consent statement would **NOT** include:
   a. how much money it costs the researcher to conduct the study  
   b. a guarantee of anonymity and confidentiality  
   c. a description of the procedure of the study  
   d. a statement that participation is completely voluntary

8. Max Weber is credited with developing an analysis of which of the following concepts?
   a. Dialectics  
   b. Rationality  
   c. Hegemony  
   d. Functional interdependence

9. Which of the following is **NOT** a social construct?
   a. race  
   b. gender  
   c. class  
   d. All are social constructs.

10. Which of the following is **NOT** a measure of central tendency?
    a. mean  
    b. mode  
    c. variance  
    d. median

11. Which is the field of study concerned with the analysis of how social and cultural factors are related to population characteristics?
    a. Ethnography  
    b. Demography  
    c. Ecology  
    d. Gerontology

12. If a practice has become institutionalized, it has
13. Most social scientists do not accept a person’s height in centimeters and millimeters as a measure of her or his intelligence because it lacks:
   a. precision       c. accuracy
   b. reliability       d. validity

14. Karl Marx and Frederich Engels define social class as…?
   a. A person’s relationship to a market.
   b. A person’s relationship to their father’s occupation.
   c. A person’s relationship to the means of production.
   d. A person’s status at birth.

15. Sociology studies
   a. human societies       c. social interaction
   b. social institutions       d. all of the above

16. Classify the measurement type for education as follows: (1) less than high school, (2) high school graduate, (3) some college, (4) graduated college, (5) post-graduate.
   a. nominal
   b. ordinal
   c. interval
   d. ratio

17. Georg Simmel is most often viewed as contributing to the development of
   a. Symbolic Interaction       c. Functionalist
   b. Postmodern       d. Conflict

18. The process through which ideas, resources, practices, and people increasing operate in a world-wide rather than local framework is called:
   a. cross-nationalization.
   b. industrialization.
   c. militarization.
   d. globalization.

19. Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Jane Adams were contemporaries of which of the following male sociological thinkers?
   a. Emile Durkheim
   b. Max Weber
   c. Georg Simmel
   d. All of the above

20. What is the INDEPENDENT variable in the following hypothesis?
Persons who experience economic deprivation during socialization will place a higher priority on economic self-interest later in life than will people who did not experience economic deprivation during socialization.

21. Sociologists define the term "social institution" as
   a. a building or cluster of offices  
   b. a small, short-lived, often local group frequently built around a dominant leader 
   c. an organized system of social relationships, which emerges to deal with certain basic problems 
   d. the complex set of learned and shared beliefs, skills, traditions, and knowledge common to the members of society - that is, the "social heritage" of a society

22. A social position acquired at birth or taken on involuntarily later in life is called
   a. achieved status  
   b. ascribed status  
   c. master status  
   d. primary status

23. A negative correlation between variables X and Y implies:
   a. high scores on X are associated with high scores on Y. 
   b. low scores on X are associated with low scores on Y. 
   c. high scores on X are associated with low scores on Y. 
   d. X and Y are not strongly related.

24. If people are unable to maintain the living standards customary in their society, they are experiencing
   a. relative deprivation  
   b. blocked life chances  
   c. absolute deprivation  
   d. anomie
Appendix C: Portfolio Criteria Matrix

Scoring Rubric for the Evaluation of the Sociology Students’ Portfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REASONING</strong></td>
<td>• Underdeveloped ideas</td>
<td>• Develops a variety of simple ideas</td>
<td>• Presents ideas of some complexity</td>
<td>• Develops ideas fully to create greater understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shows little understanding of the topic</td>
<td>• Shows some understanding of the topic</td>
<td>• Shows understanding of the topic</td>
<td>• Shows thorough understanding of the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No clear point of view</td>
<td>• Point of view somewhat clear</td>
<td>• Point of view clearly expressed</td>
<td>• Point of view clearly &amp; convincingly expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STYLE</strong></td>
<td>• Weak vocabulary</td>
<td>• Contains some good vocabulary</td>
<td>• Contains good vocabulary</td>
<td>• Contains new terminology that supports the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One type of sentence</td>
<td>• Contains a variety of sentences</td>
<td>• Contains a variety of sentences</td>
<td>• Contains a wide variety of sentences effectively used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>• Several major errors &amp; major omissions</td>
<td>• Several errors or major omissions</td>
<td>• Only a errors or omissions</td>
<td>• Practically no errors or omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No clear structure or organization</td>
<td>• Some evidence of structure</td>
<td>• Structure is logical &amp; effective</td>
<td>• Structure supports the thesis &amp; enhances the argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No thesis has been stated</td>
<td>• A thesis is present but not clearly expressed</td>
<td>• A thesis is clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RESEARCH | • Rudimentary research undertaken  
• No references or sourcing  
• Improper design  
• Inability to interpret data | • Evidence of research  
• References present  
• Proper design  
• Understanding of simple analysis | • Several sources of varied types  
• References & proper sourcing present  
• Use of intermediate design techniques  
• Proper interpretation of data | • Thesis is clearly expressed & resolved  
• Extensive, varied, & appropriate resources used  
• Detailed references correctly presented & sophisticated use of quotes presented  
• Advance design techniques  
• Proper multivariate techniques & analysis or proper use of appropriate qualitative software |
Appendix D: Undergraduate Anthropology Survey

Thank you for taking this survey of students majoring in Anthropology. We are interested in hearing about your experiences as a Anthropology student and your plans for the future. Your comments will help us improve the education received by Anthropology majors.

This questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to complete. Your honest opinion is highly valued, so your responses will be kept confidential.

To use this form, simply type in your responses beneath the question or click on the appropriate response. When finished, click on the Submit button at the end of the questionnaire.

Anthropology Major Survey

1. How did you first find out about the UT undergraduate major in Anthropology?

2. Why did you choose to major in Anthropology?

3. What year in college were you when you declared your major? (Please click one.)
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Do you have another major? O Yes O No
   - If yes, what is your other major?

4. Did you ever change your major? O Yes O No
If yes, what was it before changing?

6. **Please rate the following in terms of their importance and how well the Anthropology undergraduate program meets your needs in each area.**

In the **column labeled “How important?”** please rate with 7 being **very important**, 1 being **only slightly important**, and **N/A** for any **need** you did not have.

In the **column labeled “How well meet your needs?”** please rate with 7 being **meets very well**, 1 being **meets very poorly**, and **N/A** for any **need** you did not have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW IMPORTANT?</th>
<th>HOW WELL MEET YOUR NEEDS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn about Anthropological areas of specialization (such as cultural anthropology, urban anthropology, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about anthropological theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about research methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to apply critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop critical reading abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop analytical and problem-solving skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to synthesize material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve writing skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain hands-on research experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain familiarity with library databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop career goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for entry-level positions in social services, government agencies, and businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for graduate study in anthropology or professional fields, such as law or medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **How often do you use the Sociology and Anthropology Department computer lab?**

- **Daily**
- **A few times a week**
- **Once every week or two**
- **Rarely**
- **Never**

8. **How important is the Sociology and Anthropology Department computer lab to your school work?**

- **Very important**
- **Important**
- **Neutral**
9. What is your career goal?

10. Do you think the Anthropology major is designed appropriately to meet your goals? (Please explain.)

11. When you think about your undergraduate experiences as a whole, how approachable are the Sociology and Anthropology faculty?
   - Very approachable
   - Approachable
   - Neutral
   - Unapproachable
   - Very Unapproachable

12. **You write** an honors thesis?  
    - Yes          
    - No           
    - Don't Know

   If no, why not?

13. Have you completed or do plan to complete an internship?  
    - Yes          
    - No
    - Don't Know

   If yes, what kind?

   If no, why not?
14. Do you plan to go to graduate school or a professional school (e.g., law or medicine)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don’t Know

If yes, please give the name of the program(s) and the university(ies) that you attend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>University(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Please indicate (click ONE box for EACH skill) how well you feel your UT Anthropology major is preparing you to pursue your career or graduate/professional school goal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical skills (computer)</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of cultural diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are there specific Sociology or Anthropology courses you would have liked to have taken but were not offered?

17. Do you have any suggestions/recommendations for the future development of the Anthropology undergraduate major here at UT?
18. Do you have any other comments about the Anthropology program?

19. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Anthropology program?
   - Very satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied

**In closing, please share some demographic information to help us analyze the survey results in more detail.**

20. Do you commute to campus each day, or do you live on/nearby campus?
   - Commute
   - Live on/nearby campus

21. How do you pay for your tuition? (Click all that apply.)
   - My own income
   - Support from family
   - Financial aid
   - Loan(s)
   - Other __________________________

22. Are you currently employed?
   If yes, how many hours per week do you typically work?
   __________________________

23. How many days per week does family care interfere with your school work?
   __________

24. What year were you born? ____________________

25. What is your gender?  
   - Male  
   - Female  
   - Transgender
26. With what race(s) or ethnicity(ies) do you identify yourself?
Appendix E: Undergraduate Sociology Survey

Thank you for taking this survey of students majoring in Sociology. We are interested in hearing about your experiences as a Sociology student and your plans for the future. Your comments will help us improve the education received by Sociology majors.

This questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to complete. Your honest opinion is highly valued, so your responses will be kept confidential.

To use this form, simply type in your responses beneath the question or click on the appropriate response. When finished, click on the Submit button at the end of the questionnaire.

Sociology Major Survey

1. How did you first find out about the UT undergraduate major in Sociology?

2. Why did you choose to major in Sociology?

3. What year in college were you when you declared your major? (Please click one.)
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   Do you have another major? O Yes O No

   If yes, what is your other major?

4. Did you ever change your major? O Yes O No

   If yes, what was it before changing?
6. Please rate the following in terms of their importance and how well the sociology undergraduate program meets your needs in each area.

In the column labeled “How important?” please rate with 7 being very important, 1 being only slightly important, and N/A for any need you did not have.

In the column labeled “How well meet your needs?”, please rate with 7 being meets very well, 1 being meets very poorly, and N/A for any need you did not have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW IMPORTANT?</th>
<th>HOW WELL MET YOUR NEEDS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn about Sociological areas of specialization (such as inequality, deviance, medical sociology, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about sociological theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about research methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about social statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to apply critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop critical reading abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop analytical and problem-solving skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to synthesize material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve writing skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain hands-on research experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain familiarity with library databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop career goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for entry-level positions in social services, government agencies, and businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for graduate study in sociology or professional fields, such as law or medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often do you use the Sociology and Anthropology Department computer lab?

- O Daily
- O A few times a week
- O Once every week or two
- O Rarely
- O Never

8. How important is the Sociology and Anthropology Department computer lab to your school work?

- O Very important
- O Important
- O Neutral
- O Not important
- O Not at all important
9. What is your career goal?

10. Do you think the Sociology major is designed appropriately to meet your goals?  
(Please explain.)

11. When you think about your undergraduate experiences as a whole, how approachable are the Sociology and Anthropology faculty?
   O Very approachable  
   O Approachable  
   O Neutral  
   O Unapproachable  
   O Very Unapproachable

12. You write an honors thesis? O Yes O No O Don’t Know

If no, why not?

13. Have you completed or do plan to complete an internship? O Yes O No O Don’t Know

If yes, what kind?

If no, why not?

14. Do you plan to go to graduate school or a professional school (e.g., law or medicine)? O Yes
If yes, please give the name of the program(s) and the university(ies) that you attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>University(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you do not plan to go to a graduate program or professional school, what type(s) of job(s) are you doing or planning to do after you graduate with your B.A. in Sociology?

15. Please indicate (click ONE box for EACH skill) how well you feel your UT Sociology major is preparing you to pursue your career or graduate/professional school goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical skills (computer)</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of cultural diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are there specific Sociology or Anthropology courses you would have liked to have taken but were not offered?

17. Do you have any suggestions/recommendations for the future development of the sociology undergraduate major here at UT?
18. Do you have any other comments about the Sociology program?

19. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Sociology program?
   - Very satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied

In closing, please share some demographic information to help us analyze the survey results in more detail.

20. Do you commute to campus each day, or do you live on/nearby campus?
   - Commute
   - Live on/nearby campus

21. How do you pay for your tuition? (Click all that apply.)
   - My own income
   - Support from family
   - Scholarship
   - Financial aid
   - Loan(s)
   - Other __________________________

22. Are you currently employed?
   - If yes, how many hours per week do you typically work?
   ______________________

23. How many days per week does family care interfere with your school work?
   ______

24. What year were you born? ____________________

25. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Transgender

26. With what race(s) or ethnicity(ies) do you identify yourself?
Sociology Grad Student Survey

Thank you for taking this survey of Sociology graduate students. We are interested in hearing about your experiences as a Sociology student and your plans for the future. Your comments will help us improve the education received by Sociology majors.

This questionnaire will take about 15 minutes to complete. Your honest opinion is highly valued, so your responses will be kept confidential.

To use this form, simply type in your responses beneath the question or click on the appropriate response. When finished, click on the Submit button at the end of the questionnaire.

1. How did you first find out about UT’s Masters in Sociology Program?

2. Why did you choose to pursue a Masters degree?

3. Why did you choose Sociology (as opposed to Anthropology, Political Science or any other discipline)?

4. From what university/college did you get your Bachelors degree?
5. What was/were your major/s at that university/college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW IMPORTANT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn about Sociological areas of specialization (such as inequality, deviance, medical sociology, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about sociological theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about social statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to apply critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop problem-solving skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop organizational skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve writing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public speaking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain hands-on research experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain familiarity with online databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop career goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for entry-level positions in social services, government agencies, or businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for further graduate study in sociology or professional fields, such as law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often do you use the Sociology and Anthropology Department computer lab?
   - Daily
   - A few times a week
   - Once every week or two
   - Rarely
   - Never

8. How important is the Sociology and Anthropology Department computer lab to your school work?
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Neutral
   - Not important
   - Not at all important

9. What is your career goal?
10. Do you think the Sociology Masters Program is designed appropriately to meet your goals? (Please explain.)

11. How approachable are the Sociology and Anthropology faculty?
   - Very approachable
   - Approachable
   - Neutral
   - Unapproachable
   - Very Unapproachable

12. Which MA option ayoudo?
   - Thesis
   - Internship
   - Coursework

   Why did you choose this option?

13. go on for a PhD or law degree?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

   If yes, please give the name of the program(s) and the university(ies) that you attend.
   
   Program(s)  University(ies)

If you do not plan to go to a graduate program or professional school, what type(s) of job(s) are you doing or planning to do after you graduate with your MA in Sociology?
14. Are there any specific Sociology courses you would like to take but are not offered?


15. Do you have any other comments about the Sociology program?


16. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Sociology program so far?
   - Very satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied

In closing, please share some demographic information to help us analyze the survey results in more detail.

17. Do you commute to campus each day, or do you live on/nearby campus?
   - Commute
   - Live on/nearby campus

18. How do you pay for your tuition? (Click all that apply.)
   - My own income
   - Support from family
   - TA/GA
   - Scholarship
   - Financial aid
   - Loan(s)
   - Other __________________________

19. If you are a TA/GA, approximately how many hours per week do you work at that job?

20. Aside from being a TA/GA, are you currently employed elsewhere?
   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, how many hours per week do you typically work?
21. On average, how many days per week does family care interfere with your school work? ___________

22. What year were you born? ____________________

26. What is your gender? O Male
   O Female
   O Transgender

27. With what race(s) or ethnicity(ies) do you identify yourself?
Appendix G: Alumni Survey

Alumni Survey

Thank you in advance for taking the anthropology alumni survey. We are interested in hearing about your experiences as an anthropology major and what you are doing now. We intend to use the results of the survey as part of our program assessment efforts with a goal of improving the education received by anthropology majors.

1. How did you first find out about the UT undergraduate major in anthropology?

2. What year did you begin your major in anthropology at UT?

3. What year did you finish your BA degree?

4. What year in college were you when you declared your major?
   Freshman   Sophomore   Junior   Senior

5. Did you have another major?
   If yes, what was your other major?

6. Did you ever change your declared major?
   If yes, what was it before you declared in anthropology?

7. Why did you choose to major in anthropology?
8. Do you have any suggestions about how the department might better publicize the anthropology major and recruit anthropology majors?

9. Rate the following in terms of their importance and how well the anthropology undergraduate program met your needs in each area.

In the **column labeled “How Important?,”** please rate with 5 being *very important,* 1 being *only slightly important,* and N/A for any expectation you did not have.

In the **column labeled “How Well Met?,”** please rate with 5 being *met very well,* 1 being *met very poorly,* and N/A for any expectation you did not have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW IMPORTANT?</th>
<th>HOW WELL MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn about anthropology subfields, such as cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archeology, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about different cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about research methods such as ethnography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about anthropological theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to apply critical thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop critical reading abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop analytical and problem-solving skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to synthesize material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve writing skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain research experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop career goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for entry-level positions in social services, government agencies, and businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for graduate study in anthropology or professional fields, such as law or medicine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Do you think the anthropology major was designed appropriately to meet your goals?

11. When you think about your experiences with the anthropology undergraduate program as a whole, how approachable were the faculty?
12. Did you write a thesis?
   If no, why not?

13. Did you do an internship?
   If yes, what kind?
   If no, why not?

14. Did you go on to a graduate program or professional school (e.g., law or medicine)?
   If yes, what is the name of the program and the university?
   Did you graduate from the program?
   Yes  No  Currently enrolled
   If you did not go to a graduate program or professional school, have you been employed since graduating with your B.A. in anthropology?
   If yes, what was your first job after graduation?

15. In terms of your present situation, if you perform paid work, who is your employer?
   What is your job?

16. Please indicate (check ONE box for EACH skill) how well the UT anthropology major prepared you for your current work, with 5 being the best and 1 being the worst. (Please count unpaid work if it is your full-time work).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical skills (computer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Skills</th>
<th>Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>Data Collection Skills</th>
<th>Data Analysis Skills</th>
<th>Understanding of Diversity</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Are there specific anthropology courses you would have liked to have taken but were not offered?

18. Do you have any suggestions/recommendations for the anthropology undergraduate major?

19. Do you have any other comments about the anthropology undergraduate major?

20. What year were you born?

21. What is your sex?

22. With what race or ethnicity do you identify?
University of Toledo
Psychology Assessment Plan

1. Mission Statement, Department of Psychology
The Mission of our Department is to pursue excellence in all of its academic and community endeavors. These range from discovery of the fundamental principles of psychology in the laboratory, clinic, and community, to the dissemination of this knowledge in the classroom. Through teaching, research and the application of psychological principles, the Department is committed to helping all students at the University achieve their highest potential. Furthermore, we are committed to extending this goal beyond the campus to all members of the community at large. The Educational Objectives of our program are to encourage students to actively explore, understand, and learn about psychological processes and behavior. Moreover, the psychology course work combined with practica provides students with intensive training and experience in psychological research.

2. Overall Department Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, assessment committee membership)
The Psychology Department sponsors two paths to completing the undergraduate major: the standard B.A. (approximately 110 students/year) and the B.A. with Honors (6-10 students/year).

Our Department houses two Ph.D. programs: Experimental Psychology and Clinical Psychology. The Experimental program permits concentration in the following areas: Social Psychology, Developmental Psychology, Behavioral Neuroscience and Learning, and Cognitive Processes.

There are currently six faculty in the Experimental Program and seven in the Clinical Program. There are two faculty who do not have terminal degrees in psychology who participate primarily in undergraduate teaching. Finally, one person with primarily administrative duties teaches an occasional course. The number of faculty in the Psychology Department has been reduced by three retirements, loss of two young faculty, and loss of one visiting faculty.

The department is supported by one full-time secretary. The Psychology Clinic, which allows clinical graduate students to gain experience in assessment and therapy while serving the community, is supported by a half-time secretary.

The Assessment Committee consists of:
Joe Hovey, Ph. D. (clinical)
Rickye Heffner, Ph. D. (experimental)
Alice Skeens, Ed. D.

Accepted by University Assessment Committee 9/8/08
Presented to Provost’s Council 9/25/08
3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

The undergraduate program is assessed based on the assumption that the most important achievement is to impart knowledge about the discipline of psychology, how to evaluate information, and how to write and speak clearly. A second achievement is to produce satisfied and loyal alumni.

The Clinical Psychology graduate program is accredited by the American Psychological Association and assessment is heavily based on the requirements for accreditation. In addition, measures of success include placements of clinical graduates in accredited internships and passage of the licensure exam. The Experimental Psychology program undergoes self-assessment periodically and success is measured by the research productivity of students and their success in obtaining postdoctoral positions or jobs in their profession.

4. Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/program assessment)

   a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

       Actual learning is assessed by performance of graduating seniors on an objective test, the Psychology Area Concentration Achievement Test (PACAT), of knowledge in psychology. The ability of these assessments to evaluate the success of our Psychology Dept. is compromised by the large number of Psychology courses that are taken at other institutions, primarily community colleges. Some instructors administer an objective exam on the first day of class and compare that to performance on the course final exam.

       Graduate learning is based on scores on the licensure exam and on performance in comprehensive exams and specialty exams. Publication in peer-reviewed journals and the reviews of submitted papers constitute additional measures of academic achievement.

   b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

       The undergraduate program also assessed by student satisfaction measured by a questionnaire completed by most graduating seniors. This questionnaire addresses advising, course quality, and other perceived attributes as measured at the moment the students answer the questions.
Career placement of students earning graduate degrees is measured by noting the positions obtained by graduates in their first jobs. General satisfaction is measured by attrition in the graduate program. This reflects in part upon the department and its faculty, but also on the suitability of the students for a career in psychology.

5. Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)

The results of the undergraduate assessments are examined by the chair, the associate chair, and assessment committee volunteers. The results are reported to the faculty in a meeting and changes in requirements discussed when they seem appropriate.

The graduate faculty in each program assess the separate programs at least yearly and curriculum changes are suggested as appropriate. These are brought to the department as a whole for discussion and approval.

6. Synthesis of Department/Program Plans (not applicable)

7. Action Plan
   a. Timelines – Changes in either the undergraduate or graduate program are implemented as soon as approval can be obtained and resources identified.
   b. Responsible Persons – Joe Hovey, chair

8. Appendices – Not applicable
1. Department Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration is to use the instructional, research, and service capacities of its faculty to enhance educational and professional opportunities for its students, the university and the communities of Northwest Ohio. Members of the department are linked by their shared interest and expertise in issues related to politics, government and public policy. Democracy, equality, justice, political economy, and the role of government are among the themes pursued in our research and teaching activities, whether focused at the local, state, national or international level. The department takes pride in having prepared its alumni for careers in government, law, university teaching, and other areas of public service. Individually and collectively, its members are committed to applying their professional expertise to the benefit of the people and communities of the surrounding region, as well as the professional disciplines of political science and public administration.

2. Department Assessment Structure

Assessment Liaisons

Mark Denham, Department Chair; Professors Renee Heberle and James W. Lindeen

Undergraduate Committee: Professors James W. Lindeen, Renee Heberle, David Wilson and Samuel Nelson.

3. Assumptions

There are no accreditation or professional associations that could accredit the political science undergraduate program. The assumptions on which this plan is based are thus those of basic, comprehensive, undergraduate political science programs in the United States. These include the following educational objectives:

- Prepare students for careers in government, law, college teaching, or public service (and for graduate study related to these professions) by offering a curriculum that provides a foundation in the fundamental concepts of
American government and politics, international relations, comparative politics, political theory, and public administration.

- Improve students’ skills in critical thinking, writing, and political analysis through courses that require research and writing based on print and electronic sources, analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, or textual analysis. (Appropriate sources and forms of analysis vary among the subfields -- American government and politics, international relations, comparative politics, political theory, public administration).

4. Methodology

Desired Student Outcomes

Students should have attained

- An understanding of the roles and functions of political institutions and processes in the United States and internationally.
- The mastery of essential concepts in four of the subfields of political science. Majors are required to complete an introductory American government course and gateway courses from three of the following four areas: comparative politics, international relations, political theory, and public administration. We therefore expect all graduating seniors to have working knowledge of concepts related to four of these five areas, as demonstrated by using the concepts in an essay or research paper. (Lists of concepts central to each of these subfields are in Appendix A.)
- The ability to analyze political, administrative, and policy issues, formulate hypotheses based on theory and published research, and organize information to test these hypotheses, as demonstrated through completion of major research papers.

Types of Assessment

- Student learning outcomes will be assessed primarily through evaluation of a portfolio. The portfolio will comprise papers representing work completed in courses taken at different stages of the degree program and from courses in two or more of the subfields listed above. All political science majors will be asked to select papers that meet the following criteria:
  - One paper from the first gateway course (PSC 2610, PSC 2620, PSC 2660, PSC 2700, PSC 2800, PSC 3420) taken by the student (all majors must complete a gateway course in three of the four subfields of comparative politics, international relations, political theory, or public administration).
- One paper completed in a 4000-level course taken during the student’s senior year.
- One additional paper selected by the student as representative of his or her “best work” from a course in a subfield not represented in A and B above.

- The department assessment liaisons, in consultation with the undergraduate committee, will inform students (majors) at several points throughout their careers of the portfolio collection requirement and will provide them with a set of guidelines to use in compiling their portfolios. The undergraduate curriculum committee, using the set of rubrics in appendix B, will evaluate each of the three papers in the student’s portfolio. Committee members will, where possible, review papers in their areas of expertise, but should not review papers prepared in a class they taught. Each evaluator will assign a score of 1 (low) to 4 (high) in each of the five areas of assessment (reasoning, style, organization, research, and content) and an overall score (the sum of the five scores) will be calculated. Rating sheets will be kept on file with the papers. Comparison of the scores for the “gateway” paper and other papers will be used in assessing student learning outcomes. Portfolios for all majors will be kept on file in the departmental office.

- All graduating seniors will complete a brief, standardized “exit interview,” utilizing the questions in Appendix C. This will be emailed to them about two months before graduation. Departmental undergraduate advisors will work with the college office to compile a list of majors intending to graduate each semester. Students will be asked to reflect on their educational experience and future plans. Exit interview responses will be kept on file in each major’s portfolio.

- Each semester, the assessment liaisons and the undergraduate committee will prepare a brief analysis of transcripts of students graduating that semesters (names will be obtained from college advisors), showing patterns of course selection and grades. They will summarize their findings in a report to the department identifying numbers of students specializing in each subfield and their average GPA’s.

5. Feedback Loop

**Student portfolios.** At the beginning of each academic year, the undergraduate committee will prepare a report to the department faculty and chair, summarizing their evaluation of portfolios of all majors graduating in the preceding academic year. The report will include data on the average and range of scores for each of the
three papers in the portfolio, the average and ranges of improvement from the first paper to the third, and average scores in each of the five areas of evaluation, and will comment on particularly strong or weak papers. If the report identifies areas of particular concern, the committee will recommend appropriate action to the department faculty. Information in the report, along with information gathered through exit interviews and transcript analysis, will be considered by the department chair, undergraduate committee, and individual faculty members in making decisions about revisions in courses or curriculum requirements. Another potential use of the portfolio information would be to initiate discussions of pedagogy; for example, if the portfolio review indicates that some students have not mastered some of the central concepts in a particular subfield, faculty teaching in that area might consider adopting different instructional methods.

Exit interviews. At the beginning of each academic year, undergraduate advisors and assessment liaisons will prepare a report to the department faculty and chair, summarizing the information collected from exit interviews during the preceding academic year. Of particular value will be the graduates’ views on courses in need of improvement, and suggestions for changes or additions to the curriculum. This information will inform committee and departmental discussions of changes in specific courses or major requirements; for example, developing a course on media and elections if a large number of graduates indicated the need for such a course. Comments on scheduling, for example, the need for a particular course to be offered in the evening, or through distance learning, will be considered by the scheduling committee in preparing schedules for future years. Information on the types of graduate programs to which our majors are admitted is also indicative of the strength of their preparation (as well as their interests, and financial and geographical constraints) and of their professional interests; this information should be considered along with graduates’ curriculum recommendations, because those going to law school or graduate school would need different preparation than those going to work for a state or local government agency.

Transcript analysis. As noted previously, transcript analysis will be used to identify patterns in course selection, including the sequences in which courses are taken, and grade point averages of majors in different areas of specialization. Annual reports of this information, over time, will enable us to clearly identify areas of growing and waning interest, and, when used with the exit interviews, provide justification for development of new courses or curriculum revision; advisors should also find this information helpful in encouraging students to complete gateway courses early in their academic programs.

Assessment data from exit interviews and student portfolios, over time, will inform departmental strategic planning efforts and resource allocation decisions in several ways. First, it will provide us with specific evidence on strengths and weaknesses in our curriculum and the accomplishment of our educational objectives. As we identify areas of concern, we will then be able to develop sound strategies for
remedying them. Second, as noted in the preceding section, assessment data will be useful in developing proposals for new courses. To the extent that new courses fall within the areas of expertise of existing faculty members, we will need to adjust their teaching assignments, by replacing less relevant courses with new ones. Alternatively, we may need to hire additional faculty to strengthen the department’s ability to regularly offer our students a range of courses in all subfields of the discipline. Over time, as current faculty members retire, information on the areas of the discipline that should receive more coverage will be valuable in preparing job descriptions and hiring justifications for new positions.

6. Action Plans

a. Annual Timeline for Assessment

Spring
All majors are reminded, by email, of the portfolio collection process and given the guidelines. Graduating students are identified, contact information is gathered. Exit interviews are conducted. Portfolios collected from graduating students. Undergraduate committee and assessment liaisons prepare transcript analysis of majors graduating in May

Summer or Early Fall
Portfolios examined. Ratings given

Fall
Undergraduate advisors and instructors of orientation classes provide portfolio guidelines to new majors. All majors are reminded, by email, of the portfolio collection process and given the guidelines. First and second year majors enrolled in gateway courses select a paper from that course for their portfolios.

Assessment of portfolios examined by undergraduate curriculum committee. Curricular revisions considered and, if determined needed, initiated through appropriate channels.
b. Responsible Persons

**Assessment Liaisons**

Mark Denham, Department Chair; Professors Renee Heberle and James W. Lindeen

Undergraduate Committee: Professors James W. Lindeen, Renee Heberle, David Wilson and Samuel Nelson.
Appendix A

Essential Political Science Concepts

American Government and Politics

Federalism, separation of powers, republicanism, Bill of Rights, apportionment and
districting, representation, presidential character, divided government, judicial review,
pluralism, ideology, democracy, political socialization, political participation, political party
systems, primary and general elections, group theory of politics, types of policy,
incrementalism, satisficing, policy cycle, public goods, civil liberties, civil rights, affirmative
action, monetary policy, fiscal policy, regulation, globalization, levels of measurement,
descriptive and inferential statistics.

International Relations

Idealism, realism, globalization, nationalism, liberalism, nation, state, political economy,
less developed countries, nongovernmental organizations, transnationalism, sovereignty,
national interest, bipolar system, non-state actors, international organizations, multipolar
system, power, international law, deterrence, causes of war, characteristics of the
international economic system, sustainable development

Comparative Politics

Political cultures (authoritarian, civic, participant, deferential, absolutist, pragmatic,
individualist, collectivist, statist and anti-statist), party systems (one-party, two-party,
multi-party, competitive, non-competitive); types of parties (ideological, pragmatic, mass,
cadre, disciplined, non-disciplined), parliamentary system of government, presidential
system of government, unitary governments, federal government, proportional and
pluralist electoral systems, democratic and authoritarian systems of government,
majoritarian and consociational democracy.

Political Theory

Power, obligation, justice, public good, rule of law: democracy, liberalism, republicanism,
communism, capitalism, Marxism; state of nature, consent of the governed, social contract,
private property, legitimacy, individuality, collective identity.

Public Administration

Bureaucracy, judicial review, privatization, organizational development, legislative
oversight, parliamentary system, checks and balances, popular sovereignty, limited
government, representation, pluralism, accountability, electoral college, interest groups,
constituency, issue networks, intergovernmental relations, devolution, hierarchy,
patronage, merit system, incrementalism, policy agenda, implementation, reverse
discrimination, affirmative action, deficit, types of policies, policy analysis, program
evaluation, deregulation, procedural due process, equal protection.
## Appendix B

### Rubric for Evaluation of Undergraduate Student Papers

**Department of Political Science and Public Administration**

Student papers will be evaluated in five areas: reasoning, style, organization, research, and content, using a four point scale, as outlined below, for a maximum total score of 20 and minimum of 5. Two members of the undergraduate committee will evaluate each paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REASONING</strong></td>
<td>Undeveloped ideas&lt;br&gt;Shows little understanding of topic&lt;br&gt;No clear point of view</td>
<td>Develops a variety of simple ideas&lt;br&gt;Shows some understanding of topic&lt;br&gt;Point of view somewhat clear</td>
<td>Presents ideas of some complexity&lt;br&gt;Shows understanding of topic&lt;br&gt;Point of view clearly expressed</td>
<td>Develops ideas fully to create greater understanding&lt;br&gt;Shows thorough understanding of the topic&lt;br&gt;Point of view clearly and convincingly expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STYLE</strong></td>
<td>Minimal use of political science terms &amp; concepts&lt;br&gt;One type of sentence</td>
<td>Contains some appropriate political science terms &amp; concepts&lt;br&gt;Contains a variety of sentences</td>
<td>Makes good use of political science terms &amp; concepts&lt;br&gt;Contains a wide variety of sentences</td>
<td>Effectively uses and explains political science terms &amp; concepts&lt;br&gt;Contains a wide variety of sentences effectively used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>Several major errors and major omission&lt;br&gt;No clear structure or organization&lt;br&gt;No thesis stated</td>
<td>Several errors and omissions&lt;br&gt;Some evidence of structure&lt;br&gt;Thesis present but not clearly expressed</td>
<td>A few minor errors and omissions&lt;br&gt;Logical and effective structure&lt;br&gt;Clearly expressed thesis</td>
<td>Practically no errors or omissions&lt;br&gt;Structure supports the thesis and enhances the argument&lt;br&gt;Thesis is clearly expressed and resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH</strong></td>
<td>Rudimentary research undertaken&lt;br&gt;No bibliography or sourcing</td>
<td>Evidence of research, use of sources appropriate to subfield&lt;br&gt;Bibliography present</td>
<td>Several sources from a variety of media appropriate to subfield&lt;br&gt;Bibliography and proper sourcing present</td>
<td>Extensive, appropriate and varied resources used&lt;br&gt;Detailed bibliography correctly presented and professional use of citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td>General discussion of topic unrelated to subjects covered in course</td>
<td>Mostly general information on topic somewhat related to subjects of course, few details</td>
<td>Includes general and specific information on topics related to course</td>
<td>Preponderance of general and specific information on topics and concepts central to the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix A, above, for lists of central concepts in political science subfields.
Appendix C

Exit Interview Questions
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

1. What do you plan to do after graduation?

2. If employment, where and what type of position? If graduate school or law school, in what schools or programs were you accepted?

3. What were the two best political science courses you took? Why?

4. What were the two worst political science courses you took? Why?

5. What changes or additions would you suggest to improve the political science program?

6. Did you complete an internship? If so, where, when, and what did you do? Do you expect it will be helpful to you in your chosen career?

7. In your major, did you focus in a specific area (e.g., international relations, American politics) or take courses from many areas?

8. Please provide a current e-mail address so that we can stay in touch with you.
Department of Physics & Astronomy
Undergraduate Departmental Assessment Plan

1. Departmental Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Physics and Astronomy has three parts:

1. to offer world-class instruction in physics and astronomy to undergraduate and graduate students for the B.A., B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. degrees, including introductory services courses for science and non-science majors;
2. to advance fundamental knowledge through research in selected fields in physics and astronomy;
3. to serve our professional disciplinary communities, to engage the technical and industrial community in economic development activities, and to educate the public in science issues through outreach activities such as Ritter Planetarium.

2. Departmental Assessment Structure

Assessment activities in the Department of Physics and Astronomy are conducted by the Departmental Assessment Committee composed of three faculty members.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based

Our assessment plan defines the department’s learning objectives for our undergraduate students as: 1) mastery of the basic concepts of the field at the undergraduate level (Newtonian mechanics, electromagnetism, statistical mechanics, quantum theory, optics and relativity), 2) the ability and ambition to design and conduct new research, and 3) developing the writing and oral skills necessary to communicate these results to the scientific community. Students receiving a B.S. or B.A. from our department should be able to excel in careers which emphasize scientific and critical thinking methods. Some students are expected to obtain permanent employment upon graduation. Other students are expected to pursue further education, either in a graduate program or in a professional school. Our assessment plan also defines instruments to measure the success of our students at mastering these learning objectives. The results of our assessment process are then used to modify our program in the appropriate manner.

4. Methodology for Undergraduate Assessment

For our assessment, we use instruments that measure the success of our students at obtaining all the desired learning outcomes. These instruments assess whether our students have continued careers emphasizing scientific methods, have mastered all the details of our discipline at the undergraduate level as well as have acquired the communication skills
necessary to present themselves to the appropriate audience. Rather than measuring individual skills (such as standardized test scores for particular courses), our methodology focuses on cumulative measurements.

The following data are collected each from our current and former undergraduate students:

- The results of our yearly Undergraduate Research Symposium held in the Spring Semester and judged by a rubric.
- Copies of Senior Theses submitted.
- Copies of all refereed publications including undergraduate co-authors.
- Participation by our undergraduates in National Science Foundation – Research Experiences for Undergraduates programs, as described by the students in a departmental colloquium.
- Talks given by our undergraduates at professional meetings.
- Post-baccalaureate careers of our undergraduate students.
- Exit interviews of our graduating seniors.
- Interviews with our former students 5 years after their graduation.

5. Feedback Loop

The data collected each year is analyzed by the Departmental Assessment Committee. Specific recommendations are then generated in response to the results of this analysis. A first draft of the Departmental Assessment Report is prepared by the Assessment Committee. This draft report is sent to all faculty members via email and the faculty are invited to make any comments about the draft report. The draft report plus faculty comments are then discussed at the next faculty meeting. This discussion usually ends with specific recommendations being referred to specific departmental committees (such as the Curriculum Committee) for action.

7. Action Plan

Each departmental committee considers the recommendations of the Departmental Assessment Report at their next meeting. After debate, the committees make their recommendations for action on the recommendations. These recommendations are then referred back to the full faculty for final approval.

The timelines for each committee vary depending on the circumstances, though recommendations usually come back to the full faculty within a month.
1. Departmental Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Physics and Astronomy has three parts:

1. to offer world-class instruction in physics and astronomy to undergraduate and graduate students for the B.A., B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. degrees, including introductory services courses for science and non-science majors;
2. to advance fundamental knowledge through research in selected fields in physics and astronomy;
3. to serve our professional disciplinary communities, to engage the technical and industrial community in economic development activities, and to educate the public in science issues through outreach activities such as Ritter Planetarium.

2. Departmental Assessment Structure

Assessment activities in the Department of Physics and Astronomy are conducted by the Departmental Assessment Committee composed of three faculty members.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based

Our assessment plan defines the department’s learning objective for our graduate students is that these students must be fully functioning scientists after they leave our institution. More specifically, the student learning goals are 1) mastery of the basic concepts of the field at the graduate level (Newtonian mechanics, electromagnetism, statistical mechanics, quantum theory, optics and relativity), 2) the ability and ambition to design and conduct new research, and 3) the writing and oral skills necessary to communicate these results to the scientific community. Ph.D. graduates are expected to be able to guide fully independent research without any direction while M.S. graduates should be able to conduct research, though such work is usually under the guidance of a supervisor.

4. Methodology for Undergraduate Assessment

For our assessment, we use instruments that measure the success of our students at obtaining all the desired learning outcomes. These instruments try to measure if our students have become fully functioning scientists who have mastered all the details of our discipline as well as have acquired the communication skills necessary to present themselves to the appropriate audience. Rather than measuring individual skills (such as standardized test scores for particular courses), our methodology focuses on cumulative measurements.
The following data are collected each from our current and former graduate students:

- Yearly meeting of graduate student with their thesis/dissertation committee to discuss progress of student.
- Standardized evaluation of presentations in Physics or Astronomy Journal Seminar by our graduate students.
- Oral defense of Ph.D. dissertation, open to the public.
- Written theses/dissertations.
- Non-thesis M.S. degrees awarded on the basis of publications.
- Refereed publications by our graduate students.
- Contributed talks at professional meetings by our graduate students.
- Tracking of the post-graduation careers of our graduate students.
- Exit interviews with graduating students
- 5-year interviews with former students.

5. Feedback Loop

The data collected each year is analyzed by the Departmental Assessment Committee. Specific recommendations are then generated in response to the results of this analysis. A first draft of the Departmental Assessment Report is prepared by the Assessment Committee. This draft report is sent to all faculty members via email and the faculty are invited to make any comments about the draft report. The draft report plus faculty comments are then discussed at the next faculty meeting. This discussion usually ends with specific recommendations being referred to specific departmental committees (such as the Curriculum Committee) for action.

7. Action Plan

Each departmental committee considers the recommendations of the Departmental Assessment Report at their next meeting. After debate, the committees make their recommendations for action on the recommendations. These recommendations are then referred back to the full faculty for final approval.

The timelines for each committee vary depending on the circumstances, though recommendations usually come back to the full faculty within a month.
1. College/Unit Mission Statement

According to the Department of Philosophy’s mission statement, “philosophical activity takes place in and around a variety of continuing dialectics. These center on the identification, interpretation, and defense of the most general beliefs informing reasoned human endeavors. The dialectics criticize and contribute both to academic reflections and to policy or other action-oriented reflections.” Furthermore, “philosophy’s dialectics, perhaps more than those of any other discipline, are self-reflective. Thus in philosophical research there is an underlying concern with methodology.” Finally, “philosophical questions are, perhaps more than those in other fields, subject to reinterpretation or revision within continuing traditions of work.”

Our teaching mission is linked closely to the progress of philosophical activity. By joining our students in the discussion as it unfolds in the various subdivisions of philosophy, teachers of philosophy demonstrate the self-reflective and critical nature of the dialectic and thus seek to further the discussion. We as a department hope to nurture an appreciation of the philosophical enterprise by initiating students into the work of philosophy. At the introductory level, this involves students in practicing and reflecting on the work of others. At a more advanced level, this involves students in original philosophical research.

Because of the diversity of methodologies that constitute the discipline of philosophy, and because of the self-reflective and self-critical perspective that renders these methodologies and their assumptions open to reconsideration, we regard the acquisition and development of specific skills and a demonstrable affinity with our department’s mission statement as key to assessing our success.

Finally, we understand these goals to be lifelong goals for the student of philosophy. Graduates of philosophy programs are too often told that their skills are non-transferable or ill suited to competition in the job market, though we know with complete certainty that the philosophy major is well suited to a variety of professions and occupations. Our assessment procedures should do what they can to affirm this for the sake of the department, the student, and the ideal of the reflective, enlightened practitioner and citizen.

2. Overall College/Unit Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, college assessment committee membership)

1 Department of Philosophy, “By Laws,” Policy I, “Mission Statement”
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Assessment committee consists of the Chair of the Department and the Undergraduate advisor. Because we are adopting online assessment strategies through an e-portfolio, all faculty in the department will participate in evaluation. No resources needed for plan assuming the presence of a university-wide e-portfolio system.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

The American Philosophical Association, the main professional association for professional, academic philosophers, provides guidelines on assessment, saying in part:

“The basic aim of education in philosophy is not and should not be primarily to impart information. Rather it is to help students learn to understand various kinds of deeply difficult intellectual problems, to interpret texts regarding these problems, to analyze and criticize the arguments found in them, and to express themselves in ways that clarify and carry forward reflection upon them. It may be that these abilities are to some extent amenable to patterns of outcomes measurement typical of outcomes assessment; but they are far from being reducible to them. It is not to be expected that student progress in philosophy can either be specified to a degree beyond what is already possible by means of an essay examination or a term paper, or given a purely quantitative expression. It is essential that those values inherent in and specific to the process of teaching and learning in philosophy not be lost.” (http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/governance/statements/outcomes.html)

Given our mission statement and the deliberately pluralistic nature of our department, no single assessment measure alone is sufficient to gauge the value of this degree. Therefore we assume that student success is related to variables such as disciplinary standards, areas of student research and standards appropriate to those areas, and expectations from faculty with regard to the character of the philosophical learner. Regarding these indicators, we assume they can be measured accurately, and that they in some part attributable to the Philosophy major and curriculum. We also assume that some of these measures, such as personal satisfaction and career goals and achievements, can be accurately self-reported. Finally, we assume that any benefits from a Philosophy degree begin to accrue—though are not fully realized—during one’s school years, thus we should be able to observe those benefits longitudinally.

Assessment is one aspect of a complex system of feedback for students and faculty, a system that includes classroom experiences, grades, evaluations of teacher effectiveness and robust discussion among faculty and students about the task of a philosophy department. We engage in it in order to acquire information valuable to the transformation of our own teaching and research, and to help students develop self-awareness as a key element of life-long learning.

Accepted by University Assessment Committee 9/8/08
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4. Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/ program assessment)
   a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

Philosophy will use an e-portfolio (vendor to be determined). Students will have access to an online portfolio that can be useful for networking, job applications, applications to graduate programs, and, at the very least, online storage. Moreover, the department of philosophy can receive selective access to student portfolios. Thus we will use the e-portfolio to assess the degree to which we succeed in meeting our department’s pedagogical objectives. Finally, faculty members themselves can create a professional portfolio that will link our research and interests to those of our graduates as well as to the philosophical community at large.

Each major in Philosophy will be required to establish an e-portfolio account prior to his or her senior year. Each major will upload at least three representative papers or projects in philosophy; an “exit interview” that solicits feedback about the department (quality of instruction, attentiveness in advising, availability of faculty, safety of learning environment, etc.); a resumé or CV; and a brief post-graduation plan. The student will be asked to allow access by the department or a departmental assessment committee for a period of at least six months prior to graduation and six months following graduation. This will allow us to work toward maximum participation and to track our graduates for at least a brief period after graduation.

The portfolio will allow us to monitor retention and satisfaction on an ongoing basis, and degree completion statistics can be correlated with results from the exit interview and post-graduation planning.

b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

The “exit interview” will be used to generate initial, pre-graduation data about anticipated career placement, overall satisfaction, etc. Subsequent measures can be taken at regular intervals as long as students continue to use the portfolio. We will seek longitudinal data about the department that will help us assess student preparation for life after college.

The student will be asked to allow access by the department or a departmental assessment committee for a period of at least six months prior to graduation and six months following graduation. This will allow us to work toward maximum participation and to track our graduates for at least a brief period after graduation.

The student outcomes associated with the portfolio are closely tied to our department’s mission and character. We require our students to develop knowledge of the field of philosophy, not limited to Western or Anglo-American philosophical traditions; the
ability to interpret that knowledge in relation to multiple perspectives, and to acquire facility with the process by which these outcomes are achieved:

The Department of Philosophy will take responsibility for and assess its effectiveness toward satisfying the following learning goals:

**Goal I:** demonstration of clear and effective communication skills in written work and oral presentations. This will include the ability to formulate arguments, analyze texts with an awareness of multiple interpretative possibilities, and to engage in philosophical dialogue in a collaborative and productive way.

**Goal II:** demonstration of reading comprehension. This is the ability to read carefully, to understand, and to analyze or interpret philosophical texts.

**Goal III:** demonstration of familiarity with multiple traditions in philosophy and with the importance of the history of philosophy to contemporary thought. Students should demonstrate an ability to interpret philosophical issues in the context of broad cultural, historical, and intellectual traditions. Students will be able to understand and think critically about the assumptions and traditions that guide distinct philosophical approaches.

**Goal IV:** demonstration of the capacity for original and creative philosophical work. Students should have access to research opportunities and demonstrate ability to work collaboratively with other faculty and students on research into key areas of philosophy or by taking a philosophical approach to a problem in an interdisciplinary context.

**Goal V:** demonstration of the acquisition of life-long abilities. Students should graduate with an awareness of and engagement with their communities or with social and cultural setting in which philosophical and conceptual practices are important or valuable. Students in should demonstrate awareness of and ability to understand and interpret the social and political effects of philosophical thought and ethical decisionmaking in an integrated, global setting. Students should demonstrate an awareness of issues surrounding racial, ethnic, cultural, physical, cognitive, linguistic, and economic differences.

5. **Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)**

Success in meeting these goals will be assessed by the department with a template in which we enter scores (1-5). Scores will be tabulated by the assessment committee. Students will not have access to raw or processed data, but each student will be given a narrative evaluation at the end of the process. This narrative evaluation will not be part of the students transcript and will have no official value. It will consist of our department’s statement as to the student’s success in the program and will be constructed
in consultation with faculty members who worked closely with the student in question. The evaluation can be made public only by the student.

Students will be accessible via the e-portfolio prior to and long after graduation, assuming that the student maintains a willingness to engage. Thus by asking students to post a resumé or CV and a brief post-graduation plan, we can both monitor and affect the way students connect their major to their work after college. On the assumption that student success is not a matter of completion of tasks, we hope to both maintain a connection to students who want feedback after leaving college, and to learn more about where we are effective and where we need improvement by tracking student progress.

The assessment results will be reported to the faculty of the department on a regular basis and will be discussed during the first department meeting of each academic year. Planning will take assessment results into account.

7. **Action Plan**
   a. **Timelines**

Through attentive advising, we will work to have each philosophy major meet the following deadlines:

- **Second year:** Introduce portfolio requirement in both “Ancient and Medieval Philosophy” and “Modern Philosophy”
- **Third year:** Advisor checks portfolio in spring semester, advising student on the basis of mid-course results.
- **Fourth year, beginning fall 2010:** Major “Pro-seminar.” Philosophy majors will take a 1 unit “Proseminar” course. This course will involve participation in department activities, discussion of philosophical topics, and progress toward the portfolio. No student will pass the “Pro-seminar” without having made progress toward the portfolio, and no student will graduate with a major in philosophy without passing the “Pro-seminar.”
- **Fourth year, spring/summer:** Committee meets and assesses portfolio, provides written assessment to student via e-portfolio within 6 months of graduation.

b. **Responsible Persons**

Ben Pryor, Chair
Susan Purviance, Undergraduate Adviser
Department of Music Assessment Plan

Program Assessment
Each area of the department is to have in place a program assessment plan. The assessment plan for Music History is as follows:

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1   Students will demonstrate the ability to write in a clear, effective style and to use research materials to strengthen their arguments.

          OBJECTIVE 1. Students will demonstrate the ability to write a clear thesis statement and develop the ideas necessary to support it.
          OBJECTIVE 2. Students will demonstrate the skills needed to research a topic, to gather ideas from disparate sources, and to organize the presentation of the information that aids the development of the paper.

Goal 2   Students will demonstrate an understanding of musical genre, historical periods, and composers.

          OBJECTIVE 1. Students will demonstrate their knowledge of subject areas in music history and provide historically accurate information on the topic.

Goal 3   Students will demonstrate an understanding of multiple cultural perspectives in music, as well as a diversity of musical influences within one style.

Goal 4   Students will demonstrate the ability to identify historical development and make connections between developments within time and place.

Undergraduate Methodology
The Department of Music and Dance will create student portfolios that may include the following materials:

1. Writing Samples
   Music majors will contribute samples of their writing from various stages of the degree program.
   - Students will choose a writing sample that was written in conjunction with class requirements for 2000 level music history course.
   - Students will designate a 3000 or 4000 level course as their “capstone” and contribute a paper or project completed in conjunction with the class requirements.
   - Students will choose a third writing sample for inclusion in the portfolio.

An Assessment Committee consisting of Department of Music and Dance faculty will review the writing samples. Assessment will be scored according to a rubric created by the department. (See Appendix A) Scores will be quantified for purposes of comparison over time.

2. Exit Interview
   The Assessment Committee will prepare an “exit questionnaire” for completion by music majors enrolled in 4000 level courses during the spring semester of their senior year.

3. Transcript
Assessment Committee members will provide a brief analysis of the transcript that identifies patterns in course selection and grades. This analysis will be used to provide a comprehensive portrait of the degree program.

Graduate Methodology
The Department of Music and Dance will begin tracking the following information:

1. Comprehensive Examinations
Students pursuing a Master’s degree take comprehensive examinations upon completing their coursework in the department. These examinations are independently graded by several members of the department. These scores will be recorded and archived in a yearly database that will allow the department to track changes in the performance of our graduate students over time.

2. Theses
Students in the Masters level research and write theses or projects that are independently graded and evaluated by a committee of graduate faculty. Faculty will be urged to grade students according to an established evaluation rubric in addition to their overall evaluation. These scores, in addition to the name of the student’s faculty advisor, and the student’s years in residence at UT will be archived in a database and updated yearly.

Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of Spring Semester</th>
<th>Student papers will be requested for the portfolio.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Fall Semester</td>
<td>The Assessment committee will meet to evaluate student portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Fall semester</td>
<td>Evaluations, including data on graduate examinations, projects, and theses, will be tabulated and archived by the department chairperson. A comparison report will be prepared by the chair of the Assessment Committee. This report will be the basis for department-wide discussions of curricular and programmatic changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction. This proposal details an assessment mechanism for the undergraduate degree programs in mathematics at The University of Toledo. The Department of Mathematics currently offers B.S. and B.A. degree programs with specializations in pure mathematics, applied mathematics, actuarial science, statistics, mathematics and computer science, and in addition a B.A. program in mathematics for adolescent and young adult (AYA) educators. Currently, the department has about 120 majors that populate the pure, applied, statistics, and education specializations. Because these four specializations contain almost all of the department’s students, the current proposal will only involve assessment of these programs.

The objective of this plan is to provide the department with data relating to the degree of understanding of mathematics gained by our majors during their course of study. The plan is designed in accordance with the principles set forth by the Mathematical Association of America’s Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics (CUPM). The CUPM guidelines articulated in 1995 describe assessment procedures as consisting of four elements: (1) setting the learning goals and objectives, (2) determination of areas and methods of assessment, (3) establishing methods for gathering assessment data, and (4) using assessment results to improve the mathematics major.

In the department’s view, the most important element, and one that measures the value of all preceding steps, is whether assessment data is used to improve education in the major as prescribed by the programs’ educational goals. It is for this reason that this plan focuses the area of assessment on measuring the value of course-work in training students to become proficient in their disciplines. In order to ensure that assessment plays a central role in curricular discussions, the plan includes a two-tiered mechanism for data gathering. At the first level, data will be presented in accessible database format and will measure in certain key courses the degree of success students have in satisfying the program goals. This data will measure the performance of each major in achieving the educational goals associated with a course and will be derived by establishing a time-dependent correspondence between the grade in the course and the level of achievement. Such a measure will allow us to track student performance through the length of our program and pinpoint subjects where preparation can be improved. Assessment data gathered in this way will be supplemented with student portfolios that will consist of the final exams in the key courses from which performance measures are taken. The portfolios will allow us to obtain detailed longitudinal information concerning deficiencies indicated by the performance data.

Some words of explanation may be useful to address the question as to why, in mathematics, assessment of course outcomes is sufficient to determine the overall quality of the undergraduate major. Although capstone courses do exist in mathematics, and ETS does provide a Major Field Test in mathematics, many departments with recognized
assessment procedures, such as those at the Colorado School of Mines and North Dakota State University, center their assessment activities on course outcomes. The reason for this is that in mathematics the curriculum of the undergraduate major does not have a large number of areas in which the student needs expertise and which the student needs to integrate into a general appreciation of the major. On the contrary, undergraduate training in the mathematics prepares students for a small number of terminal courses that contain the principles and techniques that undergraduate majors are expected to know. It is also true that this body of knowledge is only infrequently updated with new information or points of view. Thus, in assessing the success of our undergraduate program it is critically important to focus on the success of our students in these terminal courses, and correspondingly to examine our success in preparing students for this course-work.

**Student Outcomes.**

**Mission:** The learning goals and objectives elaborated here follow naturally from the department’s mission as resources for education and research in the mathematical sciences. The mission is delineated in the following statement:

The mission of the Department of Mathematics is to transmit mathematical ideas through teaching and teaching related activities; contribute to the advancement of mathematics through quality research; utilize the department's resources to aid the University and local communities in the applications of mathematics and statistics; and to serve as a resource of mathematical knowledge and pedagogy for the University of Toledo and the local community.

**Educational Objectives:** In this spirit, the course work in mathematics associated with the degree programs in Pure Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, Statistics, and Mathematics for AYA Education, should prepare students, at the completion of their degree program, to satisfy the following general expectations.

1. Students should learn single and multi-variable calculus that is reflected by the ability to solve detailed problems, and knowledge of how calculus is applied in other areas of mathematics such as differential or integral equations, differential geometry, probability, and numerical analysis.

2. Students should learn the principles of linear algebra, in particular, the theory of linear equations, and vector spaces. The student’s knowledge of the subject should include an appreciation of the role that linear algebra plays in calculus and in the student’s area of specialization.

3. Students should learn the formal structure of mathematics. This includes the role that axioms and definitions play in describing mathematical objects. Students should develop the ability to construct mathematical hypotheses, and the ability to prove mathematical statements.
(4) Students should have the capacity to read and comprehend mathematical literature
appropriate to their specialization.

In addition, in each specialization and upon completion of the program, students will be
expected to achieve the following goals:

(5) Pure Mathematics: Students in pure mathematics will be expected to grasp the basic
principles of real analysis, topology, and algebra. In topology and analysis this means
that students will be familiar with the structure of real numbers, metric spaces, and the
theory of functions of one variable. In algebra this implies an understanding of the
principles of group theory and the structure of rings and fields.

(6) Applied Mathematics: Students in applied mathematics will be expected to be
familiar with the mathematical structures most commonly used in solving practical
problems. This includes the uses of linear algebra in solving discrete or combinatorial
applied problems, and the use of differential equations in modeling. Students should
have the skills required to implement algorithmic solutions to applied problems.

(7) Statistics: Students of statistics will be expected to learn the foundations and
applications of probability for both discrete and continuous random variables and vectors.
They will also be expected to grasp the reasoning behind, applications of, and properties
of basic statistical methods. This includes methods for point and interval estimation and
testing statistical hypotheses such as likelihood-based methods and methods related to the
set of basic statistical distributions.

(8) Mathematics for AYA Mathematics Education: Students in AYA mathematics will
be expected to learn geometry and the historical development of mathematics. In
graphs, students should be familiar with the effect of axioms on various geometries,
express geometric properties in analytical terms, explore and conjecture about geometric
properties using technology, and prove or disprove such conjectures. In the history of
mathematics, students should be able to site major milestones in the development of
mathematics, be aware of the persons involved in such milestones, and describe the
historical climate that lead to such milestones.

**Types of Assessment.** The following approach to assessing the success of our students
in achieving the above stated goals relies on the fact that the knowledge to be acquired is
developed in a sequence of courses, each a prerequisite course to the following course
and each often reexamining the same material in a deeper level of abstraction. Thus, for
each of the goals stated above there is a point in the program, depending on the
specialization, where success in a specific pivotal course indicates that the knowledge
and skills associated with the goal have been acquired. The method to be introduced
involves two tiers of data collection. The first tier, that will allow us to track students
through our program and to gain general information as to their success in learning and
our success at educating, will be to set up a relation for each section of each pivotal
course between the grades in these courses and the program goals associated with that
course. This relationship will be established jointly by the instructor and the Math Majors Committee and will be based on the content of the section’s final exam (these are typically cumulative; we will require that they be cumulative for the courses in question). The advantage of this format is that it will quickly generate a large volume of readily analyzable data. To refine our understanding of this data, the department will establish a portfolio archive that will consist of the students final exams in the pivotal courses for each of our majors. To implement this method, the department has identified a number of pivotal courses where the grades and final exams will serve as an indicator of the extent to which a student has met one or more of the above goals. The tables below list the pivotal required courses for each program and corresponding expectations that the grade in the course and final exam would measure.

Methods for gathering assessment data: The relationship between the grades received in the above courses and the degree to which the students have satisfied the above mentioned goals will be established by the following procedure. First, for each of the courses above, the department’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will formulate a description of how the course material relates to realizing the associated goal. Then each semester, based upon this outline, instructors of sections of these courses will prepare a recommendation indicating the grade levels that correspond to the following three categories: the student 1) exceeds expectations, 2) meets expectations, or 3) fails to meet expectations. This recommendation will be submitted to the Math Majors Committee together with a copy of the final exam in the course at the beginning of the following semester. The committee will review these recommendations and certify their suitability. If there is disagreement between the instructor and the committee on the correspondence between grades and attainment of goals, the committee will consider carefully the instructor’s explanations, but, ultimately, the committee has authority to fix the correspondence. Once the correspondence has been established the data will be collected using an ODS query to Banner. In addition, the committee will add to the student portfolio archive copies of each student’s final exams in each of the pivotal courses in the student’s specialization. The final exams will provide detailed information so that the topics that caused failure to meet expectations can be identified. They also will provide assessment personnel with data with which to reference the expectation level. It should be mentioned that in upper division undergraduate mathematics courses there is considerable uniformity over time and between institutions concerning the essential material that must be included in these courses. Further, instructors have universally used final exams to determine whether students have learned these basic techniques and concepts. Consequently, due to these historical facts, final exams in upper division math courses provide uniform detailed information about the level of learning.

Using assessment data: Each fall, after compiling assessment information from the previous spring, the Math Majors Committee will review the assessment data collected during the previous year and probe it for trends that might warrant more extensive investigation that would involve examination of student portfolios. The committee will also segregate students who show a pattern of weakness in the program, and determine if their difficulties could be addressed through program development or revision.
Timeline for Assessment.

February 2009. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviews guidelines relating to learning goals to pivotal course content in the light of assessment data collected over the previous years and recommends changes, if necessary.

February 2009. Math Majors Committee reviews instructor recommendations and collects assessment data for 2008 fall semester.

April 2009. Guidelines distributed to instructors of fall semester courses and instructors make recommendations to Math Majors Committee concerning relationship between grade and achievement level.

May 2009. Math Majors Committee reviews instructors’ recommendations and establishes correspondences; data for 2009 spring semester is collected.

May 2009. Instructors add final exams to student portfolios, and submit grades and achievement level correspondence recommendations to Math Majors Committee using revised guidelines.

September 2009. Math Majors Committee sets spring grades to achievement level correspondence and collects assessment data. Committee reviews assessment data for 2006-2008 academic years, and reports on trends to chair. Committee also evaluates the effectiveness of department’s assessment procedure, submits recommendations to chair and department.

Specific Changes To Planning and Reallocation. The assessment vehicle that has been proposed has as its primary focus the assessment of student learning in courses related to mathematics undergraduate majors, and, as such, its impact on the department’s programs will largely be in the area of curricular revision and reform. However, it is conceivable that information gathered in this effort may lead to change in program emphasis and could also lead to a reallocation of department resources. However, the department’s major programs are fairly streamlined and concentrate on the basic area of the mathematical sciences, so it is at the moment hard to see how further efficiencies could be achieved through program planning or reallocation.

Assessment Liaisons. The Math Majors Committee with assistance from the chair and associate chairs will be responsible for implementing the above plan. The Math Majors Committee chair is elected annually; the current chair is West Vayo. The current department chair and associate chairs are Don White, Zeljko Cuckovic and Paul Hewitt.

Conclusion. The value of an effective assessment procedure arises not only from the useful data that it generates, but also from the fact that the process itself leads to an evaluation of the assessed programs. Since undergraduate instruction in mathematics is entirely centered on course work, and since this course work is cumulative, we feel that focusing of assessment methods on course sequences is important to our majors and will not only provide valuable time-ordered data on the progress of our majors, but the process itself will also create opportunities to relate what we are teaching in our courses to our stated learning goals. In this way, the data that is collected becomes immediately relevant to the discussion of teaching methods and course content, and makes assessment an integral part of curriculum revision and development. In some sense, the present plan aims to improve the impact of assessment on program development as compared to the
effect that the earlier assessment procedure had on our service courses. While the method of embedded questions produced useful information about specific difficulties that students had with particular topics, it lacked broad measures of student success that could serve as dashboard indicators of how well our program was functioning. The two-tiered system that we plan to implement will produce information at both levels and hopefully function more effectively in guiding program development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course identifier</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Goal measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3860/MATH 3820</td>
<td>Intro to Differential Equations</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3190</td>
<td>Intro to Mathematical Analysis</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4300</td>
<td>Linear Algebra I</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4820</td>
<td>Intro to Real Analysis</td>
<td>(4) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4330</td>
<td>Abstract Algebra I</td>
<td>(4) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course identifier</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Goal measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3860/MATH 3820</td>
<td>Intro to Differential Equations</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3190</td>
<td>Intro to Mathematical Analysis</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4820</td>
<td>Intro to Real Analysis</td>
<td>(4) (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4300/MATH4350</td>
<td>Linear Algebra I/Applied Linear Algebra</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4720</td>
<td>Methods of Numerical Analysis II</td>
<td>(4) (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course identifier</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Goal measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3860/MATH 3820</td>
<td>Intro to Differential Equations</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3190</td>
<td>Intro to Mathematical Analysis</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4300/ MATH 4350</td>
<td>Linear Algebra I/Applied Linear Algebra</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4680</td>
<td>Intro to the Theory of Probability</td>
<td>(4) (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4690</td>
<td>Intro to Mathematical Statistics</td>
<td>(4) (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AYA Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course identifier</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Goal measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3860/MATH 3820</td>
<td>Intro to Differential Equations</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3190</td>
<td>Intro to Mathematical Analysis</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 4300/ MATH 4350</td>
<td>Linear Algebra I/Applied Linear Algebra</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3450</td>
<td>Modern Geometry II</td>
<td>(4) (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3510</td>
<td>History of Mathematics</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Masters Program Assessment Rubric
### Pure Mathematics

Date ____________________

Student Name __________________________ Reviewer __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has student mastered the basic prerequisite material that would predict success in the program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student understood the principles of classical real analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student understood the concepts and techniques or complex analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the student proficient in the theory and basic method of linear algebra?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has student grasped the theory and methods of abstract algebra at an appropriate level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Masters Program Assessment Rubric
Applied Mathematics

Date ____________________
Student Name ______________________ Reviewer ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has student mastered the basic prerequisite material that would predict success in the program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student understood the principle of classical real analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student understood the concepts and techniques of complex analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has student grasped the theory and methods of ordinary differential equations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has student grasped the theory and methods of partial differential equations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

A&S-MATH
Masters Program Assessment Rubric
Statistics

Date ________________________
Student Name ______________________ Reviewer __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has student mastered the basic prerequisite material that would predict success in the program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student understood the principle of calculus based probability and mathematical statistics?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a knowledge of and facility with statistical programming?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has student developed a familiarity with basic methods of parametric statistical inference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has student developed an understanding of the use and range of applicability of statistical methods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student reached a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

A&S-MATH 10
Assessment Procedures for Doctoral Programs in Mathematics  
Department of Mathematics  
Rubrics

**Doctoral Program Assessment Rubric**  
**Real Analysis**

Date __________________

Student Name ___________________________ Reviewer ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a command of the topics from undergraduate real analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to use function space constructs such as uniformity, bounded variation, or absolute integrability to solve problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a command of the basic concepts of measure theory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to solve problems involving the Lebesgue Integral?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Doctoral Program Assessment Rubric
Oral Examination

Date ____________________

Student Name _______________________ Reviewer _______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a firm understanding of the mathematical background of her or his topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the level of the presentation sufficient to indicate there is a good prospect that the student could work creatively in the area of the talk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the student successful in demonstrating an ability to independently investigate and appreciate the mathematical area of the topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the student meet expectation with regard to quantity of material presented during the exam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and present it clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Doctoral Program Assessment Rubric
ODE-PDE

Date _____________________
Student Name ________________________ Reviewer __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a knowledge of theory and applications of the existence theory for ode?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an understanding of the theory of linear systems, and its applications to constant coefficient and periodic systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to understand the behavior of nonlinear systems of ode near a singular point and their general qualitative properties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrate an ability to use the method of characteristics and the Cauchy-Kowalevski theorem to analyze the solutions to first order pde?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an facility with the properties of harmonic functions including the maximum principle in solving the Dirichlet problem of elliptic pde?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an ability to use the ideas associated with weak solutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an understanding of the basic techniques and theory of hyperbolic and parabolic second order pde?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
# Doctoral Program Assessment Rubric
## Algebra

Date ___________________

Student Name ___________________________ Reviewer __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated grasped the uses of the fundamental algebraic constructions of products and quotient, and descending and ascending series?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a facility with techniques group theory such counting arguments in the analysis of finite groups and their subgroups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an understanding of the theory and use of decomposition techniques such as those found in theory of abelian groups or semi-simple modules?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a knowledge of he theory of field extension and can the student use it to analyze the solution to polynomial equations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an understanding of the basic constructions in ring theory, and in particular in the area of commutative rings including unique factorization and the field of quotients?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
**Doctoral Program Assessment Rubric**  
Topology

Date _______________________

Student Name ______________________ Reviewer __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a knowledge of the foundational constructions of set theory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an ability to use the basic constructions of topology to investigate the properties of topological spaces?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an understanding of the use of continuity in topological arguments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a knowledge of the theory and the applications of basic topological constructions of product and quotients?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an understanding of the role of homotopy theory and the fundamental group in categorizing topological spaces?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to use decompositions and covering in calculating the fundamental group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
# Doctoral Program Assessment Rubric

**Statistics**

Date ________________________

Student Name ________________________ Reviewer __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated a knowledge of the fundamental aspects of probability theory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an ability to use the ideas of probability theory to solve problems in statistical inference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an ability to use basic topics in statistical inference, including likelihood, exponential families, sufficient statistics, point and interval estimation, hypothesis testing, maximum likelihood estimates, criteria for estimators, uniformly most powerful tests, the duality between testing and interval estimation, and Bayesian estimation.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated an ability to apply the knowledge in statistical inference to data analysis and statistical modeling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student demonstrated the ability to organize work and write clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student attained a level of mathematical maturity consistent with the program objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
I. Mission Statement

The primary objective of the LST program is to develop knowledge of legal institutions from an interdisciplinary perspective. As an undergraduate program that emphasizes student participation and responsibility, LST offers not only a first rate curriculum based on law and legal institutions but an education in the art and technique of learning at an advanced level. To this end, we actively develop critical thinking skills and intellectual versatility—we provide students with the tools to assist students in understanding a complex and diverse world structured by law, power and value. Also, for students who intend to continue in a legal, academic, or public service profession, clear written expression is a fundamental skill?

A. Learning Objectives

1. Interpretative Skill:

Students in LST will demonstrate an ability to interpret current law related issues in the context of broad cultural, historical, and intellectual traditions. Students will be able to think critically about the assumptions and traditions that guide distinct interpretations of the law and of legal institutions and understandings of justice and fairness.

2. Social and Political Awareness:

Students in LST will demonstrate awareness of and ability to understand and interpret the social effects of legal decisions, legal institutions and the deployment of force that ultimately defines (or informs) law.

Students will demonstrate an awareness of issues surrounding racial, ethnic, cultural, and economic differences. Students will demonstrate sensitivity to the legal status and meaning of class, race, gender and disability.

3. Writing:

Students will develop the ability to write clearly, critically, and effectively. Students will demonstrate ability to read and analyze complex argument.
Students will demonstrate familiarity with the methodologies of various disciplines related to the study of law and legal institutions (though proficiency in the implementation of methodologies proper to the behavioral and social sciences will not be assessed).

Students will be able to identify and assess key assumptions that guide moral, political, and practical arguments and to formulate arguments and positions with clarity. Students will be able to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant data and claims, and to work creatively when making and analyzing arguments.

4. Profession:

Students will be able to describe relevance of the “Field Experience” to the interdisciplinary study of law

Students will become familiar with the professional options open to them, and will consider how their thinking about law and legal institutions will contribute to their future practice.

5. Interdisciplinary Education:

“Reflective essays” will be clear statements of the student’s judgment about the relation among courses in various disciplines and will demonstrate attention to how courses in combination promote all other goals and objectives.

Students will be able to articulate the importance of an interdisciplinary understanding of the way law combines moral argument, rhetorical practice and force to structure human life and to distinguish that understanding from a technical understanding of law. Student will be able to generate a general account of the difference between an interdisciplinary approach to an object of study and discipline-specific approaches.

II. Assessment Structure

The assessment will be carried out entirely by the faculty who are “contractually obligated” to the Program in Law & Social Thought. Currently, those persons are:

Renee Heberle (Co-Director)
Ben Pryor
Sam Nelson
Jerry Van Hoy (Co-Director)

No other special resources or staff support are currently required.
III. Assumptions

The primary assumption is that the impact of an interdisciplinary Law & Social Thought degree is multifaceted; no single assessment measure alone is sufficient to gauge the value of this degree. Ergo, we rely on several indicators related to intellectual growth, development of skills, career attainment and personal satisfaction. Regarding these indicators, we assume they can be measured accurately, and that they primarily are attributable to the Law & Social Thought major and curriculum, not other factors. We also assume that some of these measures, such as personal satisfaction and career goals and achievements, can be accurately self-reported. Finally, we assume that any benefits from a Law & Social Thought degree begin to accrue during one’s school years, thus we should be able to observe those benefits longitudinally.

IV. Methodology

The assessment data will come from three main sources: (A) Proseminars, (B) major portfolios, and (C) alumni surveys.

A. Proseminar: The Proseminar, a one-unit course taken three times throughout a student’s career in LST, is conducted as a round-table discussion among students and faculty. In the course, students evaluate their current courses in terms of the relation to the LST program as a whole as well as their personal pathways and they select the courses to be cross-listed as Upper division Seminars (UDS). Students are encouraged to express their concerns for the program as well as address LST opportunities, interest and current events. In addition, the Proseminar is also an opportunity to conduct “group advising” and obtain “group feedback.”

B. The LST Portfolio: Each student in Law and Social Thought will be required to maintain a portfolio. The portfolio will consist of written work from LST courses and short reflective essays in which a student describes the connections among LST courses and what the student learned from the interdisciplinary approach to the study of legal institutions. These essays will be assessed on an ongoing basis by the LST student’s advisor, and the portfolio as a whole will be assessed by a committee of LST faculty members at graduation as a program requirement. Students in Proseminar II will be advised on the assembly of their portfolios and will engage in an open discussion designed to enhance their essays.

The contents of the portfolio when complete will be as follows:

- **The LST Checksheet**: The checklist will play a vital role in the development of each student’s portfolio. The portfolio outlines the student’s experience with LST and his/her personal career development. The basic outline of a LST student portfolio is as follows:
• **Current resume/curriculum vitae**

• **Current transcript**

• **Entrance Essay** (on the concept of law and the function of law in society—Completed in LST 2010)

• **Selected Written Work:** Term papers, exams, and other written work representative of the student’s best efforts during a semester. Divided by course, semester, and year. Criteria of assessment:
  - Example of excellence in critical thinking in an essay format
  - Good bibliographical work with multiple sources
  - Example of quantitative analysis for students emphasizing the social sciences
  - Relationship between LST pathway and coursework

• **Reflective Essays:** Written after each semester. Requires student to reflect on relation among LST courses and on student’s progress in the major. Goals of reflective essays:
  - Assess individual progress
  - Identify personal strengths and weaknesses
  - Relation of skills to coursework
  - Identification of academic work /study most important to individual

• **Field Experience Evaluation:** Student will include materials associated with the field experience, including a self-evaluation. Evaluation will include:
  - Description of specific experience
  - Statement of Goals
  - Description of Process
  - Findings, Analysis, of Interpretation of experience
  - Analysis of experience as a whole

• **Junior Year Career/Degree/Post-Graduate Plan:** In the second semester of the Junior year, each student will answer a short questionnaire concerning post-graduate plans

C. **Alumni Surveys:** The Alumni Survey will be administered every five years; we plan to begin the surveys at LST’s 10-year anniversary in AY2010-2011.

**V. Feedback Loop**

The feedback loop consists of analyzing the data and presenting findings to faculty and students. Findings are to be presented for discussion in LST Proseminars and to the LST Faculty Working Group.

**A. Process for Analyzing Data**
The data will be analyzed using the criteria specified in this plan by the Assessment Committee to ascertain overall trends among all students in Law & Social Thought during their tenure in the program.

B. Implementing changes based on findings

In addition to presenting its findings to the College of Arts and Sciences, the Assessment Committee will share its conclusions with the faculty and students affiliated with the Program in Law & Social Thought. First the full report will be distributed to all faculty members; then the Assessment Committee will solicit feedback from the faculty and students in the LST Proseminars and Faculty Working Group meetings. This dialogue will set in motion any necessary policy changes to improve upon any shortcomings identified by our ongoing assessment process.

C. Providing feedback to students

The aforementioned Proseminars will serve as venues to disseminate the findings of the Assessment Committee and to solicit students’ reactions to the Committee’s findings. This process has always been built into LST’s program.

VI. Action Plan

Since no report was submitted last fall, this year’s timeline plans for two reports – the AY2007-2008 evaluation in the spring and the AY 2008-2009 evaluation in the fall.

A. Timelines

Data for the AY2007-2008 report already have been gathered and Committee members currently are in the process of analyzing it. All data analysis will be completed and presented to the faculty and students by April 10th, and the finalized report will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences by May 4th.

Data for the AY2008-2009 report currently are being gathered. Committee members will analyze the data during the summer. The findings will be presented to the faculty and students by September 15th. The finalized report will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences by the end of September.

B. Responsible Persons
Jerry Van Hoy and Renee Heberle co-chair the Law & Social Thought Assessment Committee. We will submit the Program’s report to the College of Arts and Sciences.
1. Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of History is to provide the highest possible quality of instruction in the content, methods and skills of history at both graduate and undergraduate levels. In this mission the Department prepares historians and teachers with both breadth and depth, trains students in the discipline of history and acquaints them with the profession, and promotes a greater public understanding and awareness of the past. History is thus a cornerstone of a liberal education.

All contemporary problems are historical in origin, and the study of history and its methodologies is therefore critical in problem solving in all areas of human endeavor. Courses in history help students in all majors develop critical thinking and writing skills. Designated as a pre-law major in the College of Arts and Sciences, history also prepares students for success in legal education.

The Department is committed to support university efforts to serve Northwest Ohio with outreach programs that include research projects, public speakers, and continuing education programs. Faculty members also serve as a reservoir of historical knowledge available to members of the general public. Finally, the Department is especially committed to public history, which advocates the active involvement of academic historians with the local community. Research constitutes a significant aspect of the Department mission, and faculty members are expected to publish and present the original contribution of their work, which serve to deepen our understanding of the past.

Through numerous course offerings that cover most of the nations and regions of the world in addition to the United States, the Department encourages an understanding and appreciation of the diversity of cultural experiences. The study of history also helps to break down barriers that foster racial, gender, and other forms of discrimination.

The Department is committed to respecting divergent views, for without freedom of expression history has little value. Engaged in the pursuit and dissemination of historical knowledge, the Department stand committed to the highest ethical standards in instruction, research, and service.

2. Unit Assessment Structure

A. Undergraduate

Curriculum and Assessment Committee will consist of Undergraduate Adviser, who will chair the committee, faculty teaching the Methods Seminar (History 2000), and one faculty from other departments.
B. Graduate

A Graduate Assessment Committee will consist of Director of Graduate Studies, who will chair the committee, faculty teaching the Graduate Seminar (History 6990/8990) and one graduate faculty from other departments.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based.

The following goals and objectives have been approved by the Department of History on February 20, 2004.

GOAL 1. Student will demonstrate a broad understanding of historical developments, their relationship to the present, and the methods of historical research.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate their knowledge of the subject areas of history and make accurate connections between developments in time and place.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to undertake historical research and interpretation using the methods of the discipline.

Objective C. Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize the contribution of historical antecedents to the understanding of current personal, social and political situations and developments.

Goal 2. Students will develop critical thinking and writing skills.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze historical questions and issues clearly and precisely, formulate historical information accurately, distinguish the relevant from irrelevant, recognize key questionable historical assumptions, use key historical concepts effectively, identify relevant competing historical points of view, and reason carefully from clearly stated historical premises.

Objective B. Students will communicate thinking clearly through effective writing, demonstrating their comprehension, critical interrogation and synthesis of a variety of sources.

Goal 3. Students will express an understanding and appreciation of the cultural diversity.

Objective A. Student will demonstrate the ability to recognize multiple perspectives and appreciate those perspectives which produce a world-view different from one’s own.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to use another perspective to analyze historical events and cultural practices.

Goal 4. Students will become familiar with the professional methodology of historian.
Objective A. Students will use and critique both primary and secondary sources.

Objective B. Students will become familiar with the opportunities for teaching, research and public service which the profession offers.

4-A. Undergraduate Methodology

The Department of History will create undergraduate students portfolios that may include the following materials:

1. Writing Samples.

History majors will contribute samples of their writing from three (at least two) stages of the degree program.

--Faculty teaching the Methods Seminar (usually taken during the sophomore year) will contribute copies of student papers from the course.

--Students will choose two other writing samples for inclusion in the portfolio.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee will evaluate the writings on the basis of a general evaluation rubric (See Appendix A). Scores will be quantified for purposes of comparison over time.

2. Exit Interview.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee will distribute “exit questionnaire” for completion by history majors enrolled in 4000 level courses during their senior year. The questionnaire includes questions on the quality of instruction and advising (See Appendix B).

3. Transcript.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee will provide a brief analysis of the transcript that identifies in course selection and grades. These can be used to provide a comprehensive portrait of the major.

4-B. Graduate Methodology.

The Department of History will create graduate students portfolios that may include the following materials:

1. Writing Samples.

Graduate students will contribute at least three samples of their writings.
A. Seminar Papers

Faculty teaching the Graduate Seminar will contribute copies of student papers from the course. Each M.A. student will have two papers and Ph.D. student – four. The Graduate Assessment Committee will evaluate the writings on the basis of a general evaluation rubric (See Appendix A). Scores will be quantified for purposes of comparison over time.

B. Theses

Students at both the Masters and Ph.D. levels research and write theses that are independently graded and evaluated by a committee of graduate faculty. Faculty will be urged to grade students according to an established evaluation rubric in addition to their overall evaluation. These scores will be archived in a database and updated yearly.

2. Exit Interview.

The Graduate Assessment Committee will distribute “exit questionnaire” for completion by graduate students in the last semester of their program. The questionnaire includes questions on the quality of instruction and advising (See Appendix C).

5. Feedback Loop

To better provide a sense a sense of community among our undergraduate majors we launched an undergraduate history club that we hope will provide opportunities for building a community of scholars and strengthening identification with our department. We’ll also reassess and revise our advising procedures in consultation with the college office.

Our graduate students actively participate in the History Honor Society (Phi Alpha Theta) that also includes undergraduate students and faculty. The Society organizes scholarly presentations and social meetings that strengthen identification with our department.

We’ll also reassess and revise our procedures in consultation with the Arts and Sciences College and Graduate School.

6. Action Plan

End of each Semester

1. Student papers will be requested from professors in HIST 2000 and HIST 6990/8990.
2. The exit questionnaires will be completed by both senior and graduate students.
3. Senior students submit a paper in the course of the students’ choice.
4. Students defending M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations will contribute copies of their manuscripts.
Beginning of Fall Semester  The Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Graduate Assessment Committee will meet to evaluate student portfolios.

The End of September  Evaluations will be tabulated and archived by the department chairperson. Chair of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the Chair of the Graduate Assessment Committee will prepare reports.

The reports will be submitted to the College and University Assessment Committees. The reports and suggestions of the College and University Assessment Committees will be the basis for department-wide discussions of curricular and programmatic changes.

William J. O’Neal, Chair
Department of History
## Appendix A

### Rubric for the Evaluation of History Department Graduate Student Works (16 possible points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Understanding (Goal 1)</strong></td>
<td>- Underdeveloped ideas</td>
<td>- Develops a variety of simple ideas</td>
<td>- Presents ideas of some complexity</td>
<td>- Develops ideas fully to create greater understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shows little understanding of the topic</td>
<td>- Shows some understanding of the topic</td>
<td>- Shows understanding of the topic</td>
<td>- Shows thorough understanding of the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No clear point of view</td>
<td>- Point of view somewhat clear</td>
<td>- Point of view clearly expressed</td>
<td>- Point of view clearly and convincingly expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weak vocabulary</td>
<td>- Contains some good vocabulary</td>
<td>- Contains good vocabulary</td>
<td>- Contains new terminology that supports the work and a wide variety of sentences effectively used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One type of sentence</td>
<td>- Contains variety of sentences</td>
<td>- Structure is logical and effective</td>
<td>- Structure supports the thesis and enhances the argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no clear organization</td>
<td>- There are several errors and omissions</td>
<td>- A thesis is clearly expressed</td>
<td>- Thesis clearly expressed and resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No thesis has been stated</td>
<td>- A thesis is presented but is not clearly expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There are several major errors and major omissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking and Writing Skills (Goal 2)</strong></td>
<td>- Inability to state opposing points of view</td>
<td>- Vague understanding that other perspectives and arguments exist</td>
<td>- Clear evidence of understanding that other perspectives and viewpoints exist but an inability to accurately articulate them</td>
<td>- Writing demonstrates fluency of understanding of multiple perspectives and Evidence of appreciation of cultural diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rudimentary research undertaken</td>
<td>- Evidence of research</td>
<td>- Use of both primary and secondary sources</td>
<td>- Extensive, appropriate and varied use of both primary and secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No bibliography or sourcing</td>
<td>- Sketchy use of relevant secondary sources</td>
<td>- Bibliography and proper sourcing present</td>
<td>- Detailed bibliography correctly presented and sophisticated use of quotes present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Little use of relevant secondary sources</td>
<td>- Bibliography present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Exit Interview

The Department of History would appreciate your comments concerning your academic work. You responses will be confidential.

Age ___   Sex ___

Great Point Average in History ______

Overall Grade Point Average ______

Are you graduating with Honors? _____

What course or courses in your major have you found the most valuable?

What criteria do you use in determining whether a course has been worthwhile?

What courses outside your major department have you found most valuable?

Which faculty members in your department offered the best quality instruction and were most helpful in preparing you for your major? Please explain.
Please comment on the quality of academic advising in your department.

Please rate overall quality of teaching you found in the courses taught by your department.

Excellent     Good       Poor
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Would you recommend the History Department to your friend?

If you were to start ever, what changes, if any, would you make in your academic program?
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Graduate Student Exit Interview

The Department of History would appreciate your comments concerning your academic work. Your responses will be confidential.

Age ___  Sex ___

Great Point Average ______

What course or courses have you found the most valuable?

What criteria do you use in determining whether a course has been worthwhile?

What courses outside your department have you found most valuable?

Which faculty members in your department offered the best quality instruction and were most helpful in preparing you for your degree? Please explain.

Please comment on the quality of academic advising in your department.
Please rate overall quality of teaching you found in the courses taught by your department.

Excellent 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Good

Please comment on research opportunities at the University of Toledo.

Would you recommend the History Department to your friend?

If you were to start ever, what changes, if any, would you make in your academic program?
1. Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of History is to provide the highest possible quality of instruction in the content, methods and skills of history at both graduate and undergraduate levels. In this mission the Department prepares historians and teachers with both breadth and depth, trains students in the discipline of history and acquaints them with the profession, and promotes a greater public understanding and awareness of the past. History is thus a cornerstone of a liberal education.

All contemporary problems are historical in origin, and the study of history and its methodologies is therefore critical in problem solving in all areas of human endeavor. Courses in history help students in all majors develop critical thinking and writing skills. Designated as a pre-law major in the College of Arts and Sciences, history also prepares students for success in legal education.

The Department is committed to support university efforts to serve Northwest Ohio with outreach programs that include research projects, public speakers, and continuing education programs. Faculty members also serve as a reservoir of historical knowledge available to members of the general public. Finally, the Department is especially committed to public history, which advocates the active involvement of academic historians with the local community. Research constitutes a significant aspect of the Department mission, and faculty members are expected to publish and present the original contribution of their work, which serve to deepen our understanding of the past.

Through numerous course offerings that cover most of the nations and regions of the world in addition to the United States, the Department encourages an understanding and appreciation of the diversity of cultural experiences. The study of history also helps to break down barriers that foster racial, gender, and other forms of discrimination.

The Department is committed to respecting divergent views, for without freedom of expression history has little value. Engaged in the pursuit and dissemination of historical knowledge, the Department stand committed to the highest ethical standards in instruction, research, and service.

2. Unit Assessment Structure

A. Undergraduate

Curriculum and Assessment Committee will consist of Undergraduate Adviser, who will chair the committee, faculty teaching the Methods Seminar (History 2000), and one faculty from other departments.
B. Graduate

A Graduate Assessment Committee will consist of Director of Graduate Studies, who will chair the committee, faculty teaching the Graduate Seminar (History 6990/8990) and one graduate faculty from other departments.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based.

The following goals and objectives have been approved by the Department of History on February 20, 2004.

GOAL 1. Student will demonstrate a broad understanding of historical developments, their relationship to the present, and the methods of historical research.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate their knowledge of the subject areas of history and make accurate connections between developments in time and place.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to undertake historical research and interpretation using the methods of the discipline.

Objective C. Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize the contribution of historical antecedents to the understanding of current personal, social and political situations and developments.

Goal 2. Students will develop critical thinking and writing skills.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze historical questions and issues clearly and precisely, formulate historical information accurately, distinguish the relevant from irrelevant, recognize key questionable historical assumptions, use key historical concepts effectively, identify relevant competing historical points of view, and reason carefully from clearly stated historical premises.

Objective B. Students will communicate thinking clearly through effective writing, demonstrating their comprehension, critical interrogation and synthesis of a variety of sources.

Goal 3. Students will express an understanding and appreciation of the cultural diversity.

Objective A. Student will demonstrate the ability to recognize multiple perspectives and appreciate those perspectives which produce a world-view different from one’s own.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to use another perspective to analyze historical events and cultural practices.

Goal 4. Students will become familiar with the professional methodology of historian.
Objective A. Students will use and critique both primary and secondary sources.

Objective B. Students will become familiar with the opportunities for teaching, research and public service which the profession offers.

4-A. Undergraduate Methodology

The Department of History will create undergraduate students portfolios that may include the following materials:

1. Writing Samples.

History majors will contribute samples of their writing from three (at least two) stages of the degree program.

--Faculty teaching the Methods Seminar (usually taken during the sophomore year) will contribute copies of student papers from the course.

--Students will choose two other writing samples for inclusion in the portfolio.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee will evaluate the writings on the basis of a general evaluation rubric (See Appendix A). Scores will be quantified for purposes of comparison over time.

2. Exit Interview.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee will distribute “exit questionnaire” for completion by history majors enrolled in 4000 level courses during their senior year. The questionnaire includes questions on the quality of instruction and advising (See Appendix B).

3. Transcript.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee will provide a brief analysis of the transcript that identifies in course selection and grades. These can be used to provide a comprehensive portrait of the major.

4-B. Graduate Methodology.

The Department of History will create graduate students portfolios that may include the following materials:

1. Writing Samples.

Graduate students will contribute at least three samples of their writings.
A. Seminar Papers

Faculty teaching the Graduate Seminar will contribute copies of student papers from the course. Each M.A. student will have two papers and Ph.D. student – four. The Graduate Assessment Committee will evaluate the writings on the basis of a general evaluation rubric (See Appendix A). Scores will be quantified for purposes of comparison over time.

B. Theses

Students at both the Masters and Ph.D. levels research and write theses that are independently graded and evaluated by a committee of graduate faculty. Faculty will be urged to grade students according to an established evaluation rubric in addition to their overall evaluation. These scores will be archived in a database and updated yearly.

2. Exit Interview.

The Graduate Assessment Committee will distribute “exit questionnaire” for completion by graduate students in the last semester of their program. The questionnaire includes questions on the quality of instruction and advising (See Appendix C).

5. Feedback Loop

To better provide a sense a sense of community among our undergraduate majors we launched an undergraduate history club that we hope will provide opportunities for building a community of scholars and strengthening identification with our department. We’ll also reassess and revise our advising procedures in consultation with the college office.

Our graduate students actively participate in the History Honor Society (Phi Alpha Theta) that also includes undergraduate students and faculty. The Society organizes scholarly presentations and social meetings that strengthen identification with our department.

We’ll also reassess and revise our procedures in consultation with the Arts and Sciences College and Graduate School.

6. Action Plan

End of each Semester

1. Student papers will be requested from professors in HIST 2000 and HIST 6990/8990.
2. The exit questionnaires will be completed by both senior and graduate students.
3. Senior students submit a paper in the course of the students’ choice.
4. Students defending M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations will contribute copies of their manuscripts.
Beginning of Fall Semester  The Curriculum and Assessment Committee and Graduate Assessment Committee will meet to evaluate student portfolios.

The End of September  Evaluations will be tabulated and archived by the department chairperson. Chair of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the Chair of the Graduate Assessment Committee will prepare reports.

The reports will be submitted to the College and University Assessment Committees. The reports and suggestions of the College and University Assessment Committees will be the basis for department-wide discussions of curricular and programmatic changes.

William J. O’Neal, Chair
Department of History
# Appendix A

## Rubric for the Evaluation of History Department Graduate Student Works (16 possible points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Understanding</strong> (Goal 1)</td>
<td>- Underdeveloped ideas</td>
<td>- Develops a variety of simple ideas</td>
<td>- Presents ideas of some complexity</td>
<td>- Develops ideas fully to create greater understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shows little understanding of the topic</td>
<td>- Shows some understanding of the topic</td>
<td>- Shows understanding of the topic</td>
<td>- Shows thorough understanding of the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No clear point of view</td>
<td>- Point of view somewhat clear</td>
<td>- Point of view clearly expressed</td>
<td>- Point of view clearly and convincingly expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weak vocabulary</td>
<td>- Contains some good vocabulary</td>
<td>- Contains good vocabulary</td>
<td>- Contains new terminology that supports the work and a wide variety of sentences effectively used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One type of sentence</td>
<td>- Contains variety of sentences</td>
<td>- There are only a few errors and omissions</td>
<td>- Structure is logical and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no clear structure or organization</td>
<td>- There are several errors and omissions</td>
<td>- A thesis is presented but is not clearly expressed</td>
<td>- A thesis is clearly expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No thesis has been stated</td>
<td>- A thesis is presented but is not clearly expressed</td>
<td>- A thesis is clearly expressed</td>
<td>- Thesis clearly expressed and resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking and Writing Skills</strong> (Goal 2)</td>
<td>- No evidence of awareness of multiple perspectives to events</td>
<td>- Vague understanding that other perspectives and arguments exist</td>
<td>- Clear evidence of understanding that other perspectives and viewpoints exist but an inability to accurately articulate them</td>
<td>- Writing demonstrates fluency of understanding of multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inability to state opposing points of view</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Evidence of appreciation of cultural diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Understanding</strong> (Goal 3)</td>
<td>- Rudimentary research undertaken</td>
<td>- Evidence of research undertaken</td>
<td>- Use of both primary and secondary sources</td>
<td>- Extensive, appropriate and varied use of both primary and secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No bibliography or sourcing</td>
<td>- Sketchy use of relevant secondary sources</td>
<td>- Bibliography and proper sourcing present</td>
<td>- Detailed bibliography correctly presented and sophisticated use of quotes present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Little use of relevant secondary sources</td>
<td>- Bibliography present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Exit Interview

The Department of History would appreciate your comments concerning your academic work. Your responses will be confidential.

Age ____  Sex ___

Great Point Average in History ______

Overall Grade Point Average ______

Are you graduating with Honors? _____

What course or courses in your major have you found the most valuable?

What criteria do you use in determining whether a course has been worthwhile?

What courses outside your major department have you found most valuable?

Which faculty members in your department offered the best quality instruction and were most helpful in preparing you for your major? Please explain.
Please comment on the quality of academic advising in your department.

Please rate overall quality of teaching you found in the courses taught by your department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would you recommend the History Department to your friend?

If you were to start ever, what changes, if any, would you make in your academic program?
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Graduate Student Exit Interview

The Department of History would appreciate your comments concerning your academic work. You responses will be confidential.

Age ___   Sex ___

Great Point Average ______

What course or courses have you found the most valuable?

What criteria do you use in determining whether a course has been worthwhile?

What courses outside your department have you found most valuable?

Which faculty members in your department offered the best quality instruction and were most helpful in preparing you for your degree? Please explain.

Please comment on the quality of academic advising in your department.
Please rate overall quality of teaching you found in the courses taught by your department.

Excellent     Good       Poor
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Please comment on research opportunities at the University of Toledo.

Would you recommend the History Department to your friend?

If you were to start ever, what changes, if any, would you make in your academic program?
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1. Mission Statement: Department of Geography and Planning

The mission of the Department of Geography and Planning is to provide a quality multi-functional program that supplies service at the general education and baccalaureate level to the university community, provides quality undergraduate and graduate programs, fosters theoretical and applied research in geography and planning, promotes multicultural understanding, complements interdisciplinary work, and engages in community outreach.

2. GEPL Assessment Structure

**Department Organizational Chart**

- Chair, Department of Geography and Planning: Dr. Peter Lindquist
- Department Secretary: Nadine Hoffman
- Personnel Committee Chair: Dr. David J. Nemeth
- Undergraduate Advisor: Dr. David J. Nemeth
- Graduate Advisor: Dr. Patrick Lawrence
- Internship director: Dr. Daniel Hammel
- AAUP Liaison: Dr. David Nemeth
- GTU Advisor: Dr. David J. Nemeth
- Department Personnel Committee (all tenured faculty)
- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Lawrence, Schlemer, Lindquist
- Assessment Committee: Lindquist, Lawrence, Nemeth, Czajkowski
- Graduate Curriculum Committee: Lawrence, Hammel, Czajkowski, Lindquist
- Director, Instructional Computing Lab: Dr. Kevin Czajkowski
- Director, Lake Erie Center Labs: Dr. Kevin Czajkowski
- Director, GISAG Center: Dr. Kevin Czajkowski
- Director, Hoffman Library: Dr. David J. Nemeth
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Key elements of the leadership, governance structure, and assessment of The Department of Geography and Planning

The Chair (Dr. Lindquist) serves the department to coordinate all budgetary, curricular, service, and research activities in the department. The chair is responsible for personnel decisions in terms of recommendations to the dean for hiring, annual renewal of untenured faculty, tenure, promotion and merit decisions upon the recommendations of the Personnel Committee.

The Undergraduate Advisor (Dr. Nemeth) serves to advise all undergraduate students in curricular matters, coordinates course changes and program changes in the undergraduate program, and serves as Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. In addition, the undergraduate advisor oversees the pre- and post-testing program for majors within the department and conducts exit interviews as part of our assessment efforts in the department. He reports directly to the chair.

The Graduate Advisor (Dr. Lawrence) serves to oversee graduate admissions in cooperation with the Graduate Curriculum Committee. He advises all graduate students in curricular matters prior to the assignment of their thesis advisor. He coordinates the assignment of teaching assistants to faculty and coordinates the comprehensive examination process. He reports directly to the chair.

The Department Assessment Committee serves to review assessment plans, carry out assessment activities (e.g., student interviews, pre- and post-testing, comprehensive examinations, etc.), and prepare annual assessment reports on behalf of the faculty of the department faculty. Members of the assessment committee include the following:

- Peter S. Lindquist (GEPL Chair)
- Patrick Lawrence (Graduate Advisor)
- David "Jim" Nemeth (Undergraduate Advisor)
- Kevin Czajkowski (Director, GIS Certificate Program)

Department Staffing

Faculty:

- Dr. Bhuiyan Alam, Assistant Professor
- Dr. Kevin Czajkowski, Associate Professor
- Dr. Daniel Hammel, Associate Professor
- Dr. Patrick Lawrence, Associate Professor and Graduate Advisor
- Dr. Peter Lindquist, Associate Professor and Chair
- Dr. David J. Nemeth, Professor and Undergraduate Advisor
- Dr. Neil Reid, Associate Professor and Director, Urban Affairs Center
- Dr. M. Beth Schlemper, Lecturer
- Dr. Sujata Shetty, Assistant Professor

9 Teaching Assistants: Assist faculty in teaching

12 Graduate Research Assistants
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3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

At the present time, the department does not operate within any legal, regulatory, licensing, or accrediting environment. We are, however, in the process of proposing a professional graduate degree program in Urban and Regional Planning in which we will seek accreditation from the Planning Accreditation Board of the American Collegiate Schools of Planning. The department will be eligible for accreditation within this organization five years after approval and implementation of the new degree program.

In terms of self-assessment, external assessments, or reviews within the past ten years, we have only engaged in self-assessment as part of the wider initiative in assessment within the College of Arts and Sciences. Our undergraduate assessments include standardized pre- and post-testing of students in the program as well as a detailed exit interviews conducted by the undergraduate advisor. Graduate assessments are based on external assessment criteria that include both academic placement of graduates into Ph.D. Programs and job placements into professional positions. Internal assessment criteria for the graduate program include 1) Completion rates/grades issued for performance in comprehensive examination for first year students; 2) Number of completed master theses during the academic year; 3) Student scholarly and research achievements: paper presentations at conferences, publications, and other outlets for scholarship during the academic year; and 4) Number of research assistants and interns funded in program during the academic year.

4. Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate Assessment

PART I: GRADUATE EDUCATION

a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

Department Goals and Expectations for Graduate Students

In general, graduate outcomes in GEPL include successful completion of: 1) 36 credits of course work and thesis with a minimum 3.00 GPA; 2) successful completion of a comprehensive examination; and 3) successful defense of a completed thesis. The department uses a limited number of assessment tools to evaluate our program’s ability to assist students in completing these educational objectives and in obtaining the broad competencies defined by GEPL Graduate faculty. These broad competencies are listed as five primary levels of achievement expected of graduate students:
1. A general knowledge of the traditions, history and philosophical underpinnings of the disciplines of geography and planning. In addition, students are expected to achieve a level of competency in an applied or theoretical area. During the first semester all incoming graduate students will be required to take a diagnostic examination assessing their knowledge of basic geographic concepts. After the exam, each student will meet with the instructor of the philosophy and methods class to bolster skills, if needed. This may involve independent study or course work taken for credit or audit.

2. Strong computer skills in cartography, computer graphics, location analysis, and multivariate statistical analysis.

3. The development of basic research skills as demonstrated by completion of a theoretical or applied thesis project.

4. Comprehensive understanding of classical and contemporary literature in an area of specialization. Demonstrated by successful completion of comprehensive examination.

5. Adequate writing and communications skills demonstrated by completion of a master’s thesis and oral defense.

**Assessment Approaches and Data Collection Based on Established Assessment Criteria**

The department currently uses an assessment strategy that involves data collection based on the following:

1. Completion rates/grades issued for performance in comprehensive examination for first year students;

2. Number of completed master theses during academic year;

3. Student scholarly and research achievements: paper presentations at conferences, publications, and other outlets for scholarship during the academic year;

4. Number of research assistants and interns funded in program during the academic year.

**Internal Graduate Assessment Criteria**

1. **The Master’s Comprehensive Exam.** The master’s comprehensive examination in GEPL is an effective diagnostic tool used to evaluate a graduate student’s progress with respect to the Department’s expectations. The exam is scheduled at the end of the first year of graduate study, during the second half of the Spring Semester. To qualify, a student must have a "B" average (3.0 or better) for all graduate course work, a B or better in both Research Methods (6150) and Philosophy and General Methods (6100), at least 15 credit hours of completed course work not including teaching practicum or internship credit, be enrolled for a full-time schedule during the semester when the comprehensive exam is scheduled, and have all incomplete and progress grades removed from the record. Upon successful completion of the examination, the student is formally admitted to candidacy for the master's degree in geography and planning. Also, students must have successfully completed the requirements for the diagnostic exam.
A. Examination Format. The format of the comprehensive examination is based on two parts, a written examination followed by an oral examination. The content of the written and oral examinations are divided into two primary examination topics: (1) a general set of questions related to core material associated with the philosophical and historical elements of the discipline of geography and planning, and (2) a set of questions related to a specific specialization area within geography and planning that interests the student.

B. Examination Committee Composition. The composition of the faculty committee is based primarily on the student's area of specialization. The three examiners submit two questions each, for the written portion of the examination. This is a closed book examination and students are given the entire day to complete the examination. In the one-hour oral examination, the three examiners ask the majority of questions. Other faculty members are invited to attend and ask follow-up questions. The three examiners in consultation with the other attending faculty members make final evaluation of the student.

C. Evaluation Criteria for Comprehensive Exam. The general understanding of the faculty is that little additional preparation is needed for the exam other than selected readings and a review of past course work. Other than the general review, all candidates preparing for the examination consult with each of the three examiners to prepare a bibliography of selected reading materials in the topical area of their specialization. Consultation with each of the faculty members will alert the student to those general and specific areas which will be covered in the examination. Specific evaluation criteria to be used in the examination include the following:

1. The student's understanding of the philosophical and historical dimensions of the discipline of geography.
2. The ability of the student to define and understand basic geographic concepts, methods and theories in their field of specialization.
3. The level of the student's comprehension of the current literature and authors in their areas of specialization.
4. The student's writing skills with respect to coherence, organization and accuracy.
5. The student's oral communication skills.

Students may pass the comprehensive examination unconditionally and continue normal progress toward the degree. Students who pass unconditionally are given a letter grade. A conditional pass means that examiners have learned of some deficiencies in the student's knowledge of the discipline and additional study is assigned. The student is notified of these deficiencies after the oral exam and later in writing. The conditional pass is not a reprimand but a constructive criticism. Candidacy is delayed until successful completion of remedial study, to be determined by the graduate adviser or another faculty member. Normally this work occupies only a summer or an additional semester. Upon successful completion of remedial study, a student is assigned a grade no higher than a B+. Occasionally a student may not meet the expectations of the examiners and will
be asked to repeat the oral exam or the entire examination, normally during the following semester. A second unsuccessful attempt will result in the student being required to leave the graduate program.

2. The Master’s Thesis. Immediately after the successful completion of the comprehensive exams, the student chooses a thesis committee by completing a Thesis Advising Form. A thesis committee consisting of three voting members is required for each student. The student selects a thesis advisor whose area of specialization is consistent with the student's thesis topic. One member of the committee may be a faculty member from outside the department. In the case of the applied thesis option, the committee consists of three geography and planning faculty members and a fourth member (practicing professional) from an outside agency. Superannuate and adjunct faculty can serve as additional non-voting members. After the committee has been formed and the faculty has accepted the proposal, the graduate school's Notice of Thesis form must be filed.

Following the selection of the thesis committee and the research topic the student prepares a formal thesis proposal to be presented orally to the department's faculty and students. Problems in Geography (GEPL-6910) should be taken with the prospective thesis advisor during the second semester of residency with the objective of preparing the proposal.

Two thesis track options are available to students based on their interests and career objectives: (1) the traditional academic thesis, and (2) the professional or applied thesis option. The professional project option differs from the traditional academic thesis only by its emphasis on the practical solution to problems through the application of geographic methodology and techniques. Formats of the two-thesis option are similar and will vary according to the nature of the problem or topic. Additional components of the applied thesis would necessarily include maps and figures where appropriate and a bibliography. Where necessary, a technical appendix must also accompany the text when models or techniques of a complex nature are incorporated in the study.

3. Student Presentations, Publications and other Outlets. The Department of Geography and Planning encourages graduate students to publish and present their work at regional and national conferences. Funds are provided for student travel and registration for conferences. Department faculty keeps records of student scholarship in addition to completed theses.

4. Records of Research Assistants and Interns Externally Funded. The faculty of the Department of Geography and Planning devote considerable effort to funding students in research projects and internships. Both types of positions are competitively awarded and provide not only a measure of the department’s capacity to support student work but also provide evidence of students’ knowledge, skills and productivity in being placed in these positions.
b. **Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)**

The department currently uses an assessment strategy that involves data collection based on external assessment criteria for the graduate program. These include:

1. **Job Placement of Graduates.** The department makes every attempt to maintain records of job placements of graduates of the MA program as a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum and research experience of our students in producing competitive candidates for professional positions.

2. **Academic Placement of Graduates.** In a similar manner, the department makes every attempt to maintain records of academic placements of graduates in Ph.D. programs as a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum and research experience of our students in producing competitive candidates for advanced graduate study. The department maintains records for both acceptance into Ph.D. programs and financial support awarded in those programs.

---

**PART II: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

a. **Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)**

**Department Goals and Expectations for Undergraduate Students**

In general, previous versions of the department assessment plan cited five major academic outcomes for undergraduates majoring in Geography and Planning:

1. All undergraduate majors must acquire knowledge of fundamental geography and planning terms and concepts.

2. All undergraduate majors must have an understanding of each of the major traditions in geography. These include: 1) Community and Urban Planning; 2) Geographic Information Science; 3) Environmental Geography and Planning; 4) Economic Geography; and 5) Cultural and Behavioral Geography

3. All undergraduate students must acquire basic graphiacy skills, particularly with respect to maps and their usage

4. All students must acquire basic quantitative skills and microcomputer literacy with respect to word processing, computer cartography and graphics, geographic information systems (GIS), statistical analysis and elementary data management.

5. To ensure that all undergraduate majors have adequate writing and communications skills demonstrated by writing intensive courses, a capstone course or senior thesis, and oral class presentations

Accepted by University Assessment Committee 9/8/08
Presented to Provost’s Council 9/25/08
Assessment Approaches and Data Collection Based on Established Assessment Criteria

The department currently conducts an exit interview of all majors during the semester in which they are graduating. The undergraduate advisor conducts this interview in his office. Students are tested on an oral basis for their knowledge of fundamental terms and concepts that the department faculty have assembled into a formal list. This list consists of 100 fundamental terms and concepts in Geography and Planning. Students are also questioned in regard to future plans for immediate employment, graduate study, and long-term career plans. The undergraduate advisor reports his findings from these interviews to the faculty in regular faculty meetings.

In addition to the exit interview, the department chair has assembled an inventory of GEPL majors who have graduated and records such data as current address, employer, job description, and any graduate study that the graduate has undertaken.

This approach is currently undergoing modification based on recent discussions among department faculty to produce a plan to design, develop and implement a pre-testing and post-testing program for undergraduate majors. Department undergraduate faculty will develop a test instrument to be administered to students in the required undergraduate foundation course: *Fundamentals of Geography (GEPL 2010)*. The Undergraduate Advisor will then administer the test instrument to the same population of students during their final semester to evaluate the progress made by students in the program.

The test instrument is based on the approach used in the Geography Program in the Department of Geography-Geology at Illinois State University. This test instrument was developed by Peter Lindquist (then at Illinois State University) and James Carter. Members of the GEPL Assessment Committee are currently reviewing the test instrument and will make the necessary modifications to include Planning-related material. This test is designed to test students’ knowledge of fundamental concepts, graphicacy, quantitative skills, and written communication skills.

This test is administered during the spring semester to all majors enrolled in GEPL 2010. The test results will then be kept on record to compare to students’ performance during their final semester of study.

b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

External evaluation of student outcomes currently assessed include both career placement in positions related to geography and planning and placement of undergraduate majors in graduate programs.

In addition to the external evaluation process, each graduating senior is interviewed by the undergraduate advisor. The exit interview will continue to be administered during the Progress Evaluation appointment conducted by the undergraduate advisor during each student’s final semester. The post test using the test instrument described above will also be administered at this time. The undergraduate advisor
will also continue to inquire about students’ career plans, plans for graduate study and/or employment. These data will then be recorded and submitted as a report as a second element of GEPL assessment.

The inventory of GEPL majors who have graduated consisting of current addresses, employers, job description/title, and graduate study will also continue to be developed and maintained and included in the department assessment effort. It is the responsibility of the GEPL Chair to submit an annual assessment report consisting of the following three elements:

1. Pre-Post test results and discussion
2. Student career/graduate study/employment plans
3. Inventory of alumni: location, employment, advanced degrees.

5. Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)

In the years following the initial implementation of the department assessment plan, the department has carried out a number of reviews of departmental performance based on assessment results—most notably on the undergraduate level. These reviews have taken place on an annual basis in Fall Semesters using results of exit interviews and pre- and post-testing. These reviews stimulated significant discussion among the faculty and resulted in significant changes to the undergraduate curriculum as a means for students to develop fundamental proficiencies identified as critical for any geographer and planner. Initial modifications to the curriculum in the past ten years included:

A. Development of GEPL 2010: Fundamentals of Geography to 1) introduce students to the fundamental methodology for Geography and Planning, 2) to introduce the vocabulary of the discipline, and 3) to introduce fundamental concepts and approaches to study within geography and Planning. An important element of the course is a list of 100 important terms and concepts that every geographer and planner must understand.

B. Development of GEPL 3040: Quantitative Methods and Mapping to introduce students to fundamental mapping concepts which are essential to all geographers (given that the map is the fundamental tool of the discipline). The course also introduces fundamental elements of the use of graphs and graphic display of analytical data to develop graphicy skills for our students. Students are also introduced to basic statistical techniques ranging from descriptive statistics to inferential statistics including means testing, ANOVA, correlation and regression.

Subsequent assessment reviews in the past five years have focused on the analysis of the information we collected from pre- and post-testing and our exit interviews. Our findings from these more recent reviews led to the conclusion that we needed to direct our efforts to assuring that our students are provided with the necessary breadth of topics and subfields within the discipline to assured that they are "well-rounded" geographers upon graduation. In
recent years, the difference between the pre- and post-tests has been fairly consistent, with an average of 42% on the pre-test and 69% on the post-test. While this average score of 69% for our graduates may appear to be somewhat low, it is important to note that Geography is a diverse discipline with subfields ranging from human and cultural phenomena to the natural environment and technical fields such as Statistics, Cartography, GIS and Remote Sensing. Not all of our students take all of the courses that would enable them to obtain higher scores on the exam.

This led to discussions regarding modification of course content in GEPL 2010 to include a more broad-based survey of the discipline. Given that we have now experienced five years of results with very similar outcomes, we have the necessary data to help us in evaluating our current curriculum to provide our students with the necessary breadth of knowledge coming out of our program.

In addition, GEPL faculty have recommended continued review of the test instrument to assure that it adequately measures student progress and reflects intended learning outcomes within the undergraduate curriculum. We have yet to agree as a faculty that any changes in the exam are warranted at the present time; further analysis of the exam will still be required to determine whether the instrument is truly a reliable and valid instrument to test our students.

We will continue to work on changes in both of these areas over the current academic year. We also want to continue conducting our exit interviews, compile our database and report on the success of our alumni with regard to graduate study and job placement before we consider any changes to assessment in our program.

Specific outcomes from these most recent reviews can be summarized on findings from exit interviews, which have yielded a common desire on the part of students to acquire more technical expertise in the discipline and a more specialized degree program to reflect this technical emphasis. Thus one positive outcome of the exit interviews was to revise the undergraduate major and minor to include more specialized concentrations. We have therefore had the following specialized major and minor programs approved and placed in the catalog:

- Bachelor of Arts in Geography Concentration in Geographic Information Science
- Bachelor of Arts in Geography Concentration in Planning
- Minor in Geographic Information Science
- Minor in Urban and Regional Planning

These major changes proposed in the program were primarily curricular in scope. Exit interviews will be modified to provide more formal documentation. These changes have been documented in the sections listed above.

Again, much of our assessment effort will revolve around pre-testing at our majors’ entry point in the GEPL 2010 course, and post-testing with an exit interview during the Progress Evaluation session with the undergraduate advisor.

Most of the feedback mechanisms for our graduate program were described in the assessment methodology under Part 4. Students receive detailed reviews of comprehensive examination performance and thesis.
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7. Action Plan

a. Timelines

The typical process for pre-and post-testing of students begins with the testing of all of the majors enrolled in GEPL 2010 during the beginning of the Spring, 2004 Semester. Dr. M. Beth Schlemper will be in charge of this course and will administer the test. The Undergraduate Advisor (Dr. David J. Nemeth) will grade the exam along with the members of the GEPL Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The post-test and the exit interview will be conducted by the Undergraduate Advisor (Dr. Nemeth) in the last two weeks of each graduating student’s last semester (Spring and Fall).

Analysis of the unit’s assessment findings will be carried out by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee under the direction of the Undergraduate Advisor.

These findings will then be included in an annual report submitted in May, 2009 by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Department Chair.

b. Responsible Persons

The faculty members responsible for assessment in the Department of Geography and Planning include the following:

**Dr. Peter S. Lindquist, GEPL Chair.** Coordinates all assessment data collection, oversees management of student placement records, prepares annual assessment reports in cooperation with the Department Assessment Committee.

**Dr. David Nemeth, Undergraduate Adviser.** Coordinates all pre- and post-testing activities, carries out exit interviews of all students preparing to graduate.

**Dr. Patrick Lawrence, Graduate Advisor.** Coordinates comprehensive examinations, advises students preparing to select thesis committees, gathers data pertaining to placement of students in professional positions or advanced graduate study. coordinates the comprehensive examination process. He reports directly to the chair.

The **Department Assessment Committee** serves to review assessment plans, carry out assessment activities, and prepare annual assessment reports on behalf of the faculty of the department faculty. Members of the assessment committee include the following:

- Peter S. Lindquist (GEPL Chair)
- Patrick Lawrence (Graduate Advisor)
- David "Jim" Nemeth (Undergraduate Advisor)
- Kevin Czajkowski (Director, GIS Certificate Program)
1. Unit Mission Statement

*The mission of the Department is to instruct graduate and undergraduate majors in French, German, and Spanish, and minors in these three languages as well as Japanese; the focus is language and culture studies. The Department also helps students fulfill the Arts & Sciences and International Business foreign language requirement with elementary and intermediate language course work in Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Latin, and Spanish. In addition, the Department plays a pivotal role in the training of students in the College of Education who plan to teach a foreign language; we provide course work, a teaching colloquium, and mentoring.*

2. Unit Assessment Structure

French Personnel Support: 1 full professor and 1 associate professor; 1 ABD part-time instructor offer the courses for the major

2 full-time lecturers, 4-6 part-time instructors offer service courses

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based

The plan is based on ACTFL/NCATE program standards

[http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/Index.cfm?pageid=3384](http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/Index.cfm?pageid=3384)

4. Methodology for College-Level Assessment

a. Student Learning Outcomes

The French section has collected the following information and data on student learning outcomes:

- Tests and exams in individual French courses (oral and written)
- Compositions (original, peer corrected and self-corrected versions of compositions)
- Research papers
- Portfolios (from all 3000 and 4000 level classes)
- Exit interviews
- Study Abroad Experiences

b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

- French section has one advisor for majors, minors, graduate and study abroad students.
- There is no assessment tool to assess service outcomes, but communications between students and their advisers are open and even continue after graduation.
- The adviser maintains e-mail communications between French section and majors.
5. Feedback Loop

- Providing feedback to students: French 3010, 3020, 4010 and 4020 regularly incorporate process writing which requires the students to work on drafts and revisions of their writing assignments based on written comments from the instructor. Students receive corrected and graded exams and assignments. Instructors confer with students outside of class.

- French 4020 includes an exit interview with graduating seniors for comments about self-assessment and program satisfaction.

- Changes in curriculum and course offerings are based on student learning outcomes and student feedback.

6. Synthesis of Department Plans

7. Action Plan
   a. Timelines
      - Data of student learning outcomes will continue to be collected throughout the academic year
   b. Responsible Persons
      - Data collection: French faculty of upper-level courses
      - Data analysis and findings: French faculty teaching upper-level courses
      - Annual report: French assessment committee chair

8. Appendices: French Major Assessment Plan
Department of Environmental Sciences
Summary Assessment Report for Academic Year 2007-2008

1. College/Unit Mission Statement

Neither the Department nor the College has developed a formal Mission Statement.

The undergraduate program of the EEES department spans the sciences of biology, geology, environmental sciences and environmental studies. Because of the great diversity of programs and our interdisciplinary mission, the department’s learning objectives were broken into more discrete objectives and outcomes that are tied to its various majors. This change was necessary in order for the learning objectives to be more concrete and to make it easier to measure outcomes. The learning objectives for the geology and environmental sciences/studies majors are set forth in the general assessment document of the department. We are still in the formative stage of writing objectives for our new biology major.

2. Overall College/Unit Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, college assessment committee membership)

2007-2008 assessments were conducted by Dr. V. Max Brown (retired, 2008), Dr. Elliot Tramer (retired, 2007) and Dr. Von Sigler, with Dr. Mike Phillips (DES Chair). Drs. Brown and Tramer were replaced by Dr. Don Stierman and Dr. Jon Bossenbroek in the areas of geology and ecology/environmental science respectively. Dr. David Krantz is teaching EEES 4920, the senior seminar that concludes with the geology assessment examination.

The Department of Environmental Sciences presently has had no professional secretarial staff to support preparation of this report.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

This item was not requested as part of previous assessment reports and, as their Plan for 2007-2008 was implemented by faculty who are now retired and did not document their assumptions, they remain unclear.

We met as a committee (Stierman, Sigler, and Bossenbroek) shortly after first receiving (on 1/15/2009) a copy of this new template and began gathering information from governmental agencies and industries that hire our graduates as well as from professional societies, for the purpose of developing assessment methodologies based on well-documented assumptions. Our Environmental Sciences curriculum is precisely
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that recommended by Canadian University Environmental Science Network (http://cuesn-rcuse.org/index.cfm?page=en_unique) so we may look to our neighbors to the north for accreditation guidelines in Environmental Sciences.

4. Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/program assessment)
   a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

Geology and Environmental Sciences/Studies majors took senior assessment exams at the end of their senior seminar capstone course.

3 students graduated with the B.A. degree in Geology. Both their GPAs and scores on the assessment exams fall between those from 2006 and 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GPAs</th>
<th>Exam Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.6, 2.5, 2.2</td>
<td>39, 37, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.7, 2.8, 2.4</td>
<td>66, 49, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.6, 2.7, 2.9</td>
<td>49, 46, 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students majoring in Environmental Sciences and Environmental Studies are required to perform an internship of at least 100 hours. At the end of this experience they provide a letter of endorsement from their internship sponsor and a written assessment report. Guidelines are provided to each student beforehand in an attempt to ensure that questions germane to assessment are addressed within the report. Dr. Elliot Tramer (retired) supervised the 2008-2008 internship program but has not been available to provide information regarding the number of participants or results of those reports.

<environmental sciences report goes here>

   b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

Course sequencing is vital in attaining graduation in four years due to the large number of required courses outside the department. All students were tracked for progress, new students assigned to advisors, and contacted regularly.

5. Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)
No formal process has been developed for providing feedback (other than their senior assessment test results) to undergraduates, as our primary assessment instrument has been the senior seminar and examination. Graduate students now meet with their committee each semester to assess the progress of their research.

6. Synthesis of Department/Program Plans (not required for non-college unit)

7. Action Plan

We began experimenting with electronic portfolios as a tool for assessing student progress from FYI through graduation but found the Epsilen system difficult to use and probably inappropriate, a conclusion apparently shared by others given that an RFP has been issued for a replacement to this electronic portfolio platform. Once the new application is selected and installed, we look forward to workshops (through the CTL?) where we can learn how this new tool can be applied to assessment.

a. Timelines

Collect data for 2008-2009 report:
- Enrollment and retention numbers: early May, 2009
- Results of senior assessment exams and graduation numbers: early May, 2009
- Internship reports and summary: late August, 2009

Develop plans and program for assessment FYI → graduation

Although we have already discussed a general outline for a learning matrix that will document specific learning objectives as they are realized through an electronic portfolio, we cannot anticipate when a platform will be available and training provided.

b. Responsible Persons

Don Stierman, Chair, Assessment Committee (committee chair, geology assessment)
Jonathan Bossenbroek (biology and environmental sciences/studies assessment)
William Von Sigler (graduate program assessment)
Michael Phillips (Chair, Department of Environmental Sciences)

8. Appendices - Department/Program Assessment Plans
1. Mission Statement

“The mission of the Department of English Language and Literature is to provide instruction and conduct research in the literatures and verbal cultures of the English-speaking world, theories and practices of reading and writing, and the arts, sciences and histories of language and literature, and to serve the University, the people of the State of Ohio, and the disciplines of the humanities themselves with the knowledge and the skills these disciplines sustain.”
-- adopted June 16, 1989

2. Overall Assessment Structure (e.g. personnel support, resources, college assessment committee membership)

Administrative structure, English Department
Standing Curriculum Committees (members appointed by the Chair):
   - Graduate Studies Committee
   - Undergraduate Literature Committee
   - Undergraduate Writing Committee
   - Freshman Composition Committee
   - Professional and Technical Writing Committee
   - Linguistics Committee
   - ESL Committee
   - Departmental Honors Committee

Assessment committee, English Department: Sara Lundquist, Tim Geiger, Barbara Schneider, Bill Free

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

The Assessment plan is based upon the standards established by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation, and the International Council of Teachers of English. The Composition Program adheres to the standards established by the College Conference on Composition and Communication for class sizes, and the Writing Program Administrators for class outcomes. The Creative Writing Program adheres to the standards of the Associated Writing Programs for both class size and outcomes.

4. Methodology for College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department assessment)

   a. Student Learning Outcomes (e.g. portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

Student learning objectives:

- ability to recognize literary form and to analyze texts of various types and periods
- ability to discuss literary texts from various theoretical and critical perspectives
- command of linguistic terminology and methodology
• ability to recognize canonical authors and text; to recognize race, gender, and class issues with respect to canon; and to recognize differences between aesthetic and cultural concerns

• ability to employ interpretive strategies — e.g. to perform exegesis, to show relations between form and content, to parse connections among individual words with respect to emotional connotations and denotative significance, and to construct arguments about the aesthetic, emotional, and intellectual relations among literary components of individual texts ranging from the analysis of individual words to overarching plot and thematic structures.

• Ability to write short essays, impromptu essays, and long research papers, showing knowledge of conventional rhetorical strategies (e.g., audience identification, thesis and purpose for writing, invention, argumentation, patterns of organization, modes of self-presentation, coherence, cohesion, and a solid sense of stylistic appropriateness for different audiences, different writing purposes, and different writing occasions.

• For those in the creative writing concentration: ability to produce competent creative writing in the genres of poetry, essay, and fiction; ability to use a critical vocabulary to write persuasively about creative work in the primary genres of poetry, fiction, and essay; to produce a portfolio of original creative work

Student learning Outcomes:

• Exit survey. The department instituted a student exit survey during the fall semester of 2006. Graduating seniors were asked to fill out the on-line survey on a voluntary basis. The exit survey was available via a link on the English Department website. Again this year we encounter electronic difficulties as the exit survey has disappeared from the website since the site was redesigned by the University team.

• The undergraduate literature committee has not yet achieved its goal of reviewing the exit survey in order to assure its accessibility and ability to deliver usable data, and to institute it as a graduation requirement for all English majors.

• Syllabus study Two other major sources of data concerning learning outcomes are a study of spring 1999 course offerings and a follow-up study of syllabi for 3000-4000 level literature courses taught in AY 2002-2003. These were used to make conclusions about student learning, and curricular change. In spring 2008, we again collected syllabi, and are in the process of analyzing them to add to this accumulation of data.

• Portfolio Assessment Only the Creative Writing Concentration has fully developed the use of portfolios, assembled by students in the capstone course. This creative writing capstone course has proven a valuable assessment site, switched in 2004-5 from spring to fall in order that students might have their portfolios assembled well before graduation. In addition to assembling portfolios, the students do significant written assessment of their achievement in the Creative Writing concentration.

• The faculty agreed to use portfolio assessment as a most important source of data for the other concentrations in the major. A draft plan was formulated. Unfortunately, there has been insufficient motivation to carry through on this
project, mostly linked to the degree of service hours required to read and evaluate portfolios containing three-years of work from each graduating senior. This has been exacerbated by the serious loss of faculty service hours to retirement, resignation, and assignment to positions outside the department. A streamlined process of gleaning and analyzing data from portfolio will have to be discovered or invented in order to make the prospect viable. Also an effective venue will need to be identified in which to make clear to students what is required and how their written work will be used and why. Electronic portfolios may be a solution.

b. Student Service Outcomes—(e.g. advising, career placement, satisfaction)

Currently undergraduate students in English are advised in the following areas and programs:

- Undergraduate degrees (majors and minors) in English with concentrations in General Literature, American Literature, Writing, and Creative Writing
- Undergraduate Degrees (majors and minors) in Linguistics
- Courses satisfying University and College distributive requirements at both the Core and the Baccalaureate level (including the U.S. Diversity and Non-Western multicultural requirements)

5. Feedback Loop (e.g. process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)

Our collection of assessment data is still in its beginning stages. Based on our two studies of course syllabi and course offerings we concluded last year that we would:

- rethink the major to include a stronger historical overview (done)
- redefining the relation to the major of English 3790 (done)
- considering the concept of the Capstone course, as a forum in which the portfolio can be assembled
- considering adding a multicultural literature requirement
- expanding our offerings of WAC courses (ongoing)
- increase number of internships for writing students

ENGL 3790 was thoroughly overhauled and rededicated to its function as a “gateway” course for the English major (it was also renamed from “Critical Approaches to Literature” to “Foundations of Literary Study.”

Writing students did engage in internships at local newspapers, media outlets, and community service organizations via ENGL 4940 Internship in English

More WAC courses were offered at the 3000-level with the hope that more non-majors would take these rather than 3790, thereby increasing the value of 3790 to majors. At least preliminarily, this tactic seems to be working.

The English department’s webmaster is interested in creating a link to the department webpage that would serve as an interactive suggestion box so that students, alumni, and other stakeholders
can provide feedback on English Department courses, programs and services. Again, expertise and time are needed for this innovation.

7. Action Plan
   a. Timelines

   Curriculum
   A new course was added and an old course updated to further strengthen the students’ historical knowledge: these are ENGL 3600 American Literary Masterpieces and ENGL 3610 British Literary Masterpieces.

   We will continue to increase offerings of WAC courses now that the WAC committee is once again functional.

   The addition of a multicultural or global literature requirement to the English major was again endorsed by the committee, and will no doubt be effected this year, when our new faculty line in Global Literature is filled.

   The Capstone Course with the portfolio as a requirement is, as indicated above, still under discussion.

   Instruction

   We would like to increase our writing instruction in the Business, Technical and Professional and Health Sciences areas. This depends on our request replacement faculty line in this area being approved.

   We will continue to encourage faculty to introduce WebCT elements to their course delivery.

   We are experimenting with a 3000-level course to be offered entirely in the Distance Learning format. This is ENGL 3710 Literature of the Old Testament, to be developed by Prof. Robert Turley in Summer 2009, and first offered in AY 2009-10.

   Student services

   We would like to institute some career services directed specifically toward English Majors, perhaps visits from the Career Services Offices, perhaps visits from English Department Alumni who have found their English majors marketable in a variety of professional arenas.

   Strategic planning

   Due to retirements, we are much in need of additional faculty in and out of the classroom in order to ensure a viable and vital experience for our students, both in the majors (English and Linguistics) and in our contributions to general education and core courses.

   b. Responsible Persons

   The Departmental Assessment Committee consists of Dr. Sara Lundquist, Dr. William Free, Professor Timothy Geiger and Dr. Barbara Schneider.
1. Mission Statement

Students successfully completing a major in Economics are expected to demonstrate a range of analytical skills and abilities which they use in the acquisition of knowledge. They will demonstrate in their thinking command of the key economic terms and distinctions, and the ability to identify and solve fundamental economic problems. They will be able to pursue advanced studies in economics and other related disciplines with adequate economics background, or place themselves in the job market and advance their careers with the required economics knowledge.

2. Overall Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, assessment committee membership)

The department has a curriculum and assessment committee. It is consists of two members. Currently, the committee members are Gene Chang (chair) and Oleg Smirnov. We have conducted several TUCE tests for our major students. There is no particular financial budget or secretarial resources for the assessment. We only count on members' voluntary service.

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

There is no explicit written guideline for a regular assessment for our program. We use the following measures: by reviewing our curriculum and teaching materials, test questions, and how the students from our major perform in the standard economics tests, how they place in the advanced economics program, M.A. and Ph.D. programs after they graduate, and how they are placed in the market.

For the undergraduate program, the curriculum and the requirement of our program are in line with other economics program in the peer universities. We use the standard textbooks and objective examinations for the courses at principle level, intermediate level, and upper division levles. We time to time to give
students the nationwide standard test TUCE to assess the teaching effectiveness and student learning as compared with other universities.

For the graduate level, the program is also designed in line with other M.A. programs in economics at the peer state universities. For M.A. students, they must pass the comprehensive tests, which consist of macro- and microeconomics fields. The students must pass the tests to demonstrate that they have grasped the advanced level of economics theory.

4. Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/program assessment)
   a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)
   b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

Currently, the statistics for the retention, degree completion rates, are in line with other programs in the college.

We do not have a very structured statistics about the student placement after their graduation. From the anecdote information and feedbacks from other people, most of our undergraduate students take jobs related to their training, and the others move to the advanced programs in economics, business administration, public policy, etc. The placement for our students has been in generally good.

The standard test used as the assessment tool used by the Department of Economics is student scores on the Test of Understanding College Economics (TUCE). TUCE was developed through a joint effort of the American Economic Association’s standing committee on Economic Education and the Joint Council on Economic Education (Saunders, P., Fels R. and A. L. Welsh, The Revised Test of Understanding College Economics, The American Economic Review, Vol. 71, No. 2, 1981). It is a national exam that tests students on their knowledge of both macroeconomics and microeconomics. Below are the statistics of TUCE tests scores of our students in 2004, 2005 and 2008. The test is the same each year. The case in 2005 has only one student, so it does not produce a very meaningful outcome for the whole program. However, if we take a look at the scores taken in 2004 and 2008, we see they are quite consistent. In 2004, the mean score for macroeconomics is 50.7%, while in 2008 the score for the same test is 54.1%.

2004: 5 students took TUCE

Summary of Test Statistics (Macroeconomics)
Number of Questions  30
Number of students  5

Accepted by University Assessment Committee 9/8/08
Presented to Provost’s Council 9/25/08
Mean score   15.2  (50.7%)
Standard Deviation  8.167

Summary of Test Statistics (Microeconomics)
Number of Questions  30
Number of students  5
Mean score   18.8 (62.7%)
Standard Deviation  8.136

2005: 1 student took TUCE, Macroeconomics,
   Rumschlag  22 (73.3%)
1 student took TUCE, Microeconomics
   Rumschlag  19 (63.3%)

2005: 17 student took TUCE, Macroeconomics
Summary of Test Statistics (Macroeconomics)
Number of Questions  30
Number of students  17
Mean score   16.24  (54.1%)
Variance     66.7
Standard Deviation  6.026
Highest score obtained  27
Lowest score obtained  7

For the graduate program, we do not give nationwide standard test, neither
did other universities. The assessment about students' learning mainly relies on
the M.A. comp tests. We consider as long as the test materials are comparable
with other universities, the performance of our students can be assessed by their
passing scores, and by comparing their performance with others at the peer
universities.

5. Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing
changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)

From the outcomes of the TUCE tests, comp tests of our graduate students,
student placement, etc., we can assess our program. Based on the data we have,
we can identify the successes and weakness of our program, and, take necessary
measures to improve the program.

we consider our program has been in general satisfactory in most aspects as
compared with peer state universities, but we still have some deficiencies
including the rigorous training and competitiveness of our students in applying for
more advanced programs as compared with major research universities.
7. Action Plan
   a. Timelines
   b. Responsible Persons

    Each year we will conduct TUCE tests for our undergraduate students. The micro exam will be given to all students enrolled in Econ 3200 (intermediate micro theory), which is offered every Fall semester. The macro exam will be given to all students enrolled in Econ 3150 (intermediate macro theory), which is offered every Spring. (Although we would prefer to test our graduating seniors, we currently do not require them to enroll in a capstone course.) Because these two courses are required of all our majors, we should be able to test 100 percent of our students as well as students who have an interest in economics but have decided not to major in economics.

   For our graduate program, we will periodically review our comprehensive tests. The comp tests check the students understanding of the graduate level materials, the contents and the difficulty level are consistent across time periods.

   We plan to regularly collect information from graduated students about their placements and feedbacks. We plan to develop a database for the students graduated from our program, to gain some knowledge about their placement and advanced studies. We will start to collect the email addresses of these students. Then we will email them questionnaires about their placement and ask for their feedbacks about our program. While we do not expect the data set can even be close to complete for our alumni, we should be able to collect some information that will help the assessment of the program.

    Responsible persons:
    Gene Chang  email: gene.chang@utoledo.edu
    Oleg Smirlov email: osmirno@utnet.utoledo.edu
1. Department of Communication Mission Statement: The mission of the Department of Communication at the University of Toledo is to foster a new professionalism in communication and media education within the liberal arts environment of the College of Arts & Sciences. The faculty recognizes that competency in the study of communication and development of critical thinking, contextual competence, professional identity, values and ethics is based upon the liberal learning of the humanities, natural sciences and social sciences. Likewise, communication is central to the mission of the University.

The Department realizes that communication courses and faculty play an essential role in this educational endeavor. Responsible and articulate communication remain primary in the learning process and professional activity. Educated citizens must understand and practice effective communication to ensure full and responsible participation in society. Business, government, religious and civic organizations, families and professions all depend on effective and responsible communication for cooperation and survival. To these ends, the department will strive to foster in students skills in the following areas: critical thinking, public presentations, writing, listening, interviewing, and interpersonal communication.

Recognizing the central role of communication in education and human affairs, the faculty provide the University and the community a broad range of teaching, research and service activities that help people fully understand and practice this.

2. Department Assessment Committee: David Tucker (chair), Paul Fritz, and Brian Patrick.

3. Plan Assumptions: The Department plan is a combination of best practices applicable to departments such as ours, which attempt to cover a “field” comprised of a variety of practices and theoretical approaches rather than a narrow and traditional discipline. The plan also takes into account the large number of majors, more than 450, plus the number and variety of classes and the limited number of faculty available for the task. We also reviewed the accreditation procedures for the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC). In addition, Tucker, chair of the committee, has written extensively in the area of assessment, and Brian Patrick has designed and conducted assessments and evaluations in programs in the social sciences and humanities.

4. Methodology: Drawing upon the AEJMC criteria as well as the standards in a variety of texts including William Christ’s Media Education Assessment Handbook, the Department of Communication developed four “core objectives” to assess educational outcomes by means of a rubric (Attachment A) applied to student works collected and presented in a senior portfolio. The core objectives are:

a. Presentation. The ability to appropriately explain or package a concept or message directed to specified audience and/or situation. Presentation is among the most basic and essential communication skills, and originates in the classical study of rhetoric. Presentation manifest, and can therefore be measured, in a variety of communication formats suitable to the concentrations of communication majors, e.g., speeches, proposals, video productions, press releases, press packages,
radio broadcasts, newsletters, speeches and similar targeted communications common to private and public sector endeavor.

b. Theory, Ethics & History is knowledge of and conversance with general laws, values, principles of inherited wisdom and empirical research in the field of communication. The body of communication theory, ethics, and laws affect all individuals, groups, organizations and society. For example, the concepts of communication effects, interpersonal and group communication principles, the role of media in society and politics, media values and systems are central to an educated and skilled communicator.

c. Information Analysis / Critical Thinking concerns knowledge and ability to evaluate sources and processes of information-manufacture in the modern world, including the ability to produce and defend new knowledge according to the conventions and standards demanded by modern, scientific open societies. Examples include research methods and design logical argumentation, strengths/limitations of methods, and data sources.

d. Applied Knowledge is knowledge and ability to apply the ranges of communication concepts/skills to solve current social/organizational problems.

These objectives are measured via the Communication Knowledge Scale (Attachment B) also developed by the Department Assessment Committee. Additionally, the Department employs a graduation questionnaire administered during its required senior portfolio COMM-4910 class. The scale has been in use for ten years by the Department. In addition to providing some continuity with past assessment measures, it provides qualitative and quantitative data concerning student satisfaction, job preparedness, goals, internships, courses, etc. This course has now been in place so that all our graduating seniors have been aware of its requirements since their first year at the University.

5. Feedback Loop: The Assessment Committee selects a random sample of portfolios each year for analysis. This is intended to improve inter-rater reliability in applying the Evaluation Rubric and to reduce the amount of unnecessary work in intensively evaluating all the portfolios of a 100 plus graduating class ever year. Random samples are more than sufficiently accurate for assessment purposes. The yearly reports produced by the Department Assessment Committee are circulated to the entire Department and then discussed at Departmental meetings. Feedback is provided to students during one-on-one Committee Senior Portfolio meetings.

6. Not applicable at the departmental level.

7. Action Plan: The Department uses its Annual Assessment Report to continuously improve its curricular offerings. While the entire curriculum is open for modification each year, the department has adopted a plan of rotating specific attention each year to one of its four cognate areas. Next year, the Curriculum Committee will use the Assessment Reports as part of the primary focus on the Public Relations Committee. This year, the central focus of the curriculum review is the Broadcasting area. Last year, the Curriculum Committee focused primarily on the Interpersonal/Organizational Communication sequence. The prior year the main focus was the Journalism curriculum.

We are constantly examining what we do in light of the assessment results and the changing university environment. Both the Department Assessment Committee and the Department Curriculum Committee continue to be responsible for this process. Since beginning this process four years ago, it is now fully implemented. Students are collecting appropriate work in their portfolios, and the Department has been able to successfully evaluate these materials in light of our Cole Objectives to gauge results.
The mission of the Department of Communication at the University of Toledo is to educate students on a broad spectrum of human communication ranging from interpersonal to digital communication. Faculty believe that competency in the study of communication and the development of critical thinking, contextual competence, professional identify, values and ethics is based upon the liberal learning of the humanities, natural sciences and social sciences. Responsible and articulate communication remains primary in both the learning process and in any professional endeavor that follows. Educated citizens must understand and practice effective communication to ensure full and responsible participation in society. Recognizing the central role of communication in education and human affairs, faculty members provide the University and the community a broad range of teaching, research and service activities that help people achieve their full potential.
Assessment Plan Template

1. College/Unit Mission Statement

The mission of the College of Arts and Sciences

● Offers a liberal arts education as well as professional specializations at the undergraduate and graduate levels through excellence in teaching, research, creative activities, and service.
● Stimulates discovery, informed critical thought, and creative activity in the arts, humanities, mathematics and natural sciences, social sciences, and interdisciplinary efforts.
● Fosters cultural pluralism, respects diverse opinions and worldviews, and promotes values, skills, and knowledge important in regional and global communities.

The mission of the Department of Chemistry is:

● To present outstanding teaching and the highest quality education in chemistry to students at all levels and in all disciplines,
● To develop and maintain leading research programs with national and international reputations, both in support of our teaching programs and to add to the scientific and technological base of the State of Ohio and the Nation,
● To develop and enhance the teaching and research qualifications of the Faculty, and
● To serve the University, the Community, and Society through the unique expertise and talents found in the Chemistry Department.

2. Overall College/Unit Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, college assessment committee membership)

   University Assessment Committee
   
   College of Arts and Sciences Assessment Committee
   
   Department of Chemistry Representative
       Professor Dean M. Giolando

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

The basis for the Plan originates from the recommendations of the American Chemical Society in its publication “ACS GUIDELINES AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR BACHELOR’S DEGREE PROGRAMS”, which can be obtained at the web site http://portal.acs.org:80/portal/fileFetch/C/WPCP_008491/pdf/WPCP_008491.pdf. Importantly, the publication provides guidelines for the development of a set of skills to
be developed by the student that include Problem-Solving Skills, Chemical Literature Skills, Laboratory Safety Skills, Communication Skills, Team Skills and Ethics. These skill sets are imparted to our students through dedicated courses and integrating opportunities throughout the curriculum and providing a means of assessing them. To this end, courses in chemistry emphasize technical writing and presentation, senior experience, involvement in original research or a chemical literature course. In addition, there is a conscious effort to introduce team projects into courses and/or having students present information from the current literature.

4. Methodology for College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/program assessment)
   
   a. Student Learning Outcomes—(e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

   Students in the entry level (first year), the mid-level (second year) and the senior level (fourth year) are assessed, in part, through data collected with standardized examinations. The examinations are prepared by the American Chemical Society, which provides national statistics on the examination as a whole and for each individual question. These examinations also cover all of the basic elements (and some of the questions address very advanced topics) of chemical knowledge. In this way the department is able to assess:

   1. how our students are doing relative to other colleges and universities in the United States;
   2. assess and identify weakness in the chemical background of our students and by careful study of how the student responded the faculty can adjust lecture material so as to better serve the interests of the student.

   In addition for both the first and the second year students textbooks are used featuring supplementary material called Web CT Online (for the first year students) and Online Web-based Learning (OWL) (for the second year students) that allows students to take advantage of the internet to complete their homework assignments and obtain instant replies, with links to further explanations of the concepts under consideration. Student responses to surveys about this new teaching tool were remarkably positive.

   Data is annually collected for:
   A) Chem-1230, General Chemistry. The assessment is administered each semester as part of the final examination for the course, through evaluations of Web CT performance and within the structure of the peer-assisted teaching in small groups. The students are from a wide range of programs and other departments.

   B) Chem-2420, Organic Chemistry. The assessment is administered each semester that the course is taught. This course assessment is based on a combination of students’ performance on midterm exams, online quizzes, and course survey designed to gauge students’ progress. Because this course is a requirement for many science
majors and most professional schools, organic chemistry enrolls some of the most talented and highly motivated undergraduates at the university. The student population is diverse consisting of students from a wide range of programs and departments from around the university.

Newly added recitation courses (CHEM 2430 and CHEM 2440) were found to be beneficial to students. In the recitation sessions, students have a chance to assess if they understand the material. This is one area of enhancing students’ understanding of organic chemistry and should be a focus for improving this course. In addition the students of organic chemistry take a standardized examination published by the American Chemistry Society.

C) Chem-3520, Biochemistry. The assessment is done through a Standardized ACS examination as part of the final examination for the course.

D) Chem-3610, Inorganic Chemistry. The assessment is done through a Standardized ACS examination as part of the final examination for the course. The questions were chosen because they matched the subject areas covered in the semester: structure and bonding, symmetry and group theory, ionic compounds, Lewis acid-base chemistry, coordination chemistry, and some kinetics, thermochemistry, and descriptive chemistry of the transition metals. This information is used by the instructor of the course to fine-tune lectures.

E) Chem-3730, Physical Chemistry I. The assessment is conducted in the Fall Semester as a part of the final examination for the course. The ACS Physical Chemistry Examination for Undergraduates was used as the assessment tool. The instructor carefully studied the responses of the students and is using the information to make adjustments to lecture material.

Based upon the experiences of Drs. Bigioni and Findsen in teaching Chemistry 3730 a proposal was submitted to the Center for Teaching and Learning to help identify and address student weaknesses in learning principles and applications of Physical Chemistry. This proposal was funded. Additionally, the Chemistry Department id adding a voluntary recitation sections (N/C) for the chemistry courses 3730, 3710, 3740, and 3720. These increase class contact times and are specifically aimed at working on issues with problem solving and critical thinking.

F) Chem-3740, Physical Chemistry II. The assessment is done in the Spring.

b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

Student mentoring and advising provide the chemistry department an important and effective means for the student to relate their experiences and achievements. Mentors, in the form of faculty (as course instructors or research advisors), graduate students and/or senior undergraduates, guide a student’s development, networking, confidence building, and career planning. Personnel within the chemistry department advise students on the
many available career options to chemistry graduates. The department of chemistry strives to encourage members of underrepresented groups to pursue a career in chemistry. These activities take many forms with undergraduate research being an exceptional opportunity for mentoring students, and students are encouraged in their first year to seek out a group to work with. In addition the students are encouraged to join and become a member of the ACS student affiliate, through which they obtain peer-mentors who give them a “family” of support throughout their career at UT.

5. Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)

Based on the data collected the department of chemistry concludes that our students are receiving an education comparable to (and in some areas superior to) students in other colleges and universities around the United States. The questions on examinations and surveys were chosen to illustrate that our students have mastery of basic chemical knowledge and are prepared to enter the profession on graduation.

As a follow-up procedure the Department of Chemistry maintains contact with our graduates through a yearly mailing of a department newsletter, which many of our alumni respond to with news of how well they are proceeding through their careers (as well as relating important personal information such the birth of children). All indications are that our students do very well in their chosen careers.

6. Synthesis of Department/Program Plans (not required for noncollege unit)

Not Applicable.

7. Action Plan
   a. Timelines

   The timeline is set by the University Assessment Committee.

   b. Responsible Persons

   For the chemistry department Dean M. Giolando has been assigned the task of collecting and reporting all assessment information.

8. Appendices – Department/Programs Assessment Plans
   Not Applicable.
Department Mission Statement

The Department of Biological Sciences exists to provide the best possible educational experiences for all undergraduate and graduate students under its jurisdiction, to advance the frontiers of biology through research and to serve as an intellectual resource to the community at large. (From the Constitution of the Department of Biological Sciences, as revised April 2006)

Overall Department Assessment Structure

The Department of Biological Assessment Committee is John Plenefisch (Chair), Bruce Bamber, Charlie Creutz, Tony Quinn, Rob Steven, Patsy Komuniecki (ex officio). (As of Dec 31, 2008. This committee will be revised pending selection of the new departmental chair.)

Assumptions upon which Plan is Based

Our assumptions are that assessment should reflect attainment of learning objectives and professional development in the field of Biological Sciences that are commensurate with the degree pursued.

The Department of Biological Sciences objectives for learning in its Undergraduate Degree program as described in its 2004 Revised Assessment Plan are 1) "students should have a solid understanding of the fundamentals of biology", 2) "students should be able to read and understand the primary biological literature and develop critical thinking skills [...] with the maturity of someone with a baccalaureate degree", 3) "students should be able to write and speak clearly and thoroughly about subjects relating to biological sciences" and 4) "students will be encouraged to appreciate relationships among the various sub-disciplines of biology and realize what they do not yet clearly understand and know how to improve their level of understanding". One important corollary of our department's learning objectives is that we provide the appropriate preparation for students to successfully compete for career positions after graduating from the University. This includes direct employment in biological sciences sector jobs (e.g. research technician positions in industry or academia, teaching of
biology, etc.), or the successful placement for graduates into post-baccalaureate professional schools (e.g. medical, dental, veterinary, law, etc.).

The Department of Biological Sciences' objectives for learning and outcomes in its Graduate Degree Program are 1) (for Ph.D. candidates) to make a substantial contribution to and demonstrate a mastery of an area of a specialized study within the biological sciences, 2) (for M.S. students) to contribute to and demonstrate an in-depth understanding of an area of specialized study within the biological sciences. Since graduate degrees are professional degrees, it is expected that students that successfully achieve the learning goals will be appropriately placed within an academic, industrial, or other professional career position commensurate with their degree.

Methodology for Undergraduate Assessment

Student Learning Outcomes-

a. The ETS Field Biology Test: The ETS Biology Field Test will be taken by each biology major during their senior year at the conclusion of BIOL 4700. It will be administered at the end of term in both fall and spring semesters, as well as at the end of summer session 3. The examinations will be sent to ETS for marking and then returned to the department for evaluation. The Assessment Committee will review the performance of UT Biology majors in each of the sub-disciplinary areas (Cell Biology, Molecular Biology/Genetics, Organismal Biology, and Population Biology/Evolution) as well as the overall score. UT student scores will be compared with scores of biology majors from the 342 other colleges and universities in the United States that also take the ETS exam. That group includes several peer institutions of the Urban 13/21 Universities. The department has regularly administered the ETS Field Biology Test over past 10 years with data collection and analysis well underway.

b. Writing Portfolio: As part of BIOL 4700, seniors write about topics based on research from the primary literature. Starting with fall 2003, each student now prepares a portfolio from course assignments including work submitted at the beginning and end of the term. The portfolios will be reviewed by the Departmental Assessment Committee to ensure that the student learning outcomes are achieved. Thus, the writing portfolios will include work that demonstrates students’ ability to think and write critically about the primary biological literature. Student
work collected by course instructors each term will be kept in a secure file cabinet in the department office (BO 1025).

**Student Services Outcomes**

a. We use exit surveys administered to graduating seniors whose major was BIOL to assess the satisfaction of students with Departmental course offerings, the alignment of department curriculum with student career goals, and advising. These surveys may include the results of the Arts and Sciences survey and department specific surveys.

b. Placement records for Biology majors in pre-professional programs who have graduated for the past 7 years will be examined to discern placement trends. Since a large majority of our students are interested in professional or graduate school training, we are especially sensitive to trends in acceptance to professional schools. These data will be obtained from the pre-professional advisors in the College supplemented by own records.

c. The Alumni Questionnaire is a new measure that is currently under development. The department will gather the names and addresses for Biology majors that have graduated over the past 20 years. As a first measure, the questionnaire will be sent to alumni/ae who graduated five years ago and will attempt to assess the value of their undergraduate education as preparation for their graduate/professional schools or job placements. In order to increase the “return rate”, we plan to ask for an electronic response so that we can utilize software to help with data analysis.

**Methodology for Graduate College-Level Assessment**

**Student Learning Outcomes**

We will assess every student's performance on the mandatory annual departmental presentation that each student is required to present at the Monday Noon session of the Seminar in Biology course (BIOL 6930/8930). This event is well attended by faculty as well as other students and for the past several years the attending faculty have filled out evaluation forms for each presenting student that are returned to the students. Starting this fall, the department will keep copies of these forms, and use them to evaluate annual improvement in student understanding within their area of specialized study.
Student Services Outcomes –
a. The most appropriate assessment of a professional program is its placement record. We will assess the placement data for graduate students who have graduated over the past 15 years to discern placement trends. We will look at both initial and current placements, and compare trends over time.

b. A second measure of success in graduate education is peer reviewed publication of students' work in journals, both in terms of number and quality of publications. We will assess the record of graduate student authorship of peer-reviewed publications emanating from the department in two ways. First, we compare the aggregate number of publications per academic year on which a graduate student was the lead author compared to the total number of students in the department. Secondly, we will examine the total number of publications on which a Ph.D. or M.S. student who graduated in a given academic year had authorship. Trends over time will be compared.

Feedback Loop
Results from the specific assessment instruments will be used to guide development or modification of departmental course offerings, strengthen advising and aid curricular development. For example, we continue to develop courses in areas of student demand as we hire new faculty with expertise in these areas, strengthening our overall program. We are developing and offering new elective courses in neurobiology, in cancer biology and in the mechanisms of human disease, areas that strengthen the overall curriculum and that align well with student interest based on surveys and placement data.

Changes made in response to assessment activities will themselves be monitored using these same tools to determine whether those changes have had any impact.

Action Plan
Timelines
As outlined above, the student learning outcome data currently are gathered directly from senior Biology majors through the use of the ETS field test and senior capstone course activities and will be gathered indirectly from the new alumni questionnaire under development.
Responsible Persons

The Assessment Committee as a whole will be responsible for the oversight of the assessment activities in the department. The Committee will prepare an annual report to be shared with the Undergraduate and Graduate Affairs Committees and the department (at a faculty meeting). The final report for each academic year should be submitted to the chair no later than September following. As committee chair, Dr. John Plenefisch is responsible for the administration and analysis of the ETS Field Biology Test, and for obtaining survey results and placement records from College and Departmental sources.

Selected faculty are responsible for teaching the senior capstone course. During the 2008-09 academic year, BIOL 4700 was taught by Drs. Creutz, Bamber, Diakonova and Quinn. Drs. Creutz and Quinn have taught this course for several years and they worked with Drs. Bamber and Diakonova who taught that course for the first time this academic year. As new faculty teach BIOL 4700 they will be mentored by experienced instructors. The Assessment Committee will review the portfolios submitted by the students in BIOL 4700 and submit the findings of their review to the Chair. Dr. Robert Steven is responsible for the scheduling of the Monday Noon graduate seminar.
Department of Art

College/Unit Assessment Plan Template

1. College/Unit Mission Statement

   Mission Statement of the Department of Art
   (Adopted – January, 1985; Revised – November, 2003.)

   The Department of Art of The University of Toledo is housed in the Center for the Visual Arts and represents the educational alliance of a large, multifaceted and dynamic university with the internationally recognized Toledo Museum of Art. The essential mission of the department is to provide students of The University of Toledo with outstanding educational experiences in the visual arts and to maintain the department’s high level of educational quality. The Department of Art is committed to presenting offerings that effectively explore the significance of the visual arts and the relevance of the creative process to both the individual and society. For majors in art education, art history and studio fine arts, the Department of Art is committed to offering curricula of the highest academic quality which encourages the success of its graduates in their pursuit of careers or further educational experiences. Allied with these goals is the Department of Art’s express intent to effectively utilize the excellent research facilities and outstanding art collections of The Toledo Museum of Art. The Department of Art intends for its faculty members to realize their potential as teachers and artists or scholars, and for its programs to rise to a prominent position in higher education in the visual arts.

2. Overall College/Unit Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, college assessment committee membership)

3. Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)

   The Department of Art

   The Department of Art determines its programs' objectives, outcomes and assessment with respect to our outside accrediting agency NASAD (The National Association of Schools of Art and Design) and implements them in accordance with our expectations of art students attending the University of Toledo. In the NASAD Handbook, NASAD designates a strong standard about assessment under the category "Evaluation, Planning and Projections." For example, the standard states that the art/design unit shall demonstrate that "the educational and artistic development of students is first among all evaluative considerations" and that "students completing programs have achieved the artistic and education levels and competencies outlined in applicable NASAD standards" (NASAD Handbook, 2007-2008, p. 59). NASAD expects institutions to have assessment procedures in place but does not impose specific procedural mandates on institutions. NASAD visitors focus more on student outcomes than on assessment processes.

   Accordingly, the assessment strategy for each of the Department's areas -- Studio Art,
Art History, and Art Education -- is defined in their respective "Overview of Assessment Procedures" (see Appendix).

4. Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/program assessment)
   a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)
   b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

5. Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)

6. Synthesis of Department/Program Plans (not required for non-college unit)

7. Action Plan
   a. Timelines
   b. Responsible Persons

8. Appendices - Department/Program Assessment Plans

Assessment plans are included for the following Department of Art Programs:

   Art History
   Studio Art
   Undergraduate Art Education
   Graduate Art Education
Department of Art – Art History Program – Overview of Assessment Procedures

1. Learning objectives:
   Our programmatic learning objectives revolve around students developing competence in:
   (1) visual analysis;
   (2) understanding media, processes, and discipline-specific vocabulary;
   (3) writing;
   (4) analyzing and synthesizing research materials;
   (5) historical awareness; and,
   (6) art historical methodologies.

2. Instruments used to assess student learning:
   We assess the learning of students through portfolio review, an examination, and a timed writing exercise in the museum galleries:

   A. Portfolio Review

       We ask all Art History majors to assemble a portfolio containing a selection of work (e.g., exams, papers, journals, reviews, informal writing assignments, etc.) from Art History courses taken AY during the academic year under review. Requests for materials are announced in classes at the start of each semester, but portfolios are collected near the end of the academic year. Writing samples are reviewed in terms of the programmatic learning objectives listed above; see score sheet attached.

   B. Examination

       We have majors examine images of twenty works of art and architecture, each projected for one minute; ten work are well known works, while the remainder are deliberately obscure. Students are asked to identify (1) the artist or nationality of the work, (2) the title or subject matter, (3) the stylistic era, (4) the geographical origin, and (5) the approximate date. In analyzing student answers, the procedure is highly objective. Students are encouraged to guess whenever possible when they are not certain of the answer. A score of "2" is awarded for a correct response, a "1" for a knowledgeable response, and a "0" for an incorrect answer or missing answer. Thus, there is a maximum of 10 points for each work, 200 for the entire examination.

   C. Timed writing exercise in the galleries

       We also assess art historical learning in terms of visual analysis; understanding media, processes, and discipline-specific vocabulary; writing; and historical awareness; and art historical methodologies. Students are given a clipboard, pencil, and assignment sheet; choosing from three designated works from quite disparate eras, each writes an analysis of the form and content of a single work. (A copy of the instructions for this instrument is available on request.)
Department of Art – Studio Art Program – Overview of Assessment Procedures

1. Learning objectives:
   Students will develop conceptual abilities, formal (aesthetic) abilities, and technical skills:
   a. Formal Abilities: Students will demonstrate the ability to create an aesthetic order that expresses their unique vision.
   b. Technical Skills and Understanding Medium’s Potential: Students will demonstrate their ability to safely use tools and materials, and to understand the potential of specific media to make works of art.
   c. Conceptual Ability: Students will demonstrate their ability to express themselves inventively through the use of traditional and experimental media.
   d. Presentation and Portfolio Development: Students will be prepared for admission into colleges/universities which offer advanced degrees in Fine Art.
   e. Writing Skills: Students will be prepared to function as a professional in the broader art community. Students can effectively discuss their artwork through writing.

2. Instruments and methods used to assess student learning:
   Student learning outcomes data are successfully collected from students through:
   a. BA portfolio reviews
   b. BFA portfolio reviews
   c. BA artist statements
   d. BFA artist statements
   e. Foundations portfolio reviews

   The Criteria used to measure student learning (assessed using rubric on file/attached) are:
   a. Formal ability (aesthetic concerns)
   b. Technical skills
   c. Understanding of their medium’s potential
   d. Conceptual ability
   e. Presentation
   f. Portfolio development
   g. Ability to write about their work.

Foundations Assessment

The Foundations Coordinator meets with Foundations faculty during the Fall and Spring semesters to review class projects by Foundations students. The instructors are given immediate feedback in order to assure students were acquiring the skills and knowledge desired by the department. The specific skills and knowledge are outlined in the “Assessment of Learning Objectives Evaluation Form- Sophomore Level” and are directly tied to the department’s learning objectives. The Foundations coordinator also meets with all Foundations faculty (about 14 instructors per semester) each semester to
discuss goals, achievements, problems and solutions. Peer observations are also conducted to help facilitate the process.

**General Portfolio Assessment**

**Scholarship review**

The annual Spring assessment portfolio review is linked to the department's scholarship review process and is held in April. BA and BFA students compete for studio scholarships by submitting a small portfolio of their artwork along with transcripts, a statement about their work, and an application form. All Studio Faculty review the scholarship applications/portfolios and rank each student within their class level (sophomore, junior, senior) on the “Assessment of Student Learning Evaluation Form” (directly tied to the department’s learning objectives) for sophomore, junior, and senior levels.

**The mid-year Biannual Student Exhibition**

In order to achieve a more representative sampling of student work to evaluate, we utilize the mid-year Biannual Student Exhibition as an assessment tool and evaluate all submissions to the exhibition (over 200) prior to the jurying process. We used the same criteria/same rubric we’ve been using to assess student learning in other assessment reviews for consistency.

**Individual Classes**

We also evaluate portfolios from within individual classes to give a more representative sampling of student work to evaluate. This new Annual Portfolio Review allows us to assess representative work that is displayed throughout our facilities from a selection of classes at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels. Not all classes are assessed and the specific classes/disciplines will rotate. However, of any class chosen for assessment, every student enrolled in those classes has their work assessed. This ensures we are looking at a representative sampling of student work, and not just the “best” work. We select a variety of studio courses at the 2000-3000 level and a variety of 3000-4000 level classes. Instructors display all students’ work from a given assignment in those classes during the first or second week of April. The studio faculty decide as a group which classes would be used for this purpose at the beginning of the semester. We use the same criteria/same rubric we’ve been using to assess student learning in other assessment reviews for consistency.

In all reviews, the portfolios are grouped by class (sophomore, junior, senior) since different expectations are held for each class level. Individual portfolios are looked at as representative samples of a given class. Later, summaries are compiled by the department’s administrative assistants and results are distributed to studio faculty for discussion. Faculty then met in late April to discuss the results and decide what, if any, action needs to be taken. All data is filed in the department office for future use.

**BFA Assessment**

All studio faculty participate in the bi-annual reviews of all BFA candidates
(held in November and February) and BFA exhibitions (held in March/ April
and April/ May). Students’ work is assessed according to the criteria in the
“Assessment of Student Learning Evaluation Form for BFA candidates”
directly tied to the department’s learning objectives). Faculty meet after the
biannual BFA reviews and throughout the year to discuss students’ work and
progress. These discussions, along with the annual portfolio review meeting,
will inform any future curricular changes driven by collected assessment data.
1.) Learning Objectives

Overall, the objective for our students as they complete our program in Art Education, is to demonstrate the ability to be an effective art teacher for grades K-12.

The Art Education program has more specific objectives related to the capstone experience – Student Teaching. As a result of the student teaching experience at the secondary and elementary level, the pre-service teacher will be able to do the following:

1.) Organize content knowledge for student learning.
2.) Create an environment for student learning.
3.) Teach for student learning.
4.) Exhibit teacher professionalism.
5.) Achieve passing scores on the PRAXIS II
6.) Successfully complete a professional portfolio that includes:
   a. A Resume
   b. A Philosophy Statement
   c. An Autobiographical Sketch
   d. A Classroom Management Statement
   e. Lesson Plans
   f. Personal Art Work
   g. Student Art Work
   h. Student Art Displays

Objectives 1 to 4 are aligned with the Pathwise Assessment Domains. First year teachers are expected to satisfy each of these domains in the state of Ohio. No changes have been made to these objectives since our initial assessment plan was approved. However, since student teaching is the capstone experience, this report only includes the assessment of this experience and does not include information on Field Placements, which are done much earlier in our program. This is the only change with regard to our assessment plan.

2.) Instruments used to assess student learning:

Data is collected on an observation form with sub-categories for the first four objectives listed above. These sub-categories are as follows:

*Organize Content Knowledge for Student Learning*

1.1) Awareness of socio-economic cultural diversity in the school
1.2) Punctuality in turning in plans to the supervising teacher in time to permit review and necessary alterations.
1.3) Thoughtful consideration of safety factors related to the lesson.
1.4) Thoughtful consideration of alternatives or additions to the lesson if students finish early.
1.5) Using planning time efficiently.
1.6) Incorporation of art history in teaching experiences.
1.7) Adequate use of a variety of visual materials as teaching tools.
1.8) When appropriate, the student teacher made an example of a final product related to the lesson.
1.9) Utilization of technology.
1.10) Use of art displays as an addition to the art curriculum.
1.11) Use of art displays of student work related to lesson planning during the semester.
1.12) Ability to express ideas & organization of plans in clear and correctly written English.
1.13) Relationship of lessons to Non-Art Bench Marks.
1.14) Relationship of lessons to Art Bench Marks.
1.15) Relationship of lessons to National Standards in Art.
1.16) Appropriate vocabulary and acceptable pronunciation.
1.17) Effective quality of voice.

Creating an Environment for Student Learning
1.18) Demonstration of empathy with students.
1.19) Awareness of the physical appearance, existing plan of organization and use of the art room.
1.20) Professional attitude about maintenance of the art room.
1.21) Ability to plan and organize cleanup with sufficient recognition of timing and lack of confusion.

Teaching for Student Learning
1.22) Providing praise and encouragement to individual learners.
1.23) Adaptability to different grade levels.
1.24) Use of constructive evaluation at the beginning, during, or at the end of the class period to reinforce, clarify or add to the objectives of the lesson.
1.25) Ability to work effectively with small groups and within the larger framework.
1.26) Ability to work with students in large groups – focuses on the total group.
1.27) Ability to conduct student critiques and art criticism.
1.28) Utilization of aesthetics/aesthetic theory.
1.29) Thoughtful consideration of utilizing trans-disciplinary curriculum development.
1.30) Understanding of the economic use of art materials.

Teacher Professionalism
1.31) Appropriate professional appearance.
1.32) Understanding of professional responsibility.
1.33) Positive attitude toward student teaching and the teaching profession.
1.34) Cooperation with staff.
1.35) Analytical ability and insight in self-evaluation of each training experience as reflected in discussions with the cooperating teacher.
1.36) Analytical ability and insight in self-evaluation of each training experience as reflected in written commentary.
1.37) Accurate concept of self as a teacher.
1.38) Reaction to professional advice.

Students are evaluated on each of these criteria using a Likert Scale format with ratings from ‘excellent’ to ‘poor’. The supervising teacher completes this assessment form & reviews it with the student teacher and the college supervisor.

In achieving Learning Objective #5, students are required to take the PRAXIS II exam in order to receive teaching licensure.

In achieving Learning Objective #6, students submit their professional portfolio at the end of their student teaching experience. These portfolios are reviewed by a team of art education faculty members and are assessed using a Likert Scale for each category (See Learning Objective #6) listed in the portfolio.
1.) Learning Objectives
   Overall, the objective for our students as they complete our program in Art
   Education, is to demonstrate the ability to be an effective art teacher for grades K-
   12.

   The Art Education program has more specific objectives related to the capstone
   experience – Student Teaching. As a result of the student teaching experience at
   the secondary and elementary level, the pre-service teacher will be able to do the
   following:

   1.) Organize content knowledge for student learning.
   2.) Create an environment for student learning.
   3.) Teach for student learning.
   4.) Exhibit teacher professionalism.
   5.) Achieve passing scores on the PRAXIS II
   6.) Successfully complete a professional portfolio that includes:
   a. A Resume
   b. A Philosophy Statement
   c. An Autobiographical Sketch
   d. A Classroom Management Statement
   e. Lesson Plans
   f. Personal Art Work
   g. Student Art Work
   h. Student Art Displays

   Objectives 1 to 4 are aligned with the Pathwise Assessment Domains. First year
   teachers are expected to satisfy each of these domains in the state of Ohio. No
   changes have been made to these objectives since the initial assessment plan was
   approved.

2.) Instruments used to assess student learning:
   Data is collected on an observation form with sub-categories for the first four
   objectives listed above. These sub-categories are as follows:

   Organize Content Knowledge for Student Learning
   1.1) Awareness of socio-economic cultural diversity in the school
   1.2) Punctuality in turning in plans to the supervising teacher in time to
   permit review
   and necessary alterations.
   1.3) Thoughtful consideration of safety factors related to the lesson.
   1.4) Thoughtful consideration of alternatives or additions to the lesson if
   students finish early.
   1.5) Using planning time efficiently.
   1.6) Incorporation of art history in teaching experiences.
1.7) Adequate use of a variety of visual materials as teaching tools.
1.8) When appropriate, the student teacher made an example of a final product related to the lesson.
1.9) Utilization of technology.
1.10) Use of art displays as an addition to the art curriculum.
1.11) Use of art displays of student work related to lesson planning during the semester.
1.12) Ability to express ideas & organization of plans in clear and correctly written English.
1.13) Relationship of lessons to Non-Art Bench Marks.
1.14) Relationship of lessons to Art Bench Marks.
1.15) Relationship of lessons to National Standards in Art.
1.16) Appropriate vocabulary and acceptable pronunciation.
1.17) Effective quality of voice.

**Creating an Environment for Student Learning**

1.18) Demonstration of empathy with students.
1.19) Awareness of the physical appearance, existing plan of organization and use of the art room.
1.20) Professional attitude about maintenance of the art room.
1.21) Ability to plan and organize cleanup with sufficient recognition of timing and lack of confusion.

**Teaching for Student Learning**

1.30) Providing praise and encouragement to individual learners.
1.31) Adaptability to different grade levels.
1.32) Use of constructive evaluation at the beginning, during, or at the end of the class period to reinforce, clarify or add to the objectives of the lesson.
1.33) Ability to work effectively with small groups and within the larger framework.
1.34) Ability to work with students in large groups – focuses on the total group.
1.35) Ability to conduct student critiques and art criticism.
1.36) Utilization of aesthetics/aesthetic theory.
1.37) Thoughtful consideration of utilizing trans-disciplinary curriculum development.
1.38) Understanding of the economic use of art materials.

**Teacher Professionalism**

1.39) Appropriate professional appearance.
1.40) Understanding of professional responsibility.
1.41) Positive attitude toward student teaching and the teaching profession.
1.42) Cooperation with staff.

1.43) Analytical ability and insight in self-evaluation of each training experience as reflected in discussions with the cooperating teacher.

1.44) Analytical ability and insight in self-evaluation of each training experience as reflected in written commentary.

1.45) Accurate concept of self as a teacher.

1.46) Reaction to professional advice.

Students are evaluated on each of these criteria using a Likert Scale format with rating criteria from ‘superior’ to ‘poor’. The supervising teacher completes this assessment form and reviews it with the student teacher and college supervisor.

In achieving Learning Objective #5, students are required to take the PRAXIS II exam in order to receive teaching licensure.

In achieving Learning Objective #6, students submit their professional portfolio at the end of their student teaching experience. These portfolios are reviewed by a team of art education faculty members and are assessed using a Likert Scale for each category (See Learning Objective #6) listed in the portfolio.
1. College/Unit Mission Statement

The mission of the Department is to instruct graduate and undergraduate majors in French, German, and Spanish, and minors in these three languages as well as Japanese; the focus is language and culture studies. The Department also helps students fulfill the Arts & Sciences and International Business foreign language requirement with elementary and intermediate language course work in Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Latin, and Spanish. In addition, the Department plays a pivotal role in the training of students in the College of Education who plan to teach a foreign language; we provide course work, a teaching colloquium, and mentoring.”

- Overall College/Unit Assessment Structure (e.g., personnel support, resources, college assessment committee membership)
  Spanish assessment committee is composed of all Spanish tenured faculty members who teach upper level courses

- Assumptions upon which Plan is Based (e.g., accreditation agency and professional association guidelines)
  The plan is based on ACTFL/NCATE program standards
  http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/Index.cfm?pageid=3384

- Methodology for Undergraduate and Graduate College-Level Assessment (e.g., above and beyond department/program assessment or aggregated department/program assessment)
  a. Student Learning Outcomes- (e.g., portfolio reviews, retention, standardized test scores, degree completion rates)

  The Spanish section has collected the following information and data on student learning outcomes:

  - Tests and exams in individual Spanish courses (oral and written)
  - Compositions (original, peer corrected and self-corrected versions of compositions)
  - Research papers
  - Teaching portfolios (by students in Spanish teacher education program only)

  An entry evaluation was given to students at 3000 level and students are constantly assessed in Spanish courses.

  b. Student Services Outcomes (e.g., advising, career placement, satisfaction)

  - Spanish section has two advisers for Spanish majors, one adviser for minors and one adviser for graduate students.
  - There is no assessment tool to assess service outcomes, but communications between students and their advisers are open and even continue after graduation.
  - An adviser of Spanish majors maintains e-mail communications between Spanish section and majors.
• Feedback Loop (e.g., process for analyzing data and implementing changes based on findings, providing feedback to students)
  - Feedback to students regarding their learning outcomes is provided by individual course professors and student advisers.
  - Changes on curriculum and course offerings are discussed in Spanish faculty meetings based on student learning outcomes and student feedback.

• Synthesis of Department/Program Plans (not required for non-college unit)

7. Action Plan
c. Timelines
  - Data of student learning outcomes will continue to be collected throughout the academic year
  - Graduate students will submit data of their foreign language proficiency profile periodically to Online LinguaFolio, an online self-reported language portfolio supported by Center for Applied Second Language Studies (CASLS). (under planning)

d. Responsible Persons
  - Data collection: Spanish faculty of upper level courses
  - Data analysis & findings: Spanish faculty of upper level courses
  - Annual report: Spanish assessment committee chair

8. Appendices - Department/Program Assessment Plans