

**NON-ACCREDITED PROGRAM**

**GRADUATE ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE**

**College:** CPACS **Department/School:** Gerontology

**Program:** MA Gerontology **Degree Level:** Masters

**Academic Year of Report:** 2019-2020  **Date Range of Reported Data:** Spring 2018-Fall 2019

**Person Preparing the Report:** Julie Blaskewicz Boron

1. **Degree Program & Common Graduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)**
2. List degree program SLOs. For each, SLO, indicate the highest cognitive level and Common Graduate Program SLO it represents. To accommodate more than four SLOs, add rows as needed. The Common Graduate SLOs for master’s programs (adopted 2/2017) are listed below.

Students shall demonstrate at the graduate level:

1. Mastery of discipline content

2. Proficiency in analyzing, evaluating and synthesizing information

3. Effective oral and written communication

4. Knowledge of discipline’s ethics and standards

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcomes** | **Bloom’s Taxonomy**  **Cognitive Level**  *(check highest level*  *represented in the SLO)* | **Common Graduate**  **Program SLOs**  *(check as many as necessary)* |
| **SLO 1:** Analyze fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and theories for competent gerontological practice. | Knowledge  Analysis  Comprehension  Synthesis  Application  Evaluation | 1  3  2  4  Not applicable for SLO |
| **SLO 2:** Critique and analyze diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes from an interdisciplinary perspective. | Knowledge  Analysis  Comprehension  Synthesis  Application  Evaluation | 1  3  2  4  Not applicable for SLO |
| **SLO 3:** Exhibit abilities to effectively use basic communication (written, oral, interpersonal) skills and information technology. | Knowledge  Analysis  Comprehension  Synthesis  Application  Evaluation | 1  3  2  4  Not applicable for SLO |
| **SLO 4:** Evaluate and appraise ability of oneself and others to demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives, and exhibit personal and social responsibility, and ethical and professional behavior in all settings. | Knowledge  Analysis  Comprehension  Synthesis  Application  Evaluation | 1  3  2  4  Not applicable for SLO |

1. SLOs reflect professional standards as dictated by an accreditation or other external body. Yes  No
2. Describe how stakeholders are involved in the creation and/or review of SLOs as well as how SLOs are communicated to stakeholders.

In regard to our SLOs, all faculty and member of our External Advisory Board (EAB) are aware of our SLOs. Our SLOs are on our program website so that they are publically available.   
  
Results are relayed to the unit at least once per year in a departmental faculty meeting where discussion revolves around how to better assess and achieve the various SLOs. Our assessment report will be relayed to our instructors yearly. Further, once each semester our External Advisory Board (EAB) meets. We ensure that assessment is part of our conversation with them at least once per academic year, twice if necessary. Our SLOs were re-reviewed with our EAB in our Fall 2019 meeting, and no changes were requested.

**II. Assessment Methods**

Complete a table for each SLO. If an SLO is assessed by more than one measure, complete tables for each measure. Duplicate the table as needed to accommodate the number of measures. Attach copies of rubrics.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 1:** Analyze fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and theories for competent Gerontological practice. | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on final project paper | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The final paper is scored with a rubric (see included below). The following domains are relevant to this SLO: (a) citations and references; (b) introduction; (c) supporting project documents; (d) project evaluation. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐Examination ☒Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒Direct Measure ☐Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒All students ☐Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒Once/semester ☐Once/year ☐Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **SLO 1:** Analyze fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and theories for competent Gerontological practice. | | | 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on the comprehensive exam | | | 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The comprehensive exam consists of three content-based questions from the coursework the student has completed for the degree. Three different members of the gerontology faculty create and score these questions. The questions vary from student to student. | | | 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☒ Examination ☐Product ☐Performance | | 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure | | 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☒ In final term of program ☐ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Data are collected when the student completes the comprehensive exam. | | 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below | | 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below | | 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. | | 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **SLO 1:** Analyze fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and theories for competent Gerontological practice. | | | 1. **Title of the Measure:** Responses on progress reports submitted in the practicum course. | | | 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The practicum progress reports are an assessment of the student’s work completed during the practicum. This is turned in three times per semester. Please see rubric provided below. | | | 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐Examination ☒Product ☐Performance | | 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐Indirect Measure | | 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. | | 1. **Population Measured** | ☒All students ☐Sample of students - Describe below | | 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒Once/semester ☐Once/year ☐Other - Describe below | | 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. | | 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **SLO 1:** Analyze fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge and theories for competent Gerontological practice. | | | 1. **Title of the Measure:** Evaluation forms completed by the student and the agency. | | | 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** Both the student and the agency completed evaluation forms at the end of the semester. Specific items are highlighted below that are relevant for this SLO. | | | 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☐Product ☒Performance | | 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☒ Indirect Measure | | 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Data are collected at the end of the semester that practicum is completed by the practicum instructor. | | 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below | | 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below | | 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 90% of students meet or exceed expectations for this subjective measure. Note: for the supervisor form, a score of 3 (satisfactory) through 5 (excellent) meets our threshold; on the student’s evaluation of the agency form, a score of 2 (adequate) through 5 (excellent) meets our threshold. | | 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. | | |
| **SLO 2:** Critique and analyze diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes from an interdisciplinary perspective. | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on final project paper | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The final paper is scored with a rubric (see included below). The following domains are relevant to this SLO: (a) introduction; (b) project planning; (c) project description & content; (d) supporting project documents; (e) project evaluation. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe: Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 2:** Critique and analyze diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes from an interdisciplinary perspective. | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on the comprehensive exam | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The comprehensive exam consists of three content-based questions from the coursework the student has completed for the degree. Three different members of the gerontology faculty create and score these questions. The questions vary from student to student. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☒ Examination ☐Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☒ In final term of program ☐ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Data are collected when the student completes the comprehensive exam. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 2:** Critique and analyze diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes from an interdisciplinary perspective. | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Responses on progress reports submitted in the practicum course. | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO**. The practicum progress reports are a subjective assessment of the student’s work completed during the practicum. This is turned in three times per semester (please see below for requirements.) | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe: Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 3:** Exhibit abilities to effectively use basic communication (written, oral, interpersonal) skills and information technology. | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on final project paper | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The final paper is scored with a rubric (see included below). The following domains are relevant to this SLO: (a) grammar and mechanics; (b) APA style and communication. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieved the proficiency threshold. |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **SLO 3:** Exhibit abilities to effectively use basic communication (written, oral, interpersonal) skills and information technology. | | | 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on the comprehensive exam | | | 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The comprehensive exam consists of three content-based questions from the coursework the student has completed for the degree. Three different members of the gerontology faculty create and score these questions. The questions vary from student to student. | | | 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☒ Examination ☐Product ☐Performance | | 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure | | 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☒ In final term of program ☐ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Data are collected when the student completes the comprehensive exam. | | 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below | | 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below | | 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. | | 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **SLO 3:** Exhibit abilities to effectively use basic communication (written, oral, interpersonal) skills and information technology. | | | 1. **Title of the Measure:** Responses on progress reports submitted in the practicum course. | | | 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The practicum progress reports are a subjective assessment of the student’s work completed during the practicum. This is turned in three times per semester (please see below for requirements.) | | | 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒Product ☐Performance | | 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☒ Indirect Measure | | 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. | | 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below | | 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below | | 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations for this subjective measure. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. | | 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **SLO 3:** Exhibit abilities to effectively use basic communication (written, oral, interpersonal) skills and information technology. | | | 1. **Title of the Measure:** Evaluation forms completed by the student and the agency. | | | 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** Both the student and the agency completed evaluation forms at the end of the semester. Specific items are highlighted below that are relevant for this SLO. | | | 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☐Product ☒ Performance | | 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☒ Indirect Measure | | 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Data are collected at the end of the semester that practicum is completed by the practicum instructor. | | 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below | | 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below | | 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 90% of students meet or exceed expectations for this subjective measure. Note: for the supervisor form, a score of 3 (satisfactory) through 5 (excellent) meets our threshold; on the student’s evaluation of the agency form, a score of 2 (adequate) through 5 (excellent) meets our threshold. | | 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. | | |
| **SLO 4: Evaluate and appraise ability of oneself and others to demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives, and exhibit personal and social responsibility, and ethical and professional behavior in all settings.** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Performance on final paper project | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The final paper is scored with a rubric (see included below). The project evaluation domain is relevant to this SLO. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 4: Evaluate and appraise ability of oneself and others to demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives, and exhibit personal and social responsibility, and ethical and professional behavior in all settings.** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Responses on progress reports submitted in the practicum course. | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** The practicum progress reports are an assessment of the student’s work completed during the practicum. This is turned in three times per semester. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒Product ☐Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒Direct Measure ☐Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Within the required practicum course. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 80% of students meet or exceed expectations for this subjective measure. Please see included rubrics with highlighted columns that show proficiency. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 80% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 4: Evaluate and appraise ability of oneself and others to demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives, and exhibit personal and social responsibility, and ethical and professional behavior in all settings.** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** Evaluation forms completed by the student and the agency. | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** Both the student and the agency completed evaluation forms at the end of the semester. Specific items are highlighted below that are relevant for this SLO. | |
| 1. **Domain** *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☐Product ☒Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☒ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: Data are collected at the end of the semester that practicum is completed by the practicum instructor. |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☒ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of Data Collection** | ☒ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency Threshold** | *Describe:* 90% of students meet or exceed expectations for this subjective measure. Note: for the supervisor form, a score of 3 (satisfactory) through 5 (excellent) meets our threshold; on the student’s evaluation of the agency form, a score of 2 (adequate) through 5 (excellent) meets our threshold. |
| 1. **Program Proficiency Target** | *Describe:* 90% of students achieve the proficiency threshold. |

**III. Data Collection and Analysis**

A. Results Table – Report results for each SLO. If an SLO was assessed by multiple measures, report data for each measure. Add rows as needed to accommodate the number of SLOs and measures.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data Collection**  **Date Range** | **Number of Students Assessed** | **Percentage of Students who Met/ Exceeded Threshold Proficiency** |
| **SLO 1 –**  **Measure one,  Final Paper** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 15 | *Citations and references,* ***100%***  *Introduction,* ***93%***  *Supporting documents,* ***100%***  *Project evaluation,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 1 –**  **Measure two, Comps Ex** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | Comps, 15  Thesis, 3 | *Comps,* ***100%***  *(33% had revisions)*  *Thesis,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 1 –**  **Measure three,  Progress reports** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 16 | *Report 1,* ***94%***  *Report 2,* ***81%***  *Report 3,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 1 –**  **Measure four, Evaluations** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 14 | *Agency,* ***100%***  *Student,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 2 –**  **Measure one,  Final Paper** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 15 | *Introduction,* ***93%***  *Project planning,* ***100%***  *Project description & content,* ***100%***  *Supporting documents,* ***100%***  *Project evaluation,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 2 –**  **Measure two, Comps Ex** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | Comps, 15  Thesis, 3 | *Comps,* ***100%***  *(33% had revisions)*  *Thesis,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 2 –**  **Measure three,  Progress reports** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 16 | *Report 1,* ***94%***  *Report 2,* ***81%***  *Report 3,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 3 –**  **Measure one,  Final Paper** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 15 | *Grammar & mechanics,* ***100%***  *APA style & communication,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 3 –**  **Measure two, Comps Es** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | Comps, 15  Thesis, 3 | *Comps,* ***100%***  *(33% had revisions)*  *Thesis,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 3 –**  **Measure three,  Progress reports** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 16 | *Report 1,* ***94%***  *Report 2,* ***81%***  *Report 3,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 3–**  **Measure four, Evaluations** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | Agency, 13-15  Student, 14 | ***93%*** *on 1 student indicator*  ***100%*** *on 8 indicators*  *(6 for agency, 2 for student)* |
| **SLO 4 –**  **Measure one,  Final Paper** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 15 | *Project evaluation,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 4 –**  **Measure two,  Progress reports** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | 16 | *Report 1,* ***94%***  *Report 2,* ***81%***  *Report 3,* ***100%*** |
| **SLO 4 –**  **Measure three, Evaluations** | *Spring 2018-Fall 2019* | Agency, 13-15  Student, 14 | ***100%*** *on all 10 indicators  (9 Agency, 1 student)* |

\*\*Please note, all numbers are not consistent because some forms were not available electronically, and hard-copies were unfortunately not available. We are working to improve retention of our data sources.

1. SLO Status Table – Based on the results reported in the above table and referring to the program proficiency target, indicate the current status of program SLOs as Met, Partially Met, Not Met, or Unknown. Add rows as needed to accommodate additional SLOs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SLO 1 | Met  Partially Met  Not Met  Unknown |
| SLO 2 | Met  Partially Met  Not Met  Unknown |
| SLO 3 | Met  Partially Met  Not Met  Unknown |
| SLO 4 | Met  Partially Met  Not Met  Unknown |

**NOTE:** We will be cautious in interpreting results given the small proportion of missing data; if these data differed from those retained, our results may have indicated partially meeting our targets.

C. Describe how results are communicated within the program. Address each SLO.

We use the same process for each our four SLOs. Results are relayed to the unit once per year in a departmental faculty/staff meeting where discussion revolves around how to better assess and achieve proficiency targets for the various SLOs. Further, discussion includes what modifications may be necessary in courses prior to the practicum course so that students are better able to achieve proficiency on content-relevant indicators assessed by our rubrics associated with each SLO. Only our full time faculty teach our practicum course, thus, the assessment coordinator meets with the practicum coordinator several times over the academic year (approximately twice per semester) to touch base regarding practicum and assessment challenges. In regards to our comprehensive exam, discussion includes determining what can be done to reduce the number of revisions needed.

These results are also relayed to our external advisory board (EAB) at least once per academic year. It is important for us to get feedback from the EAB regarding their evaluation and suggestions of our data, as many members of our board are involved with agencies in the community that are relevant to working with the older adult population. In addition, they are also abreast of changing preferences and trends in the field.

**IV. Decisions and Actions**

Briefly describe specific decisions and actions related to each SLO. Include who (e.g., program faculty, a faculty committee, etc.) made the decision, when the decision was made (e.g., faculty retreat, faculty meeting, etc.), what data informed the decision, and a timeline for actions taken or to be taken. Add rows as needed to accommodate additional SLOs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 1** | ***Decision making process:*** Based on our data reported, we achieved our proficiency target for this SLO. The project evaluation for the final paper, and the evaluation portion of the progress reports will be examined closely as we collect more data to ensure that our students are able to adequately evaluate their activities and performance in regard to disciplinary knowledge. It is important to us to ensure that students are able to integrate their knowledge, understanding and skills to analyze the information in a real world setting. In regards to the comprehensive exam, we may choose to examine each question in regards to whether it focuses on this specific SLO and record whether a revision is needed for each individual question. While are sample size has increased, we remain cautious when making any decisions because our sample size is small for some of our indicators.  ***Decision maker(s):*** Primarily the assessment and practicum coordinator, along with the graduate program chair; however, the entire faculty will be involved in this discussion and final decision at our next faculty meeting in Spring 2020.  ***Decision timeline:***  Preliminary decisions were made when preparing this report in January 2020; however, as indicated above, no final decisions will be made until our Spring 2020 faculty meeting.  ***Data used for decision:*** Data reported in the above table from Spring 2018 through Fall 2019.  ***Action Timeline:*** Based on our Spring 2020 faculty meeting (and feedback from our EAB), we will make any changes beginning in Summer 2020, though we do not anticipate any major changes. We will continue to assess each semester to increase our sample size for analysis. |
| **SLO 2** | ***Decision making process:*** We also achieved proficiency for SLO 2, and are encouraged by the larger numbers showing proficiency. However, as with SLO 1, we will be mindful of our students’ progress on the project evaluation for the final paper, and the evaluation portion of the progress reports to ensure that our students are satisfactorily engaging in critical thinking when moving to the practicum experience, and writing their comprehensive exam responses. If there is reason for concern, we will aim to engage in more opportunities for discussion of concepts, theories and knowledge in class or on discussion boards, and also through writing assignments.  ***Decision maker(s):*** Primarily the assessment and practicum coordinator, along with the graduate program chair; however, the entire faculty will be involved in this discussion and final decision at our next faculty meeting in Spring 2020.  ***Decision timeline:***  Preliminary decisions were made when preparing this report in January 2020; however, as indicated above, no final decisions will be made until our Spring 2020 faculty meeting.  ***Data used for decision:*** Data reported in the above table from Spring 2018 through Fall 2019.  ***Action Timeline:*** Based on our Spring 2020 faculty meeting (and feedback from our EAB), we will make any changes beginning in Summer 2020, though we do not anticipate any major changes. We will continue to assess each semester to increase our sample size for analysis. |
| **SLO 3** | ***Decision making process:*** For SLO 3, we achieved our proficiency threshold for each indicator and feel more confident in these results given the larger numbers. We do not anticipate any major changes at this time. However, as none of the indicators on our progress report rubric focus exclusively on grammar and mechanics, which is more appropriate for this SLO, we may need to revise our rubric to address this SLO more satisfactorily (for the progress report measure). However, this is indirectly measured through the comprehensive exam; if the response is not well-written, the student would unlikely receive an evaluation of Pass or High Pass; thus, we may not need to continue to include the progress reports in our assessment of this SLO. In addition, we already have two other measures (one direct and one indirect) to adequately assess this SLO, thus, a revision would not necessarily be required.  ***Decision maker(s):*** Primarily the assessment and practicum coordinator, along with the graduate program chair; however, the entire faculty will be involved in this discussion and final decision at our next faculty meeting in Spring 2020.  ***Decision timeline:***  Preliminary decisions were made when preparing this report in January 2020; however, as indicated above, no final decisions will be made until our Spring 2020 faculty meeting.  ***Data used for decision:*** Data reported in the above table from Spring 2018 through Fall 2019.  ***Action Timeline:*** Based on our Spring 2020 faculty meeting (and feedback from our EAB), we will make any changes beginning in Summer 2020, though we do not anticipate any major changes. We will continue to assess each semester to increase our sample size for analysis. |
| **SLO 4** | ***Decision making process:*** For SLO 4, we achieved our proficiency threshold for each indicator and feel more confident in these results given the larger numbers. We do not anticipate any major changes at this time. Because our indirect, subjective measure is our best indicator of this SLO, we may want to explore other ways to adequately address this SLO to better reflect our goal for our students.  ***Decision maker(s):*** Primarily the assessment and practicum coordinator, along with the graduate program chair; however, the entire faculty will be involved in this discussion and final decision at our next faculty meeting in Spring 2020.  ***Decision timeline:***  Preliminary decisions were made when preparing this report in January 2020; however, as indicated above, no final decisions will be made until our Spring 2020 faculty meeting.  ***Data used for decision:*** Data reported in the above table from Spring 2018 through Fall 2019.  ***Action Timeline:*** Based on our Spring 2020 faculty meeting (and feedback from our EAB), we will make any changes beginning in Summer 2020, though we do not anticipate any major changes. We will continue to assess each semester to increase our sample size for analysis. |

**V.** **Additional Information**

**OPTONAL:** A new person has taken over the practicum, effective Spring 2020. The assessment coordinator will work with this individual to improve assessment efforts, as the new practicum coordinator expressed desire to modify our rubrics and evaluation reports.