

**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
SUMMARY FORM AY 2004-2005**

Degree and Program Name: Master of Art's in Gerontology

Submitted By: **Dr. Jeanne Snyder; Coordinator**

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 1**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to cskjs@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/> or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.

PART ONE

| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Demonstrate effective written and oral communication skills. | <p>a. Written communication as determined by the University Primary Trait Analysis (PTA) rubric administered while class is in session in FCS 5846, FCS 5900, PED 5225, PSY 5540, SOC 4800 (Course instructors/semester)</p> <p>b. Oral communication skills during formal presentations made as determined by University PTA rubric administered while class is in session in FCS 5846, FCS 5900, PED 5225, PSY 5540 (Course instructors/semester)</p> | <p>a. minimum mean score of 3/4. The expectation is that written communication will be focused, organized, well developed, highly competent/competent style and mechanics.</p> <p>b. minimum mean score of 3/4. The expectation is that oral communication will be highly competent/competent in organization, language, material, delivery, analysis, and voice.</p> | <p>a. FCS 5900: 3.2/4 (n=1) FCS 5846: 3.5/4 (n=5) PED 5225: 3.5/4 (n=2) PSY 5540: 2.4/4 (n=6) SOC 4800: no data given</p> <p>b. FCS 5900: 3.5/4 (n=1) FCS 5846: not required PED 5225: 3.3/4 (n=2) PSY 5540: not required SOC 4800: no data given</p> | <p>a. Core course instructors will submit the holistic scores from the rubrics assessing written work to the gerontology coordinator. Will share the results with the gerontology faculty committee members which include the gerontology core course instructors.</p> <p>b. Core course instructors will submit the holistic scores from the rubrics assessing oral communication to the gerontology coordinator. Will share the results with the gerontology faculty committee members which include the gerontology core course instructors.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| | <p>c. Perceived improvement of written and oral communication skills as determined by response on the Exit Survey (Program Coordinator/annual)</p> <p>d. Comprehensive written and oral examination/Master's thesis and thesis defense (Program Coordinator and Gerontology Faculty committee members). Comprehensive exams are administered once in the Fall and once in the Spring.</p> | <p>c. minimum mean score of 4/5 (4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree) for questions 3 and 4 on the Exit Survey.</p> <p>d. Students will be qualitatively evaluated for evidence of required content knowledge on a pass/no pass/remedial work needed. Written responses must be logically organized with well-constructed sentences and paragraphs. In addition, students must communicate in an articulate manner in the oral defense (comp or thesis) as determined by the University PTA rubric administered directly following the oral defense.</p> | <p>c. 4.8/5.0 (n=7) Question 3 4.8/5.0 (n=7) Question 4</p> <p>d. Three out of nine students did not pass their comprehensive exams and were asked to do remedial work. These three students upon evaluation of their remedial work passed.</p> <p>We had not implemented the use of rubrics until Sp '05. Two of the students who did not pass don't have a rubric score. One of the students who did not pass received a 1.8/4.0. Of the nine students who passed we have rubric data for four of them. The average score was a 3.7/4.0. One of the students who passed received a "pass with distinction."</p> | <p>c. Results are collected by the Program Coordinator and shared with the gerontology faculty.</p> <p>d. Results are shared with the gerontology faculty committee members. We have discovered that even though students may do well in their course work it does not necessarily mean that they will do well in the comprehensive exams. In light of this information, in Sp '05 we implemented a comprehensive examination preparation workshop to help our students to know what to expect and to be better prepared.</p> |
| <p>2. Effectively integrate gerontology core knowledge.</p> | <p>a. Gerontology core courses are FCS 5990, FCS 5846, PED 5225, PSY 5540, SOC 4800. Effective integration of core knowledge will be determined through comprehensive written and oral examinations. Written demonstration of core knowledge will be determined by the University Primary Trait Analysis (PTA) rubric administered directly following the oral defense. Oral demonstration of core knowledge will be determined directly following the oral</p> | <p>a. Students will be qualitatively and quantitatively evaluated for evidence of required core knowledge. Minimum mean score of 3/4 (competent/highly competent) regarding focus, organization, development, style, and mechanics. Oral defense (comp/thesis) will be evaluated qualitatively regarding organization, language, material, delivery, analysis, and voice.</p> | <p>a. Three out of nine students did not pass initially. Remedial work included rewriting comp exam questions. Most often students are asked to rewrite the required exam question if additional work is deemed necessary.</p> | <p>a. Results are shared with gerontology faculty.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | defense. (Program Coordinator and Gerontology Faculty committee members). | | | |
| 3. Develop competencies for working with older persons. | <p>a. Student internship evaluated using the internship mid-term and final evaluation form (Site Supervisor).</p> <p>b. Perceived the program as adequately providing preparation to meet professional goals as determined by the Exit Survey (Program Coordinator).</p> | <p>a. Students will be quantitatively evaluated on performance and professionalism. Should receive 3 or 4 on a five point Likert Scale along with positive comments.</p> <p>b. Student should indicate a 4/5 regarding Question 13 (My program provided adequate preparation to meet my professional goals).</p> | <p>a. 100% (n=15) students who completed internships received a 3 or 4 on a five point Likert Scale along with positive comments.</p> <p>b. Of the seven students who returned the exit survey 1 indicated a 4/5 and 6 indicated 5/5.</p> | <p>a.Results will be shared with gerontology faculty committee members.</p> <p>b.Results will be shared with gerontology faculty committee members</p> |
| 4. Demonstrate critical thinking, problem solving, and investigating. | <p>a. Student internship evaluated using the mid-term and final evaluation form (Site Supervisor).</p> <p>b. Perceived the program as increasing critical thinking and problem solving abilities as determined by the Exit Survey (Program Coordinator).</p> <p>c. Comprehensive written examination/thesis will be quantitatively evaluated as determined by the University PTA rubric administered directly following the orals. (Program Coordinator and Gerontology Faculty committee members).</p> <p>d. Comprehensive oral examination/defense will be</p> | <p>a. Students will be quantitatively evaluated on performance. Will receive 3 or 4 on a five point Likert Scale along with positive comments.</p> <p>b. Student should indicate a 4/5 regarding Question 5 on the Exit Survey (My program increased my critical thinking and problem solving abilities).</p> <p>c. minimum mean score of 4/5 regarding focus, organization, development, style, and mechanics.</p> <p>d. Qualitative evaluation will include consideration of</p> | <p>a.100% (n=15) of students completing internships received a 3 or 4 on a Likert Scale with positive comments.</p> <p>b.100% (n=7) of the students who returned the Exit Survey responded 5.0/5.0 on question 5.</p> <p>c. Data was collected for five of the nine students who completed comps. Four of the students received a 3.7/4.0 and the one student who did not pass initially received a 1.8/4.0.</p> <p>d.Qualitative data was collected for five students. Four of the students' oral</p> | <p>a.Results will be shared with gerontology faculty.</p> <p>b.Results will be shared with gerontology faculty.</p> <p>c.Results will be shared with gerontology faculty.</p> <p>d. Results will be shared with gerontology faculty.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>5. Demonstrate ability to function effectively within organizations/agencies serving older adults and their families.</p> | <p>qualitatively evaluated (Program Coordinator and Gerontology Faculty committee members).</p> <p>a. Student internship evaluated using the evaluation forms (site supervisor).</p> | <p>organization, language, material, delivery, analysis, and voice.</p> <p>a. Students will be quantitatively and qualitatively evaluated on performance. Student should receive a 3 or 4 on a five point Likert Scale along with positive comments.</p> | <p>exams were articulate, composed, organized by ideas, and specific.</p> <p>a. 100% (n=15) of students completing an internship received a 3 or 4 on a Likert Scale along with positive comments.</p> | <p>a. Results will be shared with gerontology faculty.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

PART TWO

Describe your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director's comments on last year's report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

1. Dr. Sanders recommended that rubrics be implemented for the core courses. This spring semester written and oral communication skills and core knowledge were assessed by the University Primary Trait Analysis (PTA) rubric. This has and will allow the program to better measure the program objectives and have a stronger grasp of student performance. In this year's assessment I provided a better explanation of how results are and will be shared with other gerontology faculty.
2. Performance on the comprehensive written exams was assessed by the University Primary Trait Analysis (PTA) rubric. The rubric allowed comp exam committee members to better assess the student's written performance.
3. The program has continued to effectively use exit surveys to elicit feedback from students regarding strengths and areas for improvement. The majority of comments for improvement center on having more electives to choose from which is not possible unless departments develop new course offerings related to gerontology.

PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

1. Two courses were added to the core to round out their program knowledge and to better fulfill recommendations from the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education. The courses were FCS 5900 Research Methods (Effective fall 2004) and EDF 5590 Educational Response to Third Age Learning (Effective fall 2005). It is still a bit too early to assess improvement in student learning from the addition of Research Methods, but preliminarily we can say that the students gained knowledge of the research process and developed poster presentations to demonstrate their work. Additionally, two students who had been enrolled in Research Methods are developing their research proposals from class into a thesis.

2. This spring I developed a comprehensive examination preparation workshop as well as a workshop on writing a master's thesis. These workshops were developed to help our students gain a better understanding of the written/thesis and oral/defense process. It is still too early to tell whether or not this will improve student performance. However, our students commented that they appreciated knowing what the expectations were and that the workshop helped to alleviate their test anxiety.
3. Plans are underway to retool the core course, Sociology 4800, to a 5000 level course. The graduate school and the coordinator believe that this will enhance the core course offerings. This change will be effective spring 2006.
4. Program plans for the future are to continue to improve our assessment strategies based on student performance and program needs.

*The program was honored by the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education and was awarded the Program of Merit in fall 2004. This recognition deems the program as one of excellence.