



College of Human Sciences

PhD in Human Sciences, with options in Design, Housing and Merchandising; Hospitality Administration; and Human Development and Family Science

Assessment Report, 2016-2017

Date of Report: 9/12/2017

Name of Person Submitting Report: Christine Johnson

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Christine Johnson

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: christine.johnson@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2016-2017: 55 total PhD students, fall '16

Number of students graduated in 2016-2017: 6 Total: 1 during fall '16, 2 during spring '17, and 3 during summer '17.

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statements.

The PhD in Human Sciences is a multidisciplinary degree program which includes a strong emphasis on research and application of statistical procedures, as well as having students gain experience in knowledge generation (research and other creative scholarship), sharing knowledge (teaching/instruction), community engagement (outreach/extension), and resource generation (grant proposal writing). Individualized programs lead to an area of specialization in any one of the departments/school.

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

If yes, click here to enter information about how university assessment funds were used.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

Each department/ school has an assessment plan in place for their respective degree option; this report compiles the assessment activities across the three degree options.



College of Human Sciences

Ph.D. in Human Sciences, with option in Design, Housing and Merchandising

Assessment Report 2016-2017

Date of Report: 9/5/2017

Name of Person Submitting Report: Gina Peek, Ph.D., Graduate Coordinator

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Gina Peek, Ph.D., Graduate Coordinator

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: gina.peek@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2016-2017: 5 PhD students in Fall 2016

Number of students graduated in 2016-2017: 1 PhD graduate in Summer 2017

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statements.

[To be recognized leaders in technology and sustainable design in partnership with industry and community.](#)

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? ☐Yes ☒No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

If yes, click here to enter information about how university assessment funds were used.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

D1) Student Learning Outcome #1: [Graduates show evidence of specialized knowledge.](#)

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Each outcome (1-3) are assessed in Stage 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the qualifying exam.

- [Stage 1 is a directed take-home exam](#)
- [Stage 2 is a production of a publishable full-length manuscript](#)
- [Stage 3 is a written dissertation proposal and oral defense](#)
- [Stage 4 is a written dissertation and oral defense](#)

Student	Date			
	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
Derafshi	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Summer 2017
Pereira	Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	
Singh	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2017	

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

[Three students with 10 unique assessments; please see table.](#)

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

- [Stage 1: Student's advisory committee independently review and score the exam \(rubric\)](#)
- [Stage 2: Student's advisory committee independently review and score the exam \(rubric\)](#)
- [Stage 3: Student's advisory committee evaluate the dissertation proposal and oral defense \(pass/fail\)](#)
- [Stage 4: Student's advisory committee evaluate the dissertation and oral defense \(pass/fail\)](#)

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, click here to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 1.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

Results suggest that students are gaining specialized knowledge as required.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐ Each Semester

☐ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☒ **Other (please specify):** If the assessment of Learning Outcome 1 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

Stage	When conducted	Time limits
Stage 1	Declared after completing 12 hours but before completing 18 hours.	4 weeks from signing Form A-6. Students will receive feedback on submitted work within 15 business days of receipt of student submission.
Stage 2	Declared at the end of 3rd semester.	3 months from date of signing Form A-8. Students will receive feedback on submitted work within 15 business days of receipt of student submission.
Stage 3	Set proposal meeting no later than end of the fifth semester.	Must be set to allow for one full semester following successful completion of stage 3 to complete dissertation. Complete form A-10.
Stage 4	Set dissertation defense meeting to meet Graduate College guidelines for the semester of graduation.	See Graduate College for more information. Complete form A-11.

D2) Student Learning Outcome #2: Graduates show ability to synthesize solutions to new problems through analysis and critical thinking.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Same as Learning Outcome #1 (Ph.D. Stages 1, 2, 3, and 4).

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

Same students as measured by in Learning Outcome #1

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Same students as measured by in Learning Outcome #1

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

Same students as measured by in Learning Outcome #1

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 2.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

Results suggest that students show ability to synthesize solutions to new problems through analysis and critical thinking.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

- ☐ Each Semester ☐ Yearly ☐ Every other year

☒ Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 2 occurs on a cycle or rotation, [click here to describe and provide the rationale.](#)

D3) Student Learning Outcome #3: Graduates demonstrate competency in written and oral communications at a high level in both educational and professional settings.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Students are evaluated during the thesis/dissertation proposal and defense.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

1) Mercan Derafshi; 2) Chitra Singh

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students defending a proposal or dissertation were selected for assessment.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

During the proposal/final dissertation defense, faculty were provided rubrics and asked to evaluate the student.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, click here to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 3.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Of the four students, three consistently scored over 3 on all areas of the rubric. One student received lower average scores, with one less than 3. Please see attached results.

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

Students are able to communicate orally.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Each Semester | <input type="checkbox"/> Yearly | <input type="checkbox"/> Every other year |
|--|---------------------------------|---|

☒ **Other (please specify):** If the assessment of Learning Outcome 3 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

D4) Student Learning Outcome #4 [IF NEEDED]: [Click here to type Learning Outcome 4.](#)

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

[Click here to enter opportunities for students to learn this outcome.](#)

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

[Click here to type the number of students included in the assessment of Outcome 4.](#)

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

[Click here to describe how students were selected.](#)

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |

[Click here to specify.](#)

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

[Click here to describe the how the assessment for Learning Outcome 4 was conducted.](#)

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☐ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, [click here to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.](#)

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 4.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

[Click here to type the results of the assessment for Learning Outcome 4.](#)

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

[Click here to type what the results suggest about student achievement of Learning Outcome 4.](#)

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Each Semester | <input type="checkbox"/> Yearly | <input type="checkbox"/> Every other year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 4 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale. | | |

E. Summary of Assessment Results

Describe the overall results of the program assessment and program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.

What did the assessment reveal? What do faculty interpret the results to mean? What do the results suggest about the curriculum, teaching practices, and/or student achievement of the program learning outcomes?

Click here to enter overall assessment results and description of program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.

F. Dissemination of Results

Describe the individual(s) or committee (e.g., a curriculum committee) responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data.

Ph.D.: Student's advisory committee independently review and score Stages 1, 2; Stages 3, and 4 are evaluated using pass/fail criteria.

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment results with program faculty.

None

G. Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on the findings of this assessment, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?

Describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the discussion of the assessment evidence.

Click here to type planned program changes based on assessment data.

Based on the findings of this assessment, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?

For example, are there additional assessment data that may need to be collected? Are changes to the program assessment plan warranted?

Click here to type changes planned for the assessment process.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements.

Click here to enter description of the process for implementing planned changes.

H. Assessment Tools

Please provide a copy of any assessment tools (questionnaire, scale, interview questions, etc.) here.

Please see attached.

Oklahoma State University
Department of Design, Housing & Merchandising

Form A-3

Rubric for Assessment of Oral Communication in College of Human Sciences Graduate Programs

Student name: Gabi Pereira
Course/assignment: Proposal defense
Date: September 1, 2017
Reviewer:

	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	Comments
	1	2	3	4	
Language	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language is not appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language is appropriate to audience.	
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation difficult to understand; speaker appears uncomfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable; speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting; speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling; speaker appears confident.	
Supporting Material	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities).	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) reference information or analysis that partially supports the presentation.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) reference information or analysis that generally supports the presentation.	A variety of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) reference information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation.	
Central Message	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	



College of Human Sciences

Ph.D. in Human Sciences, with option in Hospitality
Administration

Assessment Report 2016-2017

Date of Report: 9/7/2017

Name of Person Submitting Report: Li Miao & Catherine Curtis

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Li Miao

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: lm@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2016-2017: 27

Number of students graduated in 2016-2017: 2

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statement

The School of Hospitality and Tourism Management is part of a comprehensive land grant university. Innovation, Creation, and Education define the core of its activities. To these ends the School is committed to providing relevant educational experiences, conducting scholarly research, and engaging the people of Oklahoma, and throughout the world.

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

If yes, click here to enter information about how university assessment funds were used.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

D1) Student Learning Outcome #1: Critical thinking. Graduates will demonstrate the ability to think critically and apply the scientific method to a broader base of knowledge concerning hospitality management, tourism, and related disciplines. This includes the acquisition and demonstration of skills used for conducting, planning and executing research endeavors, interpreting results, which include analysis, critical evaluation, and interpretation of data.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

Critical thinking enables students to actively and skillfully conceptualize, apply, analyze, synthesize and evaluate information as a guide for sound reasoning. Students take graduate level courses and work with their graduate advisors on research projects and dissertations to develop critical thinking competencies. Three 6000 level courses were offered in the 2016-2017 academic year to develop this learning outcome. In addition, 15 hours of dissertation credits are part of the degree requirements to ensure that this learning outcome is integrated into the program. Students can also enroll in credit-earning independent study courses to achieve this outcome.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

11

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students who defended their dissertations during the 2016-2017 academic year were selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

In order to assess this outcome, the assessment coordinator collected written artifacts from course instructor. This outcome was evaluated using the "Critical Thinking Rubric". Averages of the ratings were calculated.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 1.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

The overall average score for this rubric was 3.17/5.00. The average scores ranged from 2.91 to 3.45. Please see Table 1 below.

Table 1

Outcome 1: Critical Thinking

Critical Thinking Variables	Means	Standard Deviations
Title	3.14	1.16
Objectives and Research Questions with identification and explanation of issues	3.14	0.71
Identifying theoretical underpinning	3.36	0.74
Developing conceptual framework	3.18	0.56
Developing Hypotheses or propositions	2.91	0.58
Research methods(design, sample, procedures, measurements)	3.05	0.76
Expected results/contribution	3.09	0.70
Overall thinking and inquiry	3.45	0.69
Writing	3.27	0.79

n = 11 (on a 1-5 scale)

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

The results suggest that faculty members perceived that the students performed well regarding the seven critical thinking variables except for the item regarding developing hypotheses or propositions, which is slightly below 3.00 on a 5-point scale. It could be due to the fact that the artifacts used to evaluate this outcome were research proposals representing work in progress in which hypotheses or propositions were yet to be developed. Students need to meet with their professors for areas in which they need assistance so they can gain confidence in those areas.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐ Each Semester

☒ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☐ Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 1 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

D2) Student Learning Outcome #2: Disciplinary and Specialization Area Knowledge. Graduates will have acquired fundamental knowledge in the core areas of the degree program as well as their specialization area(s).

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Disciplinary and specialization area knowledge is acquired through readings, graduate courses and research/dissertation process. Students take courses within the program to develop disciplinary and specialization area knowledge. Students also have opportunities to take courses offered by other programs on campus to augment their specialization area knowledge. Through working on dissertation and other research projects, their disciplinary and specialization area knowledge is further deepened.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

2

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students were selected based on the criteria that students defended their dissertations during the 2016-2017 academic year.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Two types of assessment methods were used: 1) Students were evaluated by their committee members using the "Dissertation Assessment Rubric" (1 = Low to 5 = High); and 2) Students were evaluated using the "Dissertation Writing Assessment Rubric" (1 =Low to 5=High).

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, click here to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 2.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Dissertation Assessment and Dissertation Writing Assessment: Data was reported for two graduates. The overall average score for Dissertation Assessment was 3.78/5.00. The average scores ranged from 3.20 to 4.20. Please see Table 2 below. The overall average score for Dissertation Writing Assessment was 3.18/5.00. The average scores ranged from 2.80 to 3.60. Please see Table 3 below.

Table 2

Outcome 2: Disciplinary and Specialization Area Knowledge

Dissertation Assessment Rubric (Appendix B)	Means	Standard Deviations
Student has background knowledge in the general area of his/her research project.	4.20	1.10
Student is familiar with most analytical instruments and methods used in his/her area, including the principles on which they are based.	3.60	0.55
Student was aware of literature both directly relevant to the work done and from related fields.	4.20	1.10
Student is able to construct hypotheses or research questions or objectives.	3.40	0.89
Thesis/dissertation hypotheses or research questions or objectives generated by the candidate from an analysis of the literature.	3.60	0.89
Methods and procedures were appropriate and addressed in detail.	3.40	0.55
Work reflects student's competency in use of research methods and appropriate data analysis tools.	3.20	0.84
Results were interpreted appropriately.	3.60	0.55
Results were placed in proper context with other work.	3.60	0.55
Work contributes to the advancement of the field.	3.00	0.00
Thoughts were logically organized.	3.80	1.30
Thoughts were expressed clearly, using appropriate words, correct grammar, etc.	4.00	1.41
Good use was made of tables and figures and followed APA Style.	4.20	1.10
Appropriate credit was given to ideas, quotations, and illustrations from other sources.	4.80	0.45
Student understood questions asked of him/her in the defense.	4.00	1.00
Student answered defense questions correctly.	4.00	1.00

n=2 (On a 5-point scale)

Table 3

Outcome 2: Disciplinary and Specialization Area Knowledge

Dissertation Writing Assessment Rubric (Appendix C)	Mean	Standard Deviations
Mechanics	3.10	1.25
Sources	3.60	0.55
Quality of Information	3.40	0.89
Stated Research Hypothesis/ Objectives	3.20	0.45
Analysis Techniques Applied	2.80	0.84
Introductory Section and Review of Literature	3.00	1.00
Methods and Procedures Section	3.20	0.45
Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications Sections	3.20	0.45

n=2 (On a 5-point scale)

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

The results indicated that faculty members perceived that students performed well on the assessment items for disciplinary and specialization area knowledge. The School's assessment committee concluded that this outcome is being successfully met. One item (2.80) that is relatively low compared with other items is "Analysis techniques applied". To improve in this area, through advising, students will be encouraged to take more statistics and method courses to improve their instrument repertoire.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐ Each Semester

☒ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☐ Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 2 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

D3) Student Learning Outcome #3: Effective Communication in Academic, Educational, and Professional Settings. Graduates will demonstrate the ability to interpret and communicate scientific data to others in writing and in oral and visual presentations. .

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Class discussions, presentations and written reports are common components in graduate level courses. Throughout their doctoral study, students regularly participate in conferences, which entails submitting written abstracts and making oral presentations. Through working on research projects and their dissertations, students further develop and demonstrate the ability to interpret and communicate scientific data to others in writing and in oral and visual presentations.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

10

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students who enrolled in the 6000 level courses offered by the School during the 2016-2017 academic year were selected to assess this learning outcome.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

1. Artifacts collected from courses were evaluated using the "Written Communication Rubric".
2. Assessment committee members and /or faculty attending oral presentations evaluated this learning outcome using the "Oral Communication Assessment Rubric".

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, click here to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 3.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

- 1) Written communication: The overall average score for this rubric was 3.51/5.00. The average scores ranged from 3.21 to 3.86. Please see Table 4 below.
- 2) Oral communication: The overall average score for this rubric was 3.60/5.00. The average scores ranged from 3.00 to 4.33. Please see Table 5 below.

Table 4

Outcome 3: Written Communication

Written Communication Variables	Means	Standard Deviations
Content	3.86	0.80
Organization	3.71	0.81
Style and Mechanics	3.29	0.39
Documentation	3.21	0.57

n=7 (On a 1-5 scale)

Table 5

Outcome 3: Oral Communication

Oral Communication Variables	Means	Standard Deviations
Content	3.33	0.58
Organization	3.67	0.58
Presentation Skills	3.67	0.58
Visual Aids	4.33	1.15
Questions from the Audience	3.00	0.00

n=3 (On a 1-5 scale)

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

The results indicated that faculty members perceived that students performed well on the assessment items. The School's assessment committee concluded that this outcome is being successfully met.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐ Each Semester

☒ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☐ **Other (please specify):** If the assessment of Learning Outcome 3 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

E. Summary of Assessment Results

Describe the overall results of the program assessment and program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.

What did the assessment reveal? What do faculty interpret the results to mean? What do the results suggest about the curriculum, teaching practices, and/or student achievement of the program learning outcomes?

As evidenced by the above sections of this report, the overall results of the program assessment are that all learning outcomes are successfully met. Program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results are considered as satisfactory.

F. Dissemination of Results

Describe the individual(s) or committee (e.g., a curriculum committee) responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data.

Li Miao, Associate Professor; Catherine Curtis, Associate Professor

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment results with program faculty.

Assessment results are to be shared at graduate faculty meeting and via email.

G. Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on the findings of this assessment, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?

Describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the discussion of the assessment evidence.

Further discussion of the results will continue at the graduate faculty meetings. The faculty will discuss any changes the faculty deem necessary in the program throughout the course of the year. If changes are recommended to the assessment plan; the plan will be updated to reflect those changes.

Based on the findings of this assessment, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?

For example, are there additional assessment data that may need to be collected? Are changes to the program assessment plan warranted?

No changes are planned at this time; however, if any changes are recommended by faculty during the year, they will be updated and reflected on the assessment plan.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements.

[Click here to enter description of the process for implementing planned changes.](#)

H. Assessment Tools

Please provide a copy of any assessment tools (questionnaire, scale, interview questions, etc.) [here](#).

Appendix A- Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Adequate (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title clearly describes the proposal presented; neither too limited nor too broad. It is concise and conveys the main point of the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is appropriate and informative, but could be more concise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is concise but unclear. It does not fully describe the content of the proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is not concise and the point of the study is difficult to determine by title 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is not presented.
Objectives and Research Questions with identification and explanation of issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research questions/purposes are clear and researchable. The research question and purposes are clearly and directly linked to the problem. A strong sense of purpose controls the development of research; The proposal has a tight and cohesive focus that is integrated throughout the document. Issue/problem is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research questions/purpose are clear and researchable A clear purpose guides the development of the composition; the focus is clear throughout the document. Issue/problem is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research questions/purposes are mostly clear but could be developed better at some points. Although the purpose/question was stated, the student generally stays on a fairly broad topic and has not developed a clear theme. Issue/problem is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, and boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most research questions are unclear, or not researchable The proposal lacks focus or contains major drifts in focus. Issue/problem is stated without clarification or description. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose or research question is not stated. Issue/problem is not stated or linked to the purpose/questions.
Identifying theoretical underpinning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive, clear and coherent overview of relevant theory or literature. Relevant theory is successfully discussed, made a synthesis of it and has been successful in tailoring the description to the research at hand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theoretical perspectives are articulated and explained with relevant theory or literature. Relevant theory is successful in tailoring the description to the research at hand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant theory is discussed and partially successful in tailoring the description to the research at hand. Few errors occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theoretical underpinnings are unclear or there is very limited support from the literature or theory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is not theoretically informed or not grounded in the existing body of knowledge.
Developing conceptual framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual framework is fully cohesive, all parts logically relate to each other, and the framework provides a strong basis for research investigation. Conceptual framework is evidence-based (e.g. clearly relates to existing literature and/or theory). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual framework is mostly cohesive but may include one or two elements that are not clearly related to the whole. Framework is developed based on emerging level of understanding, and address integrates some readings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual framework is mostly cohesive but may include one or two elements that are not clearly related to the whole. Conceptual framework makes only a passing reference to previous literature and/or theory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual framework is non-cohesive and does not provide a basis for research investigation. Conceptual framework makes no reference to previous literature and/or theory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual framework is not clearly developed.
Developing Hypotheses or propositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops hypotheses or propositions in depth with strong and appropriate supporting examples, literature, experience or data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops hypotheses or propositions with appropriate supporting examples, literature, experience or data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieves some depth and specificity of discussion. Provide specific detail in some places, but often a bit general. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moves from idea to idea without substantial development; lacks depth. Lacks support for arguments or claims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks progression and paragraphs unpredictably structured.
Research methods(design, sample, procedures, measurements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All aspects of the research methods (including research design, sample, procedures, and measurements) are appropriate to test hypotheses and crafted well. It is feasible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods described are appropriate but some details are vague. It is feasible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods described are appropriate but some details are missing or vague. It is feasible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods described are either poorly suited to test hypotheses. Many details are missing or vague; the method is largely incomplete. It may not be feasible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods described are underdeveloped, not suited to test hypotheses, and/or is not feasible.
Expected results/contribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expected results and implications are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expected results and implications are logically tied to a range of information; they are identified clearly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expected results and implications are logically tied to information; some are identified clearly and some are too general. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expected results and implications are tied to some of the information discussed; but they are oversimplified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expected result or implication are provided.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids merely summing up what has been already said. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids merely summing up what has been already said. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly sums up what has been already said. 	
Overall thinking and inquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates high degree of thought and poses critical discussion. • Uses logical and critical thinking in reflecting on theme and texts • Makes solid and insightful connections and conclusions between the proposal and the issue chosen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates considerable degree of thought and discussion. • Uses logical and critical thinking in reflecting on theme and texts • Makes a substantial connection between the proposal and the issue chosen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some degree of thought in questions • There is an average effort for critical thinking/analysis • Is able to make a connection between the proposal and the issue chosen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited degree of thought • Poor exercise of critical thinking • Connection between issues and theories is vague or unconvincing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exercise of critical thinking at all • Demonstrates noticeable lack of interest
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses clear and understandable Language. • The writing is free of spelling and grammatical errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses clear and understandable language • Contains 2-3 spelling and/or grammatical errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses understandable language but is too wordy or not that easy to follow. • Contains 4-5 spelling and/or grammatical errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasionally uses phrases or sentences that are incomplete or incomprehensible • Contains 6-7 errors Paper is riddled with spelling or grammatical errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses phrases or sentences that are incomplete or incomprehensible • Hard to follow due to too many errors

Comments:

Scores

Criteria	Student #1
Title	
Objectives and Research Questions with identification and explanation of issues	
Identifying theoretical underpinning	
Developing conceptual framework	
Developing Hypotheses or propositions	
Research methods(design, sample, procedures, measurements)	
Expected results/contribution	
Overall thinking and inquiry	
Writing	
Critical Thinking Scores (Average)	

Appendix B- Dissertation Assessment Rubric

(Completed by each committee member after the student's dissertation defense and compiled for reporting annually.)

This instrument is to be used for outcomes assessment only. It is not intended as part of your evaluation of this student's qualifications. It will not become part of the student's record. Your responses will be kept anonymous with respect to the student. Thank you for your cooperation in assessing our educational effectiveness.

Evaluator's Name: _____ Student's Name: _____

Month/Year Student Entered Program: _____ Month/Year of Defense: _____

Student's Degree Program: M.S. – Hospitality Administration Ph.D. – Human Sciences, Hospitality Administration

Please give one score per row using the 1 to 5 scale. Add an asterisk (*) if noticeable improvement has been made since the beginning of his/her graduate education.

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT				
No.	SCORE		1	2	3	4	5
1		Student has background knowledge in the general area of his/her research project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is unaware of foundational principles in their area of study. 	Exhibits most characteristics of "1" and some characteristics of "3"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student has understanding of the most basic principles of subject. 	Exhibits most characteristics of "3" and some characteristics of "5"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student has solid understanding of all relevant background information in the subject.
2		Student is familiar with most analytical instruments and methods used in his/her area, including the principles on which they are based.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student did not perform analyses and does not know how the data were obtained. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student can operate instrument and utilize data generated 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student understands principles of the analysis, knows what patterns indicate an error, and can adjust instrument to obtain excellent data.

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT				
No.	SCORE		1	2	3	4	5
3		Student was aware of literature both directly relevant to the work done and from related fields.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Totally unaware 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aware of a good range of literature 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aware of literature both directly relevant to the work done and from related fields
4		Student is able to construct hypotheses or research questions or objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree.
5		Thesis/dissertation hypotheses or research questions or objectives generated by the candidate from an analysis of the literature.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hypothesis 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knows the hypothesis. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate generated the hypothesis and mastered the analysis that led to it.
6		Methods and procedures were appropriate and addressed in detail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
7		Work reflects student's competency in use of research methods and appropriate data analysis tools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
8		Results were interpreted appropriately.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
9		Results were placed in proper context with other work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
10		Work contributes to the advancement of the field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May make small contribution 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT				
No.	SCORE		1	2	3	4	5
11		Thoughts were logically organized.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some thoughts were logically organized. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
12		Thoughts were expressed clearly, using appropriate words, correct grammar, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some thoughts were expressed clearly. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
13		Good use was made of tables and figures and followed APA Style.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some good use was made of tables and figures and followed APA Style. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
14		Appropriate credit was given to ideas, quotations, and illustrations from other sources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some credit was given to ideas, quotations, and illustrations from other sources. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree
15		Student understood questions asked of him/her in the defense.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsatisfactory 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic competency 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent
16		Student answered defense questions correctly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsatisfactory 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic competency 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent

Appendix C- Thesis/Dissertation Writing Assessment Rubric
(Completed by each committee member upon completion of reviewing the dissertation and compiled for reporting annually)

Evaluator's Name: _____ Student's Name: _____

Month/Year Student Entered Program: _____ Month/Year of Defense: _____

Student's Degree Program: M.S. – Hospitality Administration Ph.D. – Human Sciences, Hospitality Administration

	SCORE	CATEGORY	1	2	3	4
A		Mechanics	Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Almost no grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors	No grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.
B		Sources	Some sources are not accurately documented.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format.
C		Quality of Information	Information has little or nothing to	Information clearly relates to the main topic. No	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It includes several

			do with the main topic.	details and/or examples are given.	provides 1-2 supporting details and/or examples.	supporting details and/or examples.
D		Stated Research Hypothesis/ Objectives	Not discernible from the text, or so confused so as to violate scientific principles.	Discernible, but not stated in testable form; contextual connections vague.	Recognized and well stated; contextual connections clear.	Clearly stated and well-crafted in an elegantly testable form; hypothesis/objectives made with very clear contextual connection.
E		Analysis Techniques Applied	Do not describe the results; do not indicate levels of confidence in the experimental results, and/or are inappropriate for data being analyzed (i.e., some assumptions of the technique are violated).	Describe the results, but do not appropriately indicate levels of confidence, or are inappropriate for the data being analyzed.	Clearly describes the results, appropriately indicate levels of confidence in the results, and are appropriate for the data being analyzed.	Elegantly used to clearly describe results and to indicate levels of confidence. Methods used are appropriate for the data being analyzed, and no assumptions of the quantitative methods are violated.
F		Introductory Section and Review of Literature	Does not adequately review the historical literature and/or does not introduce the specific research problem by contextual framework.	Adequately reviews the historical literature, but does not introduce the specific research problem in a contextual framework.	Is well written with adequate review of the historical literature. The specific research problem is placed in a contextual	Is very well written and provides a comprehensive review of the literature. The specific research problem is clearly and elegantly presented in the context of previous work and represents a

					framework of previous work.	logical extension of the research problem.
G		Methods and Procedures Section	Procedures are vague, disorganized, and/or are filled with irrelevant information.	Procedures are unclear, but interpretable. Some irrelevant information interferes.	Procedures are easily interpreted. Relevant information dominates.	Procedures are so clear that they require no additional interpretation and could be used directly as protocol. Appropriate details are provided.
H		Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications Sections	Merely a restatement of the results and is devoid of comparison to previously published findings.	Weakly integrates current results with previous findings.	Integrates current results with previous findings. Results are compared to conceptual framework of previously published research, but lacks sufficient detail.	Clearly integrates current results with finding of previous research. Results are compared in a well-constructed and detailed conceptual framework of previously published research.

(Adapted from OSU Plant and Soil Sciences Department's Assessment Plan, September 2008)

Appendix D: Written Communication Rubric

Oklahoma State University

General Education Assessment

Learning Outcome: Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in writing.

Skill		Level of Achievement			
		1	2*	3	4**
A	Content	Topic is poorly developed; support is only vague or general; ideas are trite; wording is unclear, simplistic; reflects lack of understanding of topic and audience; minimally accomplishes goals of the assignment.		Topic is evident; some supporting detail; wording is generally clear; reflects understanding of topic and audience; generally accomplishes goals of the assignment.	Topic/thesis is clearly stated and well developed; details/wording is accurate, specific, appropriate for the topic & audience, with no digressions; evidence of effective, clear thinking; completely accomplishes the goals of the assignment.
B	Organization	Most paragraphs are rambling and unfocused; no clear beginning or ending paragraphs; inappropriate or missing sequence markers. No clear over-all organization		Most paragraphs are focused; discernible beginning and ending paragraphs; some appropriate sequence markers. Overall organization can be inferred and is appropriate for the assignment	Paragraphs are clearly focused and organized around a central theme; clear beginnings and ending paragraphs; appropriate, coherent sequences and sequence markers. Overall organization is clearly marked and is appropriate for the assignment
C	Style and mechanics	Inappropriate or inaccurate word choice; repetitive words and sentence types; inappropriate or inconsistent point of view and tone. Frequent non-standard grammar, spelling, punctuation interferes with comprehension and writer's credibility.		Generally appropriate word choice; variety in vocabulary and sentence types; appropriate point of view and tone. Some non-standard grammar, spelling, and punctuation; errors do not generally interfere with comprehension or writer's credibility.	Word choice appropriate for the task; precise, vivid vocabulary; variety of sentence types; consistent and appropriate point of view and tone. Standard grammar, spelling, punctuation; no interference with comprehension or writer's credibility.
D	Documentation	In-text and ending documentation are generally inconsistent and incomplete; cited information is not incorporated into the document; content is not supported by sources.		In-text and ending documentation are generally clear, consistent, and complete; cited information is somewhat incorporated into the document; content is somewhat supported with sources.	In-text and ending documentation are clear, consistent, and complete; cited information is incorporated effectively into the document; content is well-supported with sources.

* Exhibits most characteristics of '1' and some of '3'

** Exhibits most characteristics of '3' and some of '5'

Revised 6/09/10

Appendix E: Oral Communication Assessment Rubric

(Completed by each faculty/assessment member attending the student's oral presentation and compiled for reporting annually)

Student's Degree Program: Ph.D. – Human Sciences, Hospitality Administration

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT				
	SCORE	SKILL	1	2	3	4	5
A		Content/language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content generally does not address the topic or is not appropriate for the audience. Major ideas not developed. Vague language, inappropriate use of colloquialisms. Inconsistencies in point of view and tone. Information is inadequately documented. Minimally accomplishes the goals of the assignment. 	Exhibits most characteristics of "1" and some characteristics of "3".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is generally appropriate. Some supporting detail. Language/word choice generally reflects understanding of topic and audience. Some inappropriate colloquialisms. "Audience" is not consistent. Some inconsistencies in point of view and tone. Some ineffective documentation. Generally accomplishes the goal of the assignment. 	Exhibits most characteristics of "3" and some characteristics of "5".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is well developed and appropriate for the topic and audience. Language/word choice is accurate, specific, and appropriate. Little or limited use of colloquialisms. Clearly defined audience. Consistent point of view and tone. Sources of information are well documented. Completely accomplishes the goal of the assignment.
B		Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topic is unclear or poorly identified to the audience. Little evidence of sequence or sequence markers. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topic is evident, though not clearly stated. Argument proceeds in a discernible manner with some sequence markers. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topic/thesis is clearly stated. Argument proceeds in an orderly and identifiable manner with appropriate sequences and sequence markers.
C		Presentation skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the presentation is hard to hear. Much excess verbiage ("you know," "um"). Lack of appropriate eye contact. Makes little effort to establish rapport with audience. Inappropriate dress or physical movements. Incorporation of visual aids detracts from rather than adds to the presentation. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation generally audible. Some excess verbiage. Uneven eye contact. Establishes some rapport with the audience. Gestures and physical movements somewhat "wooden". Dress is generally appropriate. Visual aids not smoothly incorporated into presentation. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation audible to all members of the audience. No excess verbiage. Eye contact with all parts of the audience. Establishes rapport with audience. Physical movements, gestures, enunciation compatible with audience and setting. Dress is appropriate for the setting. Effective use of visual aids.

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT				
		SKILL	1	2	3	4	5
D		Visual aids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks visual aids or aids are inappropriate for audience, purpose, and setting. Difficult to see or interpret. Contain inappropriate information. Distracting design, movement. 	Exhibits most characteristics of "1" and some characteristics of "3".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally appropriate for the audience, purpose, and setting. Some parts difficult to see or interpret. Complement the presentation. Most information is appropriate. Little distracting "eye candy" (movement, graphics). 	Exhibits most characteristics of "3" and some characteristics of "5".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate for the audience, purpose, and setting. Easy to see. Effectively incorporated into the presentation. Appropriate information. No distracting "eye candy".
E		Questions from the Audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not ask audience for questions. Shows poor listening skills (misinterprets questions, interrupts). Does not repeat questions for the audience or address the response to the audience. Some answers are incomplete, wordy, or off the topic of the question. Does not check adequacy of answer. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Assumes" a question period rather than announcing one. Listens to the question, but may interrupt before the questioner finishes. Sometimes responds only to the questioner instead of involving the audience. Answers are generally satisfactory but may be long-winded or only address part of the question. Does not always check to be sure answer was adequate. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announces when questions will be taken. Listens to questions carefully without interrupting. Involves the audience by repeating the question as necessary and addressing the answer to the audience. Answers completely and concisely. When appropriate, checks to be sure question has been addressed satisfactorily.

(Developed by the OSU General Education Assessment Committee- Revised 06-2008)



College of Human Sciences

Ph.D. in Human Sciences, with option in Human Development and Family Science

Assessment Report 2016-2017

Date of Report: 9/11/2017

Name of Person Submitting Report: Michael Criss

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Michael Criss

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: michael.criss@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2016-2017: 26

Number of students graduated in 2016-2017: 1

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statements.

The Ph.D. in Human Sciences with Option in HDFS is a research doctoral program designed to promote breadth, depth, and integration in Human Development and Family Science through research and other experiences. Doctoral students collaborate with faculty and other graduate students on research projects that integrate the theoretical and empirical knowledge base in HDFS and investigate key processes associated with individual and relationship competence.

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

Funds were used to support a .0625 FTE Graduate Research Assistant for the 2016-2017 academic year to administer Senior Exit Surveys, notify faculty who were responsible for completing rubrics, getting copies of other information relevant to the Assessment Plans for the three degree programs in HDFS, and analyzing data for the annual assessment reports.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

D1) Student Learning Outcome #1: Students will be capable of synthesizing social scientific readings to make well-supported hypotheses that can be tested with existing or newly created information.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Most of our Ph.D. courses incorporate syntheses of social scientific information in textbooks, readings, and class materials. The written assignments typically require the student to synthesize information from the social scientific literature in a way that leads to conclusions or hypotheses relevant to the topic of such papers.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

We were unable to collect data on this learning outcome due to a large class sizes which limited the instructors' ability to assign papers.

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Our plan called for faculty to complete the synthesizing rubric for all HDFS students in all Ph.D.-level courses on research papers completed individually by each student.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Our plan called for faculty to complete a series of ratings as an evaluation of the quality of synthesis demonstrated by each major paper written for the class by HDFS majors.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, [click here](#) to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 1.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Table 1: *Mean scores on synthesizing rubric ratings from Ph.D. courses in HDFS*

Criterion	2014- 2015 (N = 24)	2015- 2016 (N = 11)	2016- 2017 (N/A)
Devises new intellectual insights inspired by readings.	4.2	4.0	N/A
Shows logical pathway followed to reconstruct and/or generate new insights.	3.9	4.1	N/A
Conclusion(s) clearly flow(s) from logical analysis.	4.1	4.1	N/A
Overall Average	4.1	4.1	N/A

Scale: 1 = poor to 5 = outstanding

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

Data for these ratings were not available during 2016-2017, because the class had a large class size (N=15-20) which did not allow the instructor to assign a paper. We likely will be revising the Ph.D. assessment plan this year, so we will re-evaluate the feasibility of this learning outcome and/or method of collecting the data.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☒ Each Semester

☐ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☐ Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 1 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

D2) Student Learning Outcome #2: Students will develop and implement the expertise to carry out a variety of statistical analyses and to assess the appropriate use of statistical assumptions and tests.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Ph.D. students are required to take two graduate level statistics courses and HDFS 6133 (Advanced Research Methods in HDFS). They also gain some familiarity with statistics as they are used in journal articles that are read for their other required courses, in their research experiences in HDFS 6190 (Research Internship), and other involvement with implementing the various aspects of research studies (e.g., in their Graduate Research Assistantships; presenting at professional conferences).

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

Total number of students: 3

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

These students were evaluated on the relevant rubrics by their graders when they took the statistical qualifying exam.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Faculty who graded the qualifying exam on Statistics were asked to complete the revised rubric for evaluating four aspects of statistical understanding.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, click here to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 2.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Table 2: Mean scores on statistical competency (statistical qualifying exam)

Criterion	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Showed that he/she understood basic statistical issues conceptually?	4.0	4.6	4.38
Demonstrated knowledge of details of statistical procedures relevant to HDFS research?	4.0	4.5	4.38
Demonstrated the ability to manage data, to create and evaluate summary scores from multiple items, and to understand basic aspects of reliability?	6.0	4.8	4.59
Demonstrated the ability to identify an appropriate statistic for simple research questions, given the nature of the variables?	4.5	4.7	4.87
Overall Average	4.6	4.7	4.6

Grading scale: 1 = Clear Fail, 2 = Fail, 3 = Borderline Fail, 4 = Borderline Pass, 5 = Pass, 6 = Clear Pass

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

All three students passed their qualifying exams and the overall average was relatively stable across the past 3 years. Although one of the scores increased from the previous year, there definitely is room for improvement. It seemed that students who had a lot of research and statistical experiences outside of class (e.g., presenting at professional conferences, working on manuscripts with advisors) typically performed better on the exam compared to other students. As we begin our re-evaluation of the Ph.D. curriculum this year, we will look for ways of making adjustments to provide Ph.D. students with more research and statistics opportunities inside and outside of class. **Note:** The first two ratings were completed for the conceptual portion of the exam, and the last two ratings were completed for the applied portion of the exam.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐ Each Semester

☐ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☒ Other (please specify): Whenever the statistical qualifying exam is administered (once a semester). It may occur during the fall and spring semesters or just in the fall or spring semesters. It depends on when there are Ph.D. students who are ready to take the exam which varies each semester.

D3) Student Learning Outcome #3: Develop and implement the ability to collaborate on research students that are successfully submitted to professional journals.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Ph.D. students in HDFS are required to take a total of 12 credits in HDFS 6190 (Research Internship) during their Ph.D. program. The goal is for them to collaborate on research projects with faculty, which would result in presentations at professional conferences and, ideally, manuscripts submitted to professional journals. Students' course work as well as the various ways that they can get involved in research projects are designed to develop their ability to master all aspects of doing research, writing it up, and submitting it to an appropriate professional journal.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

Six students (four during Fall 2016 and two during Spring 2017)

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Requests were sent to all faculty who were listed as supervising one or more students signed up for HDFS 6190 (Research Internship).

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Faculty completed the rubric for manuscripts submitted for publication when that was applicable in their role of supervision doctoral students' research experience in HDFS 6190 (Research Internship).

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

If yes, click [here](#) to describe the goal set for this learning outcome.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 3.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Table 3: Mean scores on criteria for a good manuscript to submit for publication

Criterion	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Mechanics	2.8	N/A	2.8
Sources	3.5	N/A	3.8
Quality of information	3.5	N/A	3.6
Stated research hypotheses or objectives	3.3	N/A	3.4
Analysis techniques applied	3.3	N/A	3.3
Introduction section	2.8	N/A	3.0
Materials and methods section	3.5	N/A	3.6
Discussion section	3.0	N/A	3.3
Overall Average	3.2	N/A	3.4

Scale: 1 = Poor, 2 = Adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Outstanding

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

Submissions and publications in professional journals are important for our Ph.D. graduates to be competitive for research-oriented faculty positions, so we encourage Ph.D. students to work on publications before they begin their dissertation projects, including papers co-authored with and mentored by faculty members. we would like to see more manuscripts being submitted, including papers co-authored with faculty members. Compared to 2014-2015 academic year, the overall average increased slightly in 2016-2017. Inspection of the individual ratings indicated slight increases and relative stability. None of the ratings indicated decreases. While the overall pattern of findings is promising, there definitely is room for improvement.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐ Each Semester

☐ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☒ Other (please specify): The rubrics are requested every semester, but they are completed only when students submit a manuscript to a professional journal, including co-authors and well as single-authored manuscripts.

E. Summary of Assessment Results

Describe the overall results of the program assessment and program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.

What did the assessment reveal? What do faculty interpret the results to mean? What do the results suggest about the curriculum, teaching practices, and/or student achievement of the program learning outcomes?

Based on the available data, the findings from the assessment suggested both relative stability and slight increases in the ratings. While the overall pattern is promising, there is room for improvement. We will need to determine how we can provide the Ph.D. students with more experiences at statistics (e.g., collecting data, creating factors, analyzing data) and writing (e.g., writing literature reviews, describing methods and analyses, creating tables) in their courses, but also outside of class which can afford valuable experiences for students regarding their professional development.

F. Dissemination of Results

Describe the individual(s) or committee (e.g., a curriculum committee) responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data.

These interpretations made in this report are from the chair of the HDFS Assessment Committee Dr. Michael Criss.

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment results with program faculty.

These results and their initial interpretation will be shared with the HDFS graduate curriculum committee for them to determine whether there are any implications for modifications in our Ph.D. curriculum.

G. Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on the findings of this assessment, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?

Describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the discussion of the assessment evidence.

A revision to the Ph.D. curriculum was just submitted to the university, in part, based on previous assessment reports. This will include a number of introductory courses the first year in the program, including professional development, teaching seminar, and a technical writing course. We believe that these course will be beneficial for the doctoral students as it will provide a more explicit introduction and socialization into academia, better teaching skills, and more detailed instruction on technical writing.

Based on the findings of this assessment, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?

For example, are there additional assessment data that may need to be collected? Are changes to the program assessment plan warranted?

The assessment committee will re-evaluate the Ph.D. assessment proposal this year and likely will submit a revision.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements.

Any changes likely will occur in collaboration between the Graduate Curriculum and Assessment Committees. Note that HDFS Assessment Coordinator Michael Criss serves on both committees.

H. Assessment Tools

Please provide a copy of any assessment tools (questionnaire, scale, interview questions, etc.) [here](#).

Note: All of the assessment rubrics have been converted to online surveys using Qualtrics as this was found to be easier for faculty to complete and for summary scores to be computed.

APPENDIX A: SYNTHESIZING RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 1

Characteristics		Level of Achievement				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Devises new intellectual insights inspired by readings (puts parts together to form new whole).	Provides information taken directly from the readings with little further elaboration, application, analysis, or synthesis		Exhibits good insights into and/or understanding of the “question” posed. Discussion extends beyond an understanding of the facts to include application or analysis of the materials. Moves toward creation of new meaning or structure but fails to generate new insights or creative thought.		Asks provocative questions that extend discussion beyond the “posed question” to include original and creative thinking. Makes insightful, critical (evaluative) comments. Contributes new information and/or insights, builds a structure or pattern from diverse elements with emphasis on creating new meaning or structure.
2	Shows logical pathway followed to reconstruct and/or generate new insights.	Written comment does not demonstrate clearly articulated logic to explain pathway followed to generate new insights. Unclear and/or lack of well-articulated pathway followed in generation of new structure and/or insights.		Some evidence of logical pattern of thought. Fails to clearly, completely, and consistently articulate logical pathway toward generation of new structure and/or insights.		Clear articulation of logical pathway taken in generation of new structure and/or insights. Discussion logically builds toward conclusion using an insightful approach.
3	Conclusion(s) clearly flow(s) from logical analysis.	Conclusions do not logically follow pathway of thought expressed in written communication.		Articulation of conclusion(s) does not appear completely logical in light of the preceding information. Flow and depth of thought are not adequate or complete, resulting in conclusions that are not insightful.		Conclusions are articulated logically, following pathway of thought evident in written communication. Conclusion(s) “make(s) sense” given the preceding discussion. Written communication shows depth of thought employed to pose insightful conclusions.

APPENDIX B: COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 2

	Conceptual Questions	Applied Questions
<i>To what extent did the candidate:</i>	Low----High	Low----High
1. Show that he/she understood basic statistical issues <i>conceptually</i> ?	1 2 3 4 5 6	
2. Demonstrate knowledge of details of statistical procedures relevant to HDFS research?	1 2 3 4 5 6	
3. Demonstrate the ability to manage data to create and evaluate summary scores from multiple items and to understand basic aspects of reliability?		1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Demonstrate the ability to identify an appropriate statistic for simple research questions, given the nature of the variables?		1 2 3 4 5 6

Note: Graders of each type of question should provide scores on at least two of the above four competencies, i.e., the ones that are most relevant to the two questions they graded. Scale (same as scale for grading comprehensive exam): 1 = Clear Fail, 2=Fail, 3 = Borderline Fail, 4 = Borderline Pass, 5 = Pass, 6 = Clear Pass.

APPENDIX C: RESEARCH MANUSCRIPT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 3

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT			
Note: Evaluate doctoral student's work, not the work of co-authors						
Score		CATEGORY	1	2	3	4
	A	Mechanics	Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Almost no grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors	No grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.
	B	Sources	Some sources are not accurately documented.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format.
	C	Quality of Information	Information has little or nothing to do with the main topic.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. No details and/or examples are given.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It provides 1-2 supporting details and/or examples.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It includes several supporting details and/or examples.
	D	Stated Research Hypothesis/ Objectives	Not discernible from the text, or so confused so as to violate scientific principles.	Discernible, but not stated in testable form; contextual connections vague.	Recognized and well stated; contextual connections clear.	Clearly stated and well crafted in an elegantly testable form; hypothesis/objectives made with very clear contextual connection.
	E	Analysis Techniques Applied	Do not describe the results; do not indicate levels of confidence in the experimental results, and/or are inappropriate for data being analyzed (i.e., some assumptions of the technique are violated).	Describe the results, but do not appropriately indicate levels of confidence, or are inappropriate for the data being analyzed.	Clearly describes the results, appropriately indicate levels of confidence in the results, and are appropriate for the data being analyzed.	Elegantly used to clearly describe results and to indicate levels of confidence. Methods used are appropriate for the data being analyzed, and no assumptions of the quantitative methods are violated.
	F	Introductory Section	Does not adequately review the historical literature and/or does not introduce the specific research problem by contextual framework.	Adequately reviews the historical literature, but does not introduce the specific research problem in a contextual framework.	Is well written with adequate review of the historical literature. The specific research problem is placed in a contextual framework of previous work.	Is very well written and provides a comprehensive review of the literature. The specific research problem is clearly and elegantly presented in the context of previous work and represents a logical extension of the research problem.
	G	Materials and Methods Section	Procedures are vague, disorganized, and/or are filled with irrelevant information.	Procedures are unclear, but interpretable. Some irrelevant information interferes.	Procedures are easily interpreted. Relevant information dominates.	Procedures are so clear that they require no additional interpretation and could be used directly as protocol. Appropriate details are provided.

			LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT			
Note: Evaluate doctoral student’s work, not the work of co-authors						
Score		CATEGORY	1	2	3	4
	H	Discussion Section	Merely a restatement of the results and is devoid of comparison to previously published findings.	Weakly integrates current results with previous findings.	Integrates current results with previous findings. Results are compared to conceptual framework of previously published research, but lacks sufficient detail.	Clearly integrates current results with finding of previous research. Results are compared in a well constructed and detailed conceptual framework of previously published research.