



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: AGTS

Academic Program Evaluated: PHD/ICS

Program Review Year: Submitted 2018-2019 Next 2020-2021

	Year 1 Academic Year:	Year 2 Academic Year:	Year 3 Academic Year:	Year 4 Academic Year:
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: <small>(List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)</small>	DeLonn Rance Valerie Rance Paul Lewis Anita Koeshall Mark Hausfeld Jerry Ireland	DeLonn Rance Valerie Rance Paul Lewis Bob Braswell Mark Hausfeld Wendy Brown		
Number of students in sample: <small>(If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)</small>	Graduate: 50 Ph.D. ICS students. Data from ten students is reviewed.	Graduate: 54 Ph.D. ICS students. Data from five students is reviewed.	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:

Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	Capstone projects from required courses evaluated each student's progress on a scale of 0 to 4 toward the student learning outcomes utilizing a standard rubric for each outcome.	Capstone projects from required courses evaluated each student's progress on a scale of 0 to 4 toward the student learning outcomes utilizing a standard rubric for each outcome.		
<i>Additional Data:</i> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	The data from the capstone projects was tabulated electronically and summarized in chart form for faculty review. Note: Because the core courses are taught in the Summer semester with grades for those courses not due until December no assessment data from those courses is available at the time of the faculty review. The faculty chose to evaluate the summer courses corresponding to the summer of the previous academic year. The data is attached.	The data from the capstone projects was tabulated electronically and summarized in chart form for faculty review. Note: Because the core courses are taught in the Summer semester with grades for those courses not due until December no assessment data from those courses is available at the time of the faculty review. The faculty chose to evaluate the summer courses corresponding to the summer of the previous academic year. The data is attached.		
Results of Assessment: (List the findings in summary format as narrative.)	The high averages ranging from 3.61 to 4.0 clearly indicate that the SLOs are being met.	Though a limited sampling group, the 4.0 averages clearly indicate that the SLOs are being met.		

Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show data results. Do not include the actual data.)	Attached	Attached		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	The SLOs cover broad areas of formation in multiple disciplines. High averages across disciplines and courses indicated a robust learning and research environment.	The SLOs cover broad areas of formation in multiple disciplines. High averages across disciplines and courses indicated a robust learning and research environment.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	The low numbers of students in the report indicates that students are struggling to complete the course requirements in a timely fashion.	The low numbers of students in the report indicates that students are struggling to complete the course requirements in a timely fashion.		

Year 1:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Twice a year reminder from the Director regarding the need to complete courses in a timely fashion.	Throughout the calendar year.	DeLonn Rance

Year 1:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
Detailed email regarding progress from DeLonn Rance	Contact in August 2018 and March 2019

Year 2:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
The creation of online cohorts for monthly follow up and encouragement	Throughout the semester	Jeffery Nelson

Year 2:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
Pending	Pending