Kean University

Kean Digital Learning Commons

Middle States Information and Publications

2012

Appendices for Standard 14 (September 2012)

Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.kean.edu/
middle_states_information_and_publications

Appendix 14-1

Templates for the program assessment reports, the annual assessment recommendation report which the deans complete, and the yearly summary reports as completed by the VPAA.

College or Division: _____

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall summary of College/Division data results: (College Deans please state summary in terms of actions aimed at improving teaching and learning. **Division VPs please state summary in terms of actions aimed at improving institutional effectiveness.)**	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)

Academic Assessment Report - AY _____

College, School/Department, Name of Program: _____

Program SLOs:
(List Program SLOs)

Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (Add rows for additional SLOs)	Assessment Measure(s) (Add rows if necessary)		Assessment Criteria (Describe how data is collected–rubric, survey, etc.)	Results of Assessment (Specific to Data Collected)	Action Taken (Closing the Loop: New action or follow up from last Assessment Report)
SLO #1	Direct:				
	Indirect:				
SLO #2	Direct:				
	Indirect:				
SLO #3	Direct:				
	Indirect:				

College or Division: _____

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Overall summary of College/Division data results: (College Deans please state summary in terms of actions aimed at improving teaching and learning. **Division VPs please state summary in terms of actions aimed at improving institutional effectiveness.)**	**(Must be tied directly to data reported in Assessment Reports)**	
Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)

Appendix 14-2

Guidelines and templates that
programs used to complete their review
in the pilot year, 2011-2012.

Kean University

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

Overview

Program review is an ongoing process involving the faculty and others concerned with the particular academic program. The guidelines established herewith will ensure that evaluation of the academic programs will occur formally at regular intervals. This document, therefore, describes the guidelines and a timetable for the systematic evaluation of academic programs at Kean University

Purpose of Program Review

The primary purpose of program review is to foster excellence in education. The review process, therefore, provides an opportunity for programs to identify areas of strength and address areas that need improvement. The program review process is also an important source of data for making some resource allocation decisions. Accordingly, at each level of the review process (program and dean), recommendations will be made that the University preserve the strengths of particular programs or address specific weaknesses.

Overview of Evaluation Procedures for Academic Programs
Scope of the Process

1. Definition of Academic Program
   Academic programs shall be defined as programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the following categories:

   A. Degree-granting programs (e.g., B.A. in Psychology, B.S. in Chemistry, Master of Public Administration)

   B. Non-degree-granting programs (e.g., General Education, Learning Assistance Program, Developmental Studies)

2. Guidelines for Program Review
   If the self study report developed by the program faculty does not address such significant requirements of the program review process as outcomes assessment, then the program faculty will be expected to address those program review requirements as an addendum to the self-study report. All other programs shall be evaluated according to guidelines in this document, as approved by the Board of Trustees.

3. Frequency of Evaluation

Each academic program that is to be evaluated by the guidelines shall be evaluated every three (3) years. The schedule for review has been developed by Vice President of Academic Affairs in consultation with the Dean.

4. Selection of Programs to Be Reviewed

The Dean of each School will consult with the Executive Director, Chairperson, and/or program coordinator to determine the schedule for developing materials.

B. *Methods for the Review Process*

1. Review of Mission, Objectives, Curriculum Map, and Student Learning Outcomes

Each program should review the program's mission, objectives, curriculum map and student learning outcomes along with the mission of the college. Every program should have clearly articulated student learning outcomes. Within the review process, the program should determine whether these elements and activities remain consistent with the University's mission statement, as well as academic and professional standards within the discipline. Programs should also review the student learning outcomes as outlined by the School of General Studies. The institution will continually modify and adapt its mission to be responsive to the needs of its constituencies and the mandates of the State. To remain viable, a program also needs to be responsive to these changes.

2. Review of Assessment Data and Use for Improving Teaching and Learning

Each program should review the program's assessment data and how that data can be used to improve teaching and learning. Programs should be collecting summative assessment data in capstones on a regular basis. Capstones should also have rubrics wherever possible. Indirect evidence includes surveys of students. At the conclusion of data gathering from the assessment mechanisms, there should be recommendations on improving student outcomes.

C. The Program Review Document

A. *Initiation and Individuals Involved*

The evaluation shall be initiated as a self-study by the program faculty, under the leadership of the executive director and coordinator. Provisions shall be made to involve in the program review faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and, where appropriate, employers and relevant professional associations. This process must begin during the first week of September.

B. The Scope of the Document

The overall emphasis of the program review report shall be on assessing the ways in which the program is meeting its goal and objectives and the relationship of these goals and objectives to the mission of the University. Specifically, the report shall provide descriptive and evaluative information about the program, incorporating multiple units of data to support its claims.

The report should follow the format outlined below.

1. Mission, Student Learning Outcomes, and Curriculum Map
    *   Provide the mission statement of the academic degree.
    *   Provide the explicitly stated student learning outcomes of the degree.
    *   Provide the curriculum map for the degree-granting program.

2. Description of the Academic Program and Syllabi
    *   Provide a catalog description of the academic program.
    *   Provide syllabi for each required course (optional for other courses).
    *   Provide all capstone syllabi.
    *   List all courses in the course catalog that have not been offered in the last three years.

3. Outcomes Assessment Plan
    For each stated student learning outcome, provide the following:
    *   Describe the multiple methods that will be used to assess the SLO.
    *   Provide data on each SLO (Student Learning Outcomes).
    *   List the courses in which the SLO is addressed, advanced, and mastered.
    *   Provide feedback on the results gathered.
    *   **Describe how the data will be used** to improve teaching and learning.
    *   Describe the assessment used in capstone to ensure that the program has met its knowledge, skill, and ability goals as defined in the SLOs.
    *   Provide any relevant graduating student or alumni data.
    *   Provide any data from employers (if necessary)
    *   Provide a representative list of all internships.

4. Rubrics and Other Tools, Final Exams
    *   Provide copies of all rubrics used in the program.
    *   If there are any other tools used (e.g., checklists), please either describe them or provide copies.
    *   Provide a copy of final examination(s) for all mandatory or high-frequency courses.

5. Statistical Data

Provide the following statistical and trend data on the academic program for the last four years. Request such data from Institutional Research.

- Enrollment headcount.
- Graduation headcount.
- Number of transfer and native graduates.
- Time to graduation.
- Number of resident faculty at time of review.
- Number of adjunct faculty and the total number of sections taught during the fall semester before the review.
- List of all sites where courses are held (Union, Ocean, etc.).
- % of core courses that require a paper of seven pages or longer.

6. Discussion of Trends

- Provide a narrative explanation of the significant trends in any of the above.

7. Faculty

- Provide a roster of resident faculty, including their titles and the courses they've taught by semester over the last three years.
- Provide CVs for all resident faculty.
- Provide resumes/CVs for all adjunct faculty teaching longer than ten (10) years.
- Provide a sampling of other adjunct faculty.

8. Students

- Include a description of the academic profile of the students served and consideration of whether or not they reflect the diversity of the student body as a whole.
- Include any other survey data gathered from students, including but not limited to insight from SIR-IIs, etc.
- List any student-related groups that supported the program (e.g., Honors Society in Business).

9. Degree Criteria and Requirements

- Provide a copy of the latest guide sheet.
- Provide a breakout of course distribution (i.e. GE, major requirements, electives).
- List the admissions requirements (if any). Provide a rationale for any admissions requirements if they exist.
- If necessary, discuss any possible changes to any of the above.

10. <u>Nontraditional Course Delivery/Weekend College</u>
- List any courses using nontraditional methods of instructional delivery (online, hybrid).
- List any courses under consideration for online and hybrid.
- List assessment procedures used to monitor the quality of instruction in these courses.

11. <u>Accreditation Organizations</u>
- Specify professional accreditation organizations to which the program may be subject (e.g., NCATE, CSWE, NASPA, etc). For each accreditation organization, list the last date(s) of their visit.
- Specify any professional accreditation organization with which the department may seek affiliation. If any, please describe the process needed for joining.

12. <u>Summary and Recommendations</u>
- Summarize the main elements included in the current review and curricular (and other related) changes proposed as a consequence of this review.

13. <u>Additional Resources Requested</u>
Indicate what new resources are needed over the next three years to:
- Enhance the current program.
- Preserve the strengths of the current program.
- Address the weaknesses in the program identified by the review.
- Address any technological impacts on the discipline.
- Address any material needs for the program.

Program review is a university requirement.

Program Review Procedures

A. Role of the Chair/Program Coordinator

In accordance with the schedule of program review, when a program is scheduled to begin its review, the Dean of the College notifies the Executive Director, Chair, and/or coordinator. In the case of graduate programs, the Graduate Dean is also notified. In consultation with the relevant program coordinators, the Executive Director selects one (or more, depending on the number of programs to be reviewed within the school) individual to assume responsibility for the review. This individual is referred to as the *Program Review Coordinator* in this document. A program review committee shall be formed within the School to provide support for the review effort, and the Program Review Coordinator shall periodically describe the status of the effort at program meetings. At the conclusion of the review, the final document shall be reviewed by program faculty and submitted to the Executive Director who will forward to the Dean. This report must be forwarded to the Dean on, or before, June 1.

B. Role of the Dean

The program review document will be submitted to the Dean of the College. The College Dean will forward copies of graduate program review documents to the Graduate Dean. The College Dean (and Graduate Dean, in the case of graduate programs) group, serving as the Chair of the program review committee, reviews the program review documents and makes recommendations for improvement, data collection and resource requirements, if any. It is the responsibility of the Dean to recommend program or course elimination if necessary. The college program review committee shall comprise all Executive Directors and two faculty members and one student appointed by the Dean. College level review must be completed on, or before, June 15 and the report presented to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Based on this review and discussion, the College Dean will prepare a brief report. This report will include:

(1) An evaluation of the findings and recommendations of the program review report.

(2) A discussion of how the recommendations will be addressed within the framework of the School strategic plan and budget requests for ensuing years.

The Graduate Dean will provide a written response to the recommendations, in the case of graduate programs. The Graduate Dean's response will be appended to the College Dean's report.

C. University Planning Council in Program Review

In general, the group of documents generated in the program review process will serve as a source of input into the planning process for the academic area and for the University as a whole. The program review process will also provide an opportunity for faculty in the academic disciplines to receive feedback about the quality of their own academic programs and the quality of academic programs in general. The VPAA Office, in consultation with the deans and appropriate department chairs, will conduct an annual institute or forum to review and discuss outcomes and trends. The University Planning Council must assess all program review documents and make recommendations to the President and program faculty. If needed, UPC must also make recommendations for resources at the University level and revisions to the mission.

UPC will serve as the University's internal program review committee. Its recommendations must be submitted to the President by July 1 of each year.

D. Program Review Time-lines

1. Program review process initiated by the Dean and Executive Director and program review task-force is charged during the first two weeks in September.

2. Program level review is completed and results and reports submitted by June 1 to the Dean.

3. College level review is completed and report submitted to the VPAA (who forwards material to the UPC) on, or before, June 15.

4. The UPC must submit its report and recommendations to the President by July 1.

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

Summary Page

Review of Program's Mission	Program's Mission:	Changes to Program's Mission (If Any):
Is Program Mission consistent with University Mission?	Please Explain:	
Does the Program remain consistent with academic and professional standards within discipline?	Please Explain:	
Review of Program's Curriculum Map	Program's Curriculum Map: (Please attach to a separate sheet if necessary)	Changes to Program's Curriculum Map (If Any):
Review of Program's Assessment Data	Program's Assessment Data from Capstone Course Review:	Assessment Data recommendations on improving Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (If Any):
Review of Program's Student Learning Outcomes	Program's Student Learning Outcomes:	Change in Program's Student Learning Outcomes (If Any):

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#1 Mission, Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map

Mission	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Student Learning Outcomes	SLO #1
	SLO #2
	SLO #3
	SLO #4
	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Curriculum Map	Please attach at the end of the section

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#2 Description of the Academic Program and Syllabi

Provide a catalog description of the Academic Program	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide syllabi for each required course (optional for other courses)	Please attach at the end of the section
Provide all Capstone Syllabi	Please attach at the end of the section
List all courses in the course catalog that have not been offered in the last three years	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#3 Outcomes Assessment Plan

		Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Describe the multiple methods that will be used to assess the Student Learning Outcomes	SLO #1	
	SLO #2	
Provide Data for each Student Learning Outcome	SLO #3	
	SLO #4	
	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary	
List the courses in which the Student Learning Outcomes is addressed, advanced and mastered	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary	

4

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#3 Outcomes Assessment Plan (Cont.)

Provide feedback on the results gathered	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Describe how the data will be used to improve teaching and learning	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Describe the assessment used in capstone to ensure that the program has met its knowledge, skill, and ability goals as defined in the Student Learning outcomes	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide any relevant graduating student or alumni data	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#3 Outcomes Assessment Plan (Cont.)	
	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide any data from employers (If applicable)	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide a representative list of all internships	

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#4 Rubrics and Other Tools, Final Exams

	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide copies of all rubrics used in the program	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
If there are any other tools used (e.g. checklists), please either describe them or provide copies	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide a copy of final examination(s) for all mandatory or high-frequency courses	

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#5 Statistical Data – Provide statistical and trend data on the academic program for the last four years. Request such data from Institutional Research if necessary.

Enrollment Headcount	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Graduation Headcount	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Number of transfer and native graduates	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Average time to graduation	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Number of resident faculty at the time of review	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Number of adjunct faculty and the total number of sections taught during the fall semester before the review	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
List of all sites where courses are held (Union, Ocean, etc.)	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Percentage of core courses that require a paper of seven pages or longer	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#6 Discussion of Trends	
Please attach a separate sheet if necessary	
Provide a narrative explanation of the significant trends in any of the fields found in #5, Statistical Data	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#7 Faculty

Provide a roster of resident faculty, including their titles and the courses they've taught over the last three years	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide CVs for all resident faculty	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide resumes/CVs for all adjunct faculty teaching longer than ten (10) years	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide a sampling of other adjunct faculty	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

#8 Students	
Include a description of the academic profile of the students served and consideration of whether or not they reflect the diversity of the student body as a whole. (Request such data from Institutional Research if necessary)	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Include any other survey data gathered from students, including but not limited to insight from SIR-IIs, etc.	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
List any student-related groups that supported the program (e.g. Honors Society in Business)	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

11

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#9 Degree Criteria and Requirements	
Provide a copy of the latest guide sheet	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Provide a breakout course distribution (e.g. GE, Major requirements, electives).	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
List the admissions requirements (if any). Provide a rationale for any admissions requirements if they exist.	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
If necessary, discuss any possible changes to any of the above	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#10 Nontraditional course delivery/weekend college

List any courses using nontraditional methods of instructional delivery (online, hybrid)	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
List any courses under consideration for online and hybrid.	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
List assessment procedures used to monitor the quality of instruction in these courses	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

13

#11 Accreditation Organizations	
Specify professional accreditation organizations to which the program may be subject (e.g., NCATE, CSWE, NASPA, etc). For each accreditation organization, please list the last date(s) of their visit	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Specify any professional accreditation organization with which the department may seek affiliation. If any, please describe the process needed for joining.	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#12 Summary and Recommendations
Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Summarize the main elements included in the current review and curricular (and other related) changes proposed as a consequence of this review.

15

Academic Program Review Guidelines Template

#13 Additional Resources Needed – Indicate what new resources are needed over the next three years to:	
Enhance the current program	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Preserve the strengths of the current program	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Address the weaknesses in the program identified by the review	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Address any technological impacts on the discipline	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary
Address and material needs for the program	Please attach a separate sheet if necessary

Appendix 14-3

University syllabi templates, and examples of syllabi from Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters.

Office of Academic Affairs

Fall 2012 Course Syllabus Template
(specific instructions for faculty are in italics)

Course Information

Course Title:

Course Number and Section:

Semester:

Course Meeting Days/Times:

Course Meeting Location:

Instructor Name:
Office Location: *(adjuncts should provide program/department office location)*
Office Hours: *(adjuncts should provide program/department office location)*
Phone: *(adjuncts should provide program/department office phone)*
Email:

Special features of the course - e.g., field trips or visits to facilities off campus

Course Description: *(catalog description here)*

Pre-requisite/program: *(any prerequisites or co-requisites, including test scores here. Or indicate how this course fits into a program or degree).* Students without prerequisite(s) must withdraw from the class.

Course Objectives: These are the specific objectives for the course that are aligned with the Program's Assessment Plan. Course Objectives can be copied to your syllabus from the course outlines. (Please ask your program's Coordinator, Executive Director, or Chair to provide you with the course outline of the course you are preparing to teach.) Program Assessment Plans are located at the following link and can be accessed by clicking on the link in the first column for each program.
http://www.kean.edu/KU/Academic-Assessment-

For Example:

At the completion of the course students will demonstrate the ability to:

1. Analyze the dynamics of the classroom and school setting and inform instructional practices and decisions to increase academic achievement of K-12 students.

Instructional Methods

Methods: *(statement about how course is taught.)*

For Example:
This course is taught using a variety of instructional approaches including lecture, class discussions, small group work, project creation, and electronic discussion (email and website chat room).

Textbook & Materials
Textbook Title:
ISBN:
Publisher:
Materials   *(Distinguish between required readings and recommended/supporting materials.)*

Topics and Assignments (Major Topics/themes and readings and assignments that are due each week.)

Week 1
Week 2
Week 3
Etc.

Important Dates
Last day to withdraw: October 31, 2012
Last day to declare Pass/Fail option (if applicable): September 24, 2012
See http://www.kean.edu/KU/Academic-Calendar-Registrar for other important dates

Assessment:

*Describe the **assessments** that will be used to evaluate student learning with respect to the course objectives and how these assessments are weighted in determining the final grade. These may include quizzes, tests, exams, papers, projects, participation, performances/products, in-class exercise such as group work, discussion, simulations or labs. Inclusion of an explicit Grading Scale is optimal.*

For GE courses, evaluation of students' oral and written communication skills need to be assessed. ***Students will need to demonstrate the skills and technology necessary to:***

1) write to communicate and clarify learning (GES1)

2) communicate effectively through speech (GES2)

Rubrics used to assess student learning outcomes in written and oral communication are located at the end of the syllabus:

1) Writing Rubric

2) Speaker Evaluation Form

Policies

Provide Course Policies, if necessary, such as tardiness, cell phone use, laptop use, etc.

Provide the following University Policies and Links: (This material can be copied and pasted into your syllabus)

Important University Policies and Information
Students are responsible to review and understand the *University Academic Integrity Policy* (available at the Center for Academic Success or at http://www.kean.edu/admin/uploads/pdf/AcademicIntegrityPolicy.pdf)

Students should review the *Student Code of Conduct*, as it discusses expectations of appropriate conduct in the classroom: http://www.kean.edu/KU/Code-of-Conduct.

The Students Rights and Responsibilities handbook is available at: http://www.kean.edu/KU/Forms-Policies-and-Publications

Students are strongly encouraged to register for the University's emergency notification system (www.mir3.com/kean) in order to be informed of campus emergencies, weather notices, and other announcements.

All students must have a valid Kean email account. For those who do not already have one, forms are available on-line at http://www.kean.edu/KU/Forms-OCIS; click on E-mail Account Request Form.

Americans with Disabilities Statement & Non-Discrimination Statement:

Kean University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution. Students with documented disabilities who may need special instructional accommodations or who may need special arrangements in the event of an evacuation should notify the instructor as soon as possible, no later than the second week of the term. Students may contact Kean Disability Office in Downs Hall Rm 127 to discuss special needs, 737-4910.

KU Non-Discrimination Policy:
Kean University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution.

Kean University Program in Early Childhood and Family Studies

Spring 2012   Course: EC3300-01 – Teaching and Learning in Early Childhood I (3 credits)
Monday and Thursday 2:00pm – 3:15pm   Hutchinson Hall 107
Instructor: Dr. Sonja de Groot Kim
Office: Hennings Hall: Room 418
Office Hours: Mo: 12:20pm-1:50pm; Tue: 12:30pm - 1:50pm; We: 1:20pm-4:20pm; Th: 12:20pm – 1:50pm & 3:30pm - 4:00pm; No appointment is needed during these office hours. For other times, please call to arrange an appointment. **For assignments:** Use BlackBoard email.
Phone: 908-737-3832; **EC/FS Office:** 908-737-3780; **E-mail:** skim@kean.edu

Important Dates:
Late registration period: January 18-24, 2012

January 25:	First class meeting of EC3250-02
January 26:	Last day to withdraw with a 100% refund
February 2:	Last day to withdraw with a 75% refund
February 9:	Last day to withdraw with a 50% refund
March 18:	Last day to withdraw with a "W" grade
March 19-25:	Spring recess

Pre-requisites:
EC2900 – Field Experience in Multicultural Early Childhood Settings
EC3250 – Perspectives on Early Childhood Practice; GPA 2.75 or higher
Co-requisite: EC3400 – Student Teaching in Early Childhood Education

Course Description
Development of teaching strategies, planning curriculum, and creating learning environments in preschool and kindergarten settings, using TWS Level II (ages 0-5). Placement in preschool is required (three mornings a week. 3 ½ hours each time). Additional observations (20 hours) in a kindergarten are required.

Required Texts:
Helm, J. H., & Katz, L. (2011). *Young investigators: The project approach in the early years* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards. Download from http://www.state.nj.us/education/cccs/2009/PreSchool.doc. Print out and bring to class.
Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S. (2009) (Eds.). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth to age eight* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Course Description
Development of teaching strategies, planning curriculum, and creating learning environments in preschool and kindergarten settings, using TWS Level II (ages 0-5). Placement in preschool is required (three mornings a week. 3 ½ hours each time). Additional observations (20 hours) in a kindergarten are required.

Course Requirements

Candidates reflect on assigned chapters/articles in a thoughtful manner, either in writing and/or in class discussions. Due dates of assignments are noted on the syllabus. In-class participation is an important part of the grade as the course design is based on the principles of collaborative learning and interaction through the sharing of thoughts, questions and problem solving. A semester-long placement in an early childhood setting is required. It will culminate in the production and presentation of a Level II Teacher Work Sample (MiniTWS).

Special Considerations

N.B.: In order to insure full class participation, any student with a disability condition requiring special accommodations (e.g. tape recorder, special adaptive equipment, sign/oral interpreter, and special note- or test-taking procedures or oral/sign language interpreter) is strongly encouraged to contact the professor at the beginning of the course.

Teaching and Learning Methods

A. Discussion of readings, class participation
B. Demonstrations and role-playing
C. Films, videos, Powerpoint, Internet, and other media resources
D. Direct observations of children through field placements
E. Oral presentations and written assignments

Course Objectives

Candidates will achieve growth toward becoming informed, dynamic professionals as evidenced by demonstrated growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teaching. From a no-sexist, multicultural point of view, the candidate will:

A. demonstrate knowledge of the theories of child development and teaching with emphasis on integrating cognitive, language, physical, and social-emotional development of children, ages 3 through 5 (K)
B. identify and develop developmentally and culturally appropriate, amiable learning environments for children ages 3 through 5, with play as a major vehicle for learning (K/S)
C. identify and use developmentally and culturally appropriate practices and interactions (K/S)
D. evaluate, select, plan, and implement integrated learning activities, based on individual and group goals and the level II TWS requirements (K/S/D)
E. engage in assessment processes that include observing, recording, documenting, and interpreting behaviors, with implications for practice (K/S/D)
F. communicate with, and involve families, other educators, and the community in the child's development and learning (K/S/D)

Course Content

A. Current child development theories with emphasis on the interrelationship of cognitive, language, physical, and social-emotional development of children ages 3 through 5
    1. Piaget – symbolic representation
    2. Vygotsky – symbolic play; language and thought
    3. Bronfenbrenner – sociocultural context
    4. Erikson – autonomy, initiative, industry
    5. Parten – social participation
    6. Gardner – multiple intelligences
B. Developmentally and culturally appropriate, amiable learning environments for children 3 through 5, with play as the major vehicle for learning
    1. physical environment/room arrangement
    2. learning centers – arts, science, mathematics, language and literacy, blocks, dramatic

play, technology
    3.   routines
C.   Developmentally and culturally appropriate practices and interactions for working with young children
    1.   classroom management
    2.   play facilitation
    3.   roles of the teacher
    4.   prosocial development – conflict resolution
D.   Group and individual goal setting strategies for planning integrated activities with young children
    1.   New Jersey Early Childhood Teaching and Learning Standards (2009)
    2.   Reggio Emilia approach – project approach
E.   Formats for developmentally and culturally appropriate assessment processes and implications for practice
    1.   observing, recording, documenting, and interpreting behaviors and interactions
    2.   types of observing, recording and documenting, including narrative observations (e.g., anecdotal records, running records), checklists/rating scales, use of technology (e.g. video, audiotape, camera)
    3.   types of assessment including Parten/Piaget social-cognitive play categories
    4.   implications for practice
F.   The role of families, professionals, support personnel, and the community in planning integrated programs for young children
    1.   interpersonal skills
    2.   written and verbal communication skills

Methods of Teaching and Learning
A.   Reading assignments and discussions
B.   Observations of children in early childhood settings
C.   Hands-on experience with a variety of learning materials
D.   Class activities and group work
E.   Use of technology

Evaluation of Performance
Your successful completion of this course entails engaging actively in the learning process. This course provides you with opportunities to demonstrate your successful acquisition and exhibition of knowledge, skills and dispositions in a variety of ways, including the following:

Letter Grades Will Be Based on the Following Scale:
A   95-100 points
A-   90-94 points
B+   85-89 points
B   80-84 points
B-   75-79 points
C+   70-74 points
C   65-69 points
D   60-64 points
F   55-59 points

Attendance, Participation, Dispositions (10 points)
In order to ensure continuity of learning it is important that you attend every class and participate productively in class discussions and activities. More than one absence will result in a reduced grade (see grading rubric). Arriving late or leaving early is very disruptive. Therefore, two late arrivals (more than 5 minutes late) or early departures (without informing me beforehand) equal one absence. Professional behavior is expected in class as well as in your observation site. Use of electronic media in class (texting, cell phone use) will equal one absence. If you miss class, it is YOUR responsibility to check with a classmate or with me about work missed.

Integrated Learning Experiences (Level II Teacher Work Sample (40 points)
Integrated theme/learning area project with four activity plans (10 points each), which will include:
1. Learning goals for each activity
2. Objectives for each activity
3. Meeting NJ Early Childhood Teaching and Learning Standards (2009)
4. Design for instruction for each activity
5. Assessment plan for each activity
6. Instructional decision making for each activity

Portfolio (35 points)
1. Introduction, including contextual factors (7 points)
2. Overview of learning goals (7 points)
3. Overview of assessment plans (7 points)
4. Overview of instructional decision making (2 for each activity) (7 points)
5. All work: writing mechanics and appearance (7 points)

Self-Reflection and Reflection on MTWS (5 points)

Journals with Observations (10 points). A minimum of 10 weekly journal observations of children, their curriculum interests, play, and activities (2 pages each). See guidelines for writing.

Grade Summary for your own record:

Assignments	Points Earned														
Attendance, Participation, Disposition (10 pts)															
Activity Plan #1 – (Design for Instr.) (10 pts)															
Activity Plan #2 – (Design for Instr.) (10 pts)															
Activity Plan #3 – (Design for Instr.) (10 pts)															
Activity Plan #4 – (Design for Instr.) (10 pts)															
Portfolio: Introduction (7 pts) Learning goals (7 pts) Portfolio: Assessment plans (7 pts) Portfolio: Instructional decision making (7 pts) Writing mechanics and appearance (7)															
Reflection (Self and MTSW) (5 pts)															
Journals (Minimum 10) (Total 10 points)															
Total number of points earned															

Rubric for Attendance, Participation, and Dispositions

9-10	6-8	3-5	0-2
You miss no more than one class. You demonstrate <u>considerable</u> effort and enthusiasm and participate fully in class discussions.	You miss 2 classes. You demonstrate <u>acceptable</u> effort and enthusiasm, and occasionally participate in class discussions.	You miss 3-4 classes. You demonstrate <u>little</u> effort and enthusiasm in the course and rarely participate in class discussions.	You miss six or more classes. You demonstrate <u>no</u> effort and enthusiasm in the course and do not participate in class discussions.

Guidelines for Writing Assignments for this Course

- All written assignments must be original, written by you and prepared specifically for this course. Submitting the same assignment for more than one course is not allowed. It constitutes academic misconduct.
- Plagiarism/Fabrication are serious violations of the Kean Academic Integrity Policy and will not be tolerated in this course. THIS VIOLATION WILL RECEIVE AN AUTOMATIC F ON THE ASSIGNMENT. Please be sure to read this policy. http://www.kean.edu/academicintegrity.html. Students found plagiarizing will have a violation report filed and submitted according to the instructions in the Academic Integrity Policy.
- All written assignments with citations must follow the APA style (please consult the APA Publication Manual for guidelines). All sources mentioned in the reference section of a paper must also be found in the paper itself, and all references in the paper must be found in the reference section.
- All written assignments must have your name, date, course number, and assignment type on the top. They must be typed, double-spaced, numbered. Use Times New Roman font, size 12" with 1" margins all around.
- It is extremely important that you thoroughly proofread your written assignments before submission. Have someone else proofread your writing.
- Typographical, grammatical, and other errors found in written assignments will result in a reduction of points.
- If you need help with writing, please consult the University's Writing Center and other resources.
- All written assignments must be submitted as scheduled in hard copies in class unless otherwise specified in the syllabus.
- Assignments submitted late, <u>within one week after the due date</u>, will receive a reduced grade.
- Assignments submitted <u>more than one week after the due date</u>, will receive a D.
- Assignments not received will received an F.
- To avoid receiving a reduced or a failing grade, contact me before class if you cannot meet the due date due to extenuating circumstances. I will set a new due date with you.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Kean University has an Academic Integrity Policy. The University maintains that all students are expected to employ the highest standards of academic integrity in their course work. Any violation of such may be subject to a penalty based on the infraction which may include a reprimand, reduction in grade, failing grade, suspension, or dismissal from the University. It is important that you are familiar with this Academic Integrity Policy. **Projects, activity plans, and other information in the portfolio copied from other sources (Internet, Books etc.) will receive an automatic F.** www.kean.edu/forms/AcademicIntegrity.pdf

COURSE OUTLINE. THERE MAY BE CHANGES DURING THE SEMESTER

Date	Topic	Reading	Assignment Due
Mo 1/23/12	Overview of the course requirements		Information about projects and MTWS
Th 1/26/12	Video: The Whole Child in Kindergarten	Read YI – Ch. 1	
Mo. 1/30/12	Issues in selecting topics for projects	Read YI – Ch. 2	**Bring NJ Early Childhood Teaching and Learning Standards**
Th. 2/2/12	Discuss NJ Early Childhood Teaching and Learning Standards	DAP 149-162	**In-class: Develop project web with ideas. Journal #1**
Mo. 2/6/12	Being an excellent teacher	Read YI – Ch. 6	**In class: Develop project web with ideas Journal #2**
Th. 2/9/12	DAP in the preschool years: Ages 3-5 Classroom management strategies	DAP 149-162	**Bring in draft of project web Due: Journal #3**
Mo. 2/13/12	Developing the project	Read YI – Ch. 3	**In-class: Work on activity plan # 1 Due: Journal #4**
Th. 2/16/12	DAP in the preschool years Ages 3-5	DAP 163-185	**Due: Journal #5 (Contextual Factors) Bring draft of finished project web**
Mo 2/20/12	**PRESIDENTS' DAY – NO CLASS**		
Th 2/23/12.	Investigation and documentation The role of the environment	DAP 163-185	Due: Activity #1 – HC + BB
Mo 2/27/12	The role of the environment	Read YI – Ch. 4	**Due: Journal #6** Activity #1 returned w. comments
Th 3/1/12	Reflection on activity - guidance	DAP 163-185	
Mo 3/5/12	The power of documentation Carry out Activity #1 (3/5 – 3/9)	Read YI Ch. 5	**Due: Journal #7** Carry out Activity #1 (3/5 – 3/9)
Th 3/8/12	Classroom Management Strategies Examples of Reggio-Inspired Practices	DAP 149-162	Due: Activity #2 - HC + BB
Mo 3/12/12	Adapting the project approach for toddlers Carry out Activity #2 (3/12 – 3/16)	Read YI – Ch. 7	**Journal #8** Carry out Activity #2 (3/12 – 3/16)
Th 3/15/12		DAP 149-162	**Due: Reflection of Activity #1 HC + BB** Due: Activity #3 - HC + BB
Mo 3/19/12 Th 3//22/12	**SPRING BREAK - NO CLASS**		
Mo. 3/26/12	Guiding projects with young children Carry out Activity #3 (3/26-3/30)	YI – Ch. 8	**Due: Journal #9** Due: Activity #4 - HC + BB
Th. 3/29/12	**MTWS – Portfolio - Contextual factors**		**Due: Reflection of Activity #2 – HC + BB**
Mo. 4/2/12	**MTWS – Learning goals** Carry out Activity #4 (4/2 – 4/6)		Carry out Activity #4 (4/2 – 4/6)
Th. 4/5/12	**MTWS – Learning goals**		**Due: Reflection of Activity #3 – HC + BB**
Mo. 4/9/12	**MTWS – Assessment plan**		**Due: Journal #10**
Th. 4/12/12	**MTWS – Assessment plan**		**Due: Reflection of Activity #4 – HC + BB**
Mo 4/16/12	**MTWS – Instructional Decision-making**		
Th. 4/19/12	**MTWS - Instructional Decision-making**		
Mo. 4/23/12	**MTWS - Reflection of Self and of MTWS**		
Th. 4/26/12	**BRING COMPUTER – IN CLASS WORK**		**Due: Reflection of SELF and of MTWS**
Mo..4/30/12	**BRING COMPUTER – IN CLASS WORK**		
Th. 5/3/12	**BRING COMPUTER – IN CLASS WORK**		
Mo. 5/7/12	**DUE: PORTFOLIO**		**DUE: PORTFOLIO**

Th. 5/10/12	**TBA**		
Mo 5/14/12	**LAST CLASS –RETURN PORTFOLIOS**		

Bibliography

Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. J. (2007). *Tools of the mind: The Vygotskian approach to early childhood education* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Cohen, D. H., Stern, V., Balaban, N., & Gropper, N. (2008). *Observing and recording the behavior of young children* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Corsaro, W. A. (2005). *The sociology of childhood* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Elkind, D. (2007). The hurried child (25th anniversary ed.). Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.

Fromberg, D. P., & Bergen, D. (2006). *Play from birth to twelve: Contexts, perspectives and meaning.* New York: Taylor & Francis

Helm, J., Beneke, S. & Steinheimer, K. (2007). *Windows on learning: Documenting young children's work* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jalongo, M.R., & Isenberg, J. P. (2008). *Exploring your role: An introduction to early childhood education* (3rd. ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Roopnarine, J. L., & Johnson, J. E. (2008). *Approaches to early childhood education* (5th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.

Scheinfeld, D. R., Haigh, K. M., & Scheinfeld, S. J. P (2008). *We are all explorers: Learning and teaching with Reggio principles in urban settings.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Trawick-Smith, J. (2010). *Early childhood development: A multicultural perspective* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Van Hoorn, J., P. M. Nourot, B. Scales & K. Alward (2006). *Play at the center of the curriculum* (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Wortham, S. (2008). *Assessment in Early Childhood Education (*5th Ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.

New Jersey: New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards. Retrieved from:
    http://www.state.nj.us/education/eccs/2009/PreSchool.doc

Reggio Emilia and Project Approach Websites

http://illinoispip.org/ Illinois Early learning Website – the Project Approach
http://illinoisearlylearning.org/askanexpert/chard/sup.htm Illinois State Board of Education - the Project Approach – Lilian Katz – Sally Beneke – Jean Mendoza
http://www.reggioalliance.org/ (North American Reggio Emilia Alliance)
http://www.reggioemiliaapproach.net/about.php (Excellent information about the Reggio Emilia Approach)
http://www.reggioemiliaapproach.net/ (Joint website of European Networking Preschools)
http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/ups/projects/ (University Primary School, University of Illinois- Projects)
http://www.cmu.edu/cyert-center/index.html (Cyert Center for Early Education - Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA)
http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/ (Early Childhood Research & Practice: Journal – free – has excellent examples of projects)
http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v2n1/schuler.html (Schuler - University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign – The Project Approach - Meeting the State Standards)

http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v2n1/helm.html (Helm - University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign –Linking Standards and Early Education)

http://ecap.crc.uiuc.edu/projects.html (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Site includes Clearinghouse on Early Education and Parenting and the Journal ECRP and the University Primary School)

http://www.designshare.com/index.php/articles/aesthetic-codes-in-early-childhood-classrooms/1/ (What art educators can learn about Reggio Emilia)

http://www.designshare.com/index.php/articles/hundred-1 (The 100 is There! - The Helen Gordon Child Development Center at the University or Oregon)

http://www.hgcdc.pdx.edu/ (Helen Gordon Child Development Center at the University of Oregon)

http://www.projectapproach.org/ The Project Approach – Sylvia Chard

http://www.lesley.edu/reggio/index.html (Lesley University and Reggio Emilia)

Other Useful Websites

http://www.learner.org Annenberg Foundation

http://www.acei.org Association for Childhood Education International

http://www.firstsigns.org/ First signs

http://www.naeyc.org National Association for the Education of Young Children

http://www.nccic.org National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center

http://www.nj.gov/njded/ece/ NJ Department of Education

http://www.cfw.tufts.edu/ Tufts University

Early Childhood Education Publications

Association of Childhood Education International (ACEI), Wheaton, MD
> *Childhood Education*
> *Focus on Preschool*

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Washington, DC
> *Young Children*
> *Teaching Young Children*

North American Reggio Emilia Alliance (NAREA)
> *Innovations*

Office of Academic Affairs

Capstone Course Syllabus Template
(Specific instructions for faculty are in italics)

Course Information

Course Title:

Course Number:

Course Date:

Course Meeting Times:

Course Location:

Instructor: *(please provide name, office location, office hours, phone and email)*

Course Description: *(catalog description here)*

Pre-requisite/program: *(any prerequisites or co-requisites, including test scores here. Or indicate how this course fits into a program or degree).* Students without prerequisite(s) must withdraw from the class.

Student Learning Outcomes for the Program (major) aligned with the course objectives:

Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): (SLOs describe what knowledge students will acquire and what skills/behaviors/attitudes they will be able to demonstrate by the end of the program. Program Assessment Plans are located at the following link and can be accessed by clicking on the link in the first column for each program. http://www.kean.edu/KU/Academic-Assessment-

Course Objectives: These are the specific objectives for the course that are aligned with the Program's Assessment Plan. Course Objectives can be copied to your syllabus from the course outlines. (Please ask your program's Coordinator, Executive Director, or Chair to provide you with the course outline of the course you are preparing to teach.)

For Example:

At the completion of the course students will demonstrate the ability to:

1. Analyze the dynamics of the classroom and school setting and inform instructional practices and decisions to increase academic achievement of K-12 students.

Instructional Methods

Methods: *(statement about how course is taught.)*

For Example:

This course is taught using a variety of instructional approaches including lecture, class discussions, small group work, project creation, and electronic discussion (email and website chat room).

Textbook & Materials

Textbook Title:
ISBN:
Publisher:
Materials   *(Distinguish between required readings and recommended/supporting materials.)*

Topics and Assignments (Major Topics/themes and readings and assignments that are due each week.)

Week 1
Week 2
Week 3
Etc.

Important Dates
Last day to withdraw: October 31, 2012
Last day to declare Pass/Fail option (if applicable): September 24, 2012

Assessment:

The culminating assignment for the program that provides the evidence that students have met the program's Student Learning Outcomes identified on the first page. Describe the assignment fully and include the scoring guide (rubric) that you will use to grade the assignment. Make sure that your scoring instrument includes the language of the program outcomes. (VERY IMPORTANT)

Also include any other assessments/expectations for the course and how they are weighted in determining the final grade. These may include quizzes, tests, exams, papers, projects, participation, performances/products, in-class exercise such as group work, discussion, simulations or labs.

Inclusion of an explicit Grading Scale is optimal.

The Capstone also assesses students' writing and oral presentation competencies using the rubrics provided in this template. This assessment of oral and written presentations will be used to determine the growth that students have experienced over their college years, as these rubrics will also be used in General Education courses.   The following language can be included here:

In this capstone course, *students will demonstrate the skills and technology necessary to:*

1) write to communicate and clarify learning (GES1)

2) communicate effectively through speech (GES2)

Rubrics used to assess student learning outcomes in written and oral communication are located at the end of the syllabus:

1) Writing Rubric

2) Speaker Evaluation Form

Policies

Provide Course Policies, if necessary, such as tardiness, cell phone use, laptop use, etc.

Provide the following University Policies and Links: (This material can be copied and pasted into your syllabus)

Important University Policies and Information

Students are responsible to review and understand the *University Academic Integrity Policy* (available at the Center for Academic Success or at http://www.kean.edu/admin/uploads/pdf/ AcademicIntegrityPolicy.pdf)

Students should review the *Student Code of Conduct*, as it discusses expectations of appropriate conduct in the classroom: http://www.kean.edu/KU/Code-of-Conduct.

The Students Rights and Responsibilities handbook is available at: http://www.kean.edu/KU/Forms-Policies-and-Publications

Students are strongly encouraged to register for the University's emergency notification system (www.mir3.com/kean) in order to be informed of campus emergencies, weather notices, and other announcements.

All students must have a valid Kean email account. For those who do not already have one, forms are available on-line at http://www.kean.edu/KU/Forms-OCIS; click on E-mail Account Request Form.

Americans with Disabilities Statement & Non-Discrimination Statement:

Kean University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution. Students with documented disabilities who may need special instructional accommodations or who may need special arrangements in the event of an evacuation should notify the instructor as soon as possible, no later than the second week of the term. Students may contact Kean Disability Office in Downs Hall Rm 127 to discuss special needs, 737-4850.

KU Non-Discrimination Policy:

Kean University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution.

Fall 2012

<u>Written Presentation Rubric Scoring Sheet for Capstone Courses</u>

Student Name: _____   Score : _____

Kean ID: _____

Course and Section: _____Instructor's name: _____

Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	0	Total
Genre/Audience						■	
Focus						■	
Development						■	
Organization						■	
Grammar/Mechanics						■	
Revision							

Comments (use back if needed):

CAPSTONE RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN PRESENTATION

	5	4	3	2	1	0
Genre/ Audience	Uses conventions in skillful way	Uses conventions in somewhat skillful way	Uses conventions in formulaic way	Does not follow conventions consistently	Fails to follow most or any conventions	Not applicable
Focus	Explicit, nuanced, complex stance	Explicit and nuanced, but not complex, stance	Stance defined in general terms	Vague stance	No clear stance	Not applicable
Development	All ideas developed with specific, relevant information.	Most ideas developed with specific, relevant information. Reader raises few questions	Ideas not developed consistently. Supported with vague generalization or inappropriate examples	Most ideas not developed or supported with inappropriate examples.	Ideas stated, not developed	Not applicable
Organization	Structure imparts feeling of wholeness and skill	Structure imparts a feeling of wholeness but not skill	Structure breaks down in some places, though solid overall	Structure feels rough or unclear	Structure clear or confusing	Not applicable
Grammar/ mechanics	Few or no errors exist; those present have no effect on reading	Errors obvious but not distracting	Errors begin to interfere with reading	Several distracting errors or multiple patterns of error	Numerous errors make understanding text difficult or impossible	Not applicable
Revision	Almost all revisions make draft stronger	Most revisions make draft stronger	Some revisions strengthen, but some weaken draft	Few revisions, with little effect on quality	Very few revisions; may make final worse	No evidence of revision

Descriptors for Capstone Written Presentation Rubric

This document contains an expanded explanation of the criteria making up the baseline and portfolio evaluation rubrics for College Composition (revised Summer 2011). Each criterion is briefly defined and linked to common terms used for it in composition textbooks. Characteristics of each level in a criterion are also included.

Genre/Audience: The writing demonstrates an understanding of the conventions of the genres they are writing as well as for academic writing in general.

Terms related to this criterion: conventions, community of readers, discourse community, genre, style, tone

- Score of 5: the writer follows all or almost all of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. In addition, the writer demonstrates a skillful ability to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations.
- Score of 4: the writer follows most, if not all, of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. There is evidence of effort made to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations. However, those efforts are not as skillful as a level-five essay.
- Score of 3: the writer follows most of the conventions. However, they do so in a formulaic way that shows little attempt to engage the audience.
- Score of 2: the writer follows most of the conventions but does not do so consistently. They may also not follow some conventions, but the reader gets the sense the writer understands the conventions.
- Score of 1: the writer fails to follow most or any of the genre conventions and of academic writing in general.

Focus: The writing presents a unified, clear stance with respect to the characteristics of the assignment. In a given essay, each paragraph relates to that stance.

Terms related to this criterion: main idea, purpose, stance, thesis statement

- Score of 5: explicit, nuanced stance. The reader feels like the writer has constructed a complex, well thought-out point.
- Score of 4: stance is explicit and/or nuanced, but not to the degree of a five. The reader may feel like some minor points are missing or that the stance could be more complex.
- Score of 3: stance somewhat clear, but may be defined in general terms (i.e. "subject A and B are a like in some ways and different in others" or "I agree/disagree with X" without giving reasons for their stance)
- Score of 2: vague stance or purpose. It may only apply to part of the piece.
- Score of 1: no clear stance or purpose.

<u>Development</u>: The main ideas in the writing are supported with specific, relevant information.

Terms related to this criterion: details, evidence, examples, facts, observations, statistics, testimony

- Score of 5: all ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. The reader feels like she or he has learned a lot from reading the piece.
- Score of 4: all major and most minor ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. However, the reader occasionally raises questions or wishes for more information.
- Score of 3: ideas are not developed consistently, causing the reader to want more information about some points. Ideas, in places, are clear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Some examples may not be appropriate.
- Score of 2: most ideas are not developed or are supported with inappropriate examples. The support is made up almost entirely unclear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Overall, the piece seems to have been written quickly and without the writer thinking through the ideas he or she wanted to convey.
- Score of 1: ideas are stated without any development at all.

<u>Organization</u>: The writing uses an overall and paragraph structures appropriate to the assignment(s).

Terms related to this criterion: coherence, cohesion, mode, patterns of development, structure, transitions

- Score of 5: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall pieces that imparts a feeling of wholeness and skill.
- Score of 4: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall piece that is effective but that may not be artful. Some slight breakdowns exist, but they are almost unnoticeable and seem more like isolated gaffes than patterns of error.
- Score of 3: the structure of the essay breaks down in some places, but holds together overall. At the paragraph level, some sentences are out of place. Some transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied among the paragraphs ideas.
- Score of 2: the structure of the essay feels rough and unclear. At the paragraph level, multiple sentences are out of place. Most of the transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied by the paragraph's ideas. The pieces seems to have been planned quickly and not revised.
- Score of 1: the writer uses an unclear or confusing overall organization. The paragraphs lack coherence; sentences are disorganized, with little or no effective use of transitions.

<u>Grammar/Mechanics</u>: the essay follows the conventions of Edited Academic English. This includes conventions for citing sources, regardless of the system used. An essay does not have to be perfect to receive a score of 5 in this criteria. Instead, consider whether the errors would either distract an average reader or make them doubt the writer's credibility.

Terms related to this criterion: diction/word choice, documentation, punctuation, sentence boundaries, sentence structure, spelling

- Score of 5: errors do not detract from the essay's central focus and from the smooth delivery of the writer's ideas. Few or no errors exist, and those that appear are minor or reflect obscure rules.
- Score of 4: errors are obvious but not to the point of distracting an average reader.
- Score of 3: grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors begin to interfere with understanding the text's meaning. Patterns of status-marking error may exist (ex. sentence boundaries, verb endings).
- Score of 2: several distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult. Multiple patterns of error exist.
- Score of 1: numerous distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult or impossible.

Revision: the writer made changes between drafts to the essay's focus, organization, development, and/or style that lead to a more successful final essay. These changes can take place at any level of the text (overall, paragraph, or sentence). Invention and planning work used to create a rough draft counts as evidence of revision.

Terms related to this criterion: addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement. (Note: The last two are not done as often, even when they are needed.)

- Score of 5: almost all of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used all four forms of revision as appropriate.
- Score of 4: Most, but not all, of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used most of the forms of revision, but may have needed to use others. (ex. the added and deleted material, but should have also rearranged it).
- Score of 3: the draft includes some revisions that make the final draft stronger, but others are needed. The writer mostly used addition and deletion, even if substitution and rearrangement was also needed. Some of the revisions may distract from the draft's quality.
- Score of 2: The draft includes few revisions, most of which have no influence on the final draft's quality. The writer may have used only one form of revision even though others are needed.
- Score of 1: the draft includes very few revisions; most either have no influence on the final draft's quality or make it worse. It seems like the writer just retyped the original draft.
- Score of 0: no evidence of revision. The writer turned in only one draft and no invention/ planning work.

SPEAKER EVALUATION FORM

Name of Speaker _____   Section _____

Student ID _____   Speech (1 or 2) _____

Key: 1=Unacceptable 2=Fair 3=OK/acceptable 4=good/above average 5=Excellent

Rating	Item	✓ = Positive, Effective 0 = Needs Work		Comments
CONTENT				
	Analysis of Topic	__Clear Purpose __Clear central idea	__Multi-sided argumentation __Relevant topic	
	Supporting Material	__Credible Sources __Cited Sources	__Varied Sources __Sufficient Sources __Appropriate visual aid	
	Organization	__Introduction __Main Points Clear	__Transitions __Conclusion	
	Style	__Defined terms __Vivid terms	__Grammar __Avoids clichés, jargon	
DELIVERY				
	Engagement	__Audience awareness __Eye contact	__Poise __Manages anxiety	
	Body Movement	__Posture __Gestures	__Facial Expression	
	Voice Quality	__Volume __Tone __Variety	__Extemporaneous __Articulation __Vocal Control	
	Fluency	__Freedom from notes __Avoids vocal fillers	__Effective pace __Effective use of Pauses __Effective rate	
PREPARATION				
	Outline	__Structure	__Bibliography __Annotation	
IMPACT				
	OVERALL IMPACT	__Speaker is credible __Appropriate use of time	__Speech is memorable __Speech accomplishes purpose	
	FINAL GRADE			

School of Communication Disorders & Deafness

COURSE TITLE:	Pre-Professional Career Preparation for
	Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology: Capstone
COURSE NUMBER & SECTION:	CDD-4275-02
SEMESTER:	Spring 2012
MEETING DAYS/TIMES:	Mondays 12:30p – 3:15p
	January 20 - May 14, 2012
LOCATION:	EC 153
INSTRUCTOR NAME:	Christina Zibas Luna, SLP.D., CCC-SLP
OFFICE LOCATION:	EC 104L
OFFICE HOURS:	Mondays 11-12; Tuesdays 4-6; Thursdays 11-12; 2-4; Fridays 8:30-10:30
	& By Appointment
PHONE:	908.737.5820
EMAIL:	cluna@kean.edu

I. Course Description:

This course is the Capstone course in the speech-language-hearing sciences program. This course is designed to provide students an opportunity to re-examine and critically explore the knowledge acquired across all major coursework completed to date. Synthesis of theoretical and clinical knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the student preparing for transition from undergraduate study to graduate school or a career as well as the pursuit of lifelong learning will be addressed. Emphasis will be placed on critical exploration and analysis of the existing professional literature as well as professional writing skills enhancement in preparation for graduate study.

II. Pre-Requisites:

Successful completion of all GELAP requirements and all major coursework in the academic sequence.
CDD 4269 is mandatory. Students without prerequisite(s) must withdraw from the class.

III. Course Objectives:

Student will demonstrate mastery of the program's student learning outcomes (SLO).

SLO 1: A fundamental knowledge base, both theoretical and practical, in the normal processes (neurological, physical, acoustic, cognitive and linguistic) that underlie the acquisition and development of human communication: speech, language and hearing across the lifespan.

SLO 2: An understanding of communicative disorders across the lifespan, their etiology, symptomology, assessment procedures and management models.

SLO 3: An introductory ability to evaluate research and consider contemporary issues (clinical, scientific, administrative and philosophical) within the disciplines of speech-language pathology and audiology.

SLO 4: An appreciation for the ability to translate content materials into appropriately tailored evaluation and treatment procedures.

SLO 5: Exposure to and use of technology in laboratory and clinical settings.

SLO 6: Knowledge of and sensitivities to cultural diversity as it impacts the development of human communication skills and the practice of speech-language pathology and audiology.

At the completion of the course, students will specifically demonstrate the ability to:

1. Synthesize general and specific knowledge of speech-language-hearing sciences

2. Describe various models of clinical intervention and reinforcement schedules across several types of disorders
3. Explain the research skills that practitioners need to function in various work settings
4. Describe and analyze various research and professional publications for quality and clinical utility in speech-language pathology and audiology
5. Articulate and discuss how current issues in legislation impact the professions of speech pathology and audiology
6. Reflect critically on the clinical preparation experience through application of this knowledge in a variety of written and verbal contexts
7. Apply theoretical knowledge to simulated clinical observations

IV. Instructional Methods:

This course is taught using a variety of instructional approaches including lecture, class discussions, small group work, research project creation, writing activities, video presentations, guided readings, clinical observation, and electronic discussion (email and website chat room).

V. Textbook & Materials:

Textbook

Haynes, W. O., & Johnson, C. E. (2009). Understanding research and evidence-based practice in communication disorders. Boston: Pearson.
ISBN13: 978-0-205-45363-4

Additional readings will include websites, articles that will need to be retrieved from the Kean library and PDF files downloadable from BlackBoard.

Materials

Composition Book

VI. Topics and Assignments:

The instructor reserves the right, at any time, to change the content of this course and/or to modify the requirements of the assignments listed within this syllabus. Changes will be completed with reasonable and timely notification to all students either on Blackboard, in class, and/or via individual e-mail. In case of inclement weather or other class cancellation, online lectures will be posted to Blackboard with a related activity to replace the face-to-face meeting that week. Assignments must be submitted to the instructor at the beginning of class time or via e-mail attachment time-stamped prior to the beginning of class time on the date due. Face-to-face class cancellation or absence from class will not constitute an extension of the due date/time of assignments.

Class	Topics	Readings/Supplemental Lectures	Assignments Due
1 Jan 23	Introduction to CDD 4275 Topic Selection Group Assignment Literature Reviews Review Developing an Argument	Syllabus Haynes Chapter 16	Group Memberships
2 Jan 30	Expository Writing Developing a Research Question Proposal Components	Haynes Chapter 3, 4	Topic Area for Project
3 Feb 6	Proposal Components Research Methodology: Overview IRB and Human Subjects Protection		Research Question
4 Feb 13	APA Style and Writing Scientifically Revisit Unfinished Topics Group Work Time	Haynes Chapter 10	
Feb 20	NO CLASS: University Closed for President's Day		

5 Feb 27	Research Designs: Single-Subject/Small Group Designs Group Work Time	Haynes Chapter 7	
6 Mar 5	Research Designs: Group Designs Group Work Time		Individual Drafts: Literature Review
7 Mar 12	Revisit Unfinished Topics Debate and Argument Group Work Time		
Mar 19	**SPRING BREAK**		
8 Mar 26	Debate Topics 1&2 Group Work Time		
9 April 2	Debate Topics 3&4 Group Work Time		
10 April 9	Debate Topics 5&6 Group Work Time		
11 April 16	Debate Topics 7&8		IRB Proposal
12 April 23	Oral Presentations		PowerPoint for Presentations
13 April 30	Oral Presentations		
14 May 7	Oral Presentations		Final Paper
15 May 14	Revisit Unfinished Topics Wrapping Up and Final Discussion		

VII. Important Dates:

January 23	Term begins
January 30	Last day to withdraw with 100% refund
February 6	Last day to withdraw with a 75% refund
February 13	Last day to declare a course as an audit
	Last day to declare or change undergraduate Pass/Fail option
	Last day to withdraw with at 50% refund
March 16	Last day to withdraw from courses with "W" grade (0% refund)

See http://www.kean.edu/KU/Academic-Calendar-Registrar for other important dates

VIII. Assessment:

Assignments

Class Attendance/Exercises:	20%			

Grading System

Assignment	%		Grade	Range
Class Attendance/Exercises:	20%		A	92 - 100
First Draft of Literature Review:	15%		A-	90 – 91
IRB Submission	20%		B+	86 – 89
Oral Presentation	20%		B	82 – 85
Final Paper	25%		B-	80 – 81
			C+	76 – 79
			C	70 – 75
			D	60 – 69
			F	Below 60

In this Capstone course, *students will demonstrate the skills and technology necessary to:*
1) write to communicate and clarify learning (GES1)
2) communicate effectively through speech (GES2)

Rubrics used to assess student learning outcomes in written and oral communication are located at the end of the syllabus and on BlackBoard:
1) Writing Rubric
2) Speaker Evaluation Form

No individual extra credit will be offered. Extra credit for the whole class may be offered over the course of the term at the discretion of the instructor.

XI. Policies:

A. Attendance

Classes will begin promptly at the scheduled time. Attendance and active participation at all class meeting is expected and will comprise 10% of the final grade. Students are responsible for any and all information and any in-class assignments or projects missed due to absence. Students are responsible for informing the instructor in advance or in a timely manner of the reasons for their absence. Attendance is expected at all classes for the semester. Please notify the instructor in advance in the event of a planned absence (e.g. religious observance). Active participation in the class will assist student learning. If a student is absent or requires an extension for submissions of assignments, written proof (e.g. doctor's note, police report of car accident) MUST be submitted in order for the request to be *considered*. Review of online lectures posted on BlackBoard and their related activities as well as completion of online phonetics laboratory exercises must be completed within specified time frames.

B. BlackBoard & Technology

All resources including all class handouts, lectures, required assignments and other information necessary for successful completion of this course are available on BlackBoard. You can access BlackBoard from any of the Kean Union campus computer labs which are open to all students if you wish. There are three computer labs in the East Campus building (two in the Communication Disorders and Deafness offices) as well as at the Library on the Main Campus. Students are responsible for downloading handouts and lecture notes and checking the course website on a regular basis for announcements. Lectures and other instructional materials will be provided through BlackBoard in lieu of face-to-face meetings. If you are unable to access the class or have difficulty accessing files on the class site on BlackBoard at any time during the term, please notify the instructor as soon as possible.

The link to get onto BlackBoard/Blackboard8 is on the bottom left of the Kean homepage at www.kean.edu or you can go to http://www.kean.edu/~de/Welcome.html Your login and password are the same as your Kean e-mail.

On the log in page (http://www.kean.edu/~de/Welcome.html), in the right hand column below the sign in is a list

of requirements for your computer system. There is also a system check you should review on the page where you log in to BlackBoard to insure you have full access to all of the materials (http://blackboard.kean.edu/webct/entryPageIns.dowebct). Be sure you have the ability to read Adobe Acrobat files.

Technology is an essential part of today's learning environment. However, when used inappropriately (e.g., checking e-mail, texting, internet surfing, playing games), technology can hinder learning for those sitting around the person engaged in this behavior as well as be distracting to the instructor. Use of laptops, PDA's, cell phones for legitimate purposes, such as taking notes, is allowed. All other use of laptops or PDA's is prohibited and will affect your participation/attendance grade negatively.

Audio recordings, video recording, and still photography will require permission of the instructor in advance.

C. Writing Assignments
There will be several writing exercises and related activities assigned over the course of the term. No hand-written assignments will be accepted unless otherwise indicated by the instructor. Assignments must be completed and submitted **electronically via Blackboard or to TurnItIn.com** by the beginning of class time on the date specified in the Course Content and Academic Calendar section of this syllabus unless otherwise noted in order not to be considered a late submission and downgraded accordingly. A detailed description of each assignment will be provided.

D. University Policies and Information
Students are responsible to review and understand the *University Academic Integrity Policy*.
Copies are available at the Center for Academic Success or at
http://www.kean.edu/admin/uploads/pdf/AcademicIntegrityPolicy.pdf

Students should review the *Student Code of Conduct*, as it discusses expectations of appropriate conduct in the classroom: http://www.kean.edu/KU/Code-of-Conduct

The Students Rights and Responsibilities handbook is available at http://www.kean.edu/KU/Forms-Policies-and-Publications

Students are strongly encouraged to register for the University's emergency notification system (www.mir3.com/kean) in order to be informed of campus emergencies, weather notices, and other announcements.

All students must have a valid Kean email account. For those who do not already have one, forms are available on-line at http://www.kean.edu/KU/Forms-OCIS; click on E-mail Account Request Form.

Americans with Disabilities Statement & Non-Discrimination Statement:
Kean University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution. Students with documented disabilities who may need special instructional accommodations or who may need special arrangements in the event of an evacuation should notify the instructor as soon as possible, no later than the second week of the term. Students may contact Kean Disability Office in Downs Hall Rm 127 to discuss special needs, 737-4910.

Kean University Non-Discrimination Policy:
Kean University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity institution. It is the policy of the Kean University Administration that there will be no discrimination or harassment on the basis of age, disability, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status in any educational programs, activities or employment. Persons having questions about equal opportunity and non-discrimination, please contact Human Resources for referral to the appropriate personnel, 908-737-3330.

Written Presentation Rubric Scoring Sheet for Capstone Courses

Student Name: _____   Score : _____
Kean ID: _____

Course and Section: _____Instructor's name: _____

Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	0	Total
Genre/Audience							
Focus							
Development							
Organization							
Grammar/Mechanics							
Critical Thinking							
Evidence/References							
Revision							

Comments (use back if needed):

CAPSTONE RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN PRESENTATION

	5	4	3	2	1	0
Genre/ Audience	Uses conventions, APA, professional language & terminology in skillful way	Uses conventions, APA, professional language & terminology in somewhat skillful way	Uses conventions APA, professional language & terminology in formulaic way	Does not follow conventions, APA, professional language & terminology consistently	Fails to follow most or any conventions APA, professional language & terminology	Not applicable
Focus	Explicit, nuanced, complex stance	Explicit and nuanced, but not complex, stance	Stance defined in general terms	Vague stance	No clear stance	Not applicable
Development	All ideas developed with specific, relevant information.	Most ideas developed with specific, relevant information. Reader raises few questions	Ideas not developed consistently. Supported with vague generalization or inappropriate examples	Most ideas not developed or supported with inappropriate examples.	Ideas stated, not developed	Not applicable
Organization	Structure imparts feeling of wholeness and skill	Structure imparts a feeling of wholeness but not skill	Structure breaks down in some places, though solid overall	Structure feels rough or unclear	Structure clear or confusing	Not applicable
Grammar/ mechanics	Few or no errors exist; those present have no effect on reading	Errors obvious but not distracting	Errors begin to interfere with reading	Several distracting errors or multiple patterns of error	Numerous errors make understanding text difficult or impossible	Not applicable
Critical Thinking	Originality of thought & clear understanding of issues presented	Most ideas are original but some seem obvious or elementary	Some original ideas with some lapses in logic or understanding	Few original ideas with many lapses in logic or understanding	No original ideas with connections between ideas confusing or missing	Not applicable
Evidence/ References	Sources cited adequately & appropriately using good professional quality sources	Most sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using some professional quality sources	Some sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using few professional quality sources	Most sources not cited &/or using mostly sources of questionable quality	Sources not adequately cited &/or are of questionable quality	Not applicable
Revision	Almost all revisions make draft stronger	Most revisions make draft stronger	Some revisions strengthen, but some weaken draft	Few revisions, with little effect on quality	Very few revisions; may make final worse	No evidence of revision

Descriptors for Capstone Written Presentation Rubric

This document contains an expanded explanation of the criteria making up the baseline and portfolio evaluation rubrics for College Composition (revised Summer 2011). Each criterion is briefly defined and linked to common terms used for it in composition textbooks. Characteristics of each level in a criterion are also included.

Genre/Audience: The writing demonstrates an understanding of the conventions of the genres they are writing as well as for academic writing in general.
Terms related to this criterion: conventions, community of readers, discourse community, genre, style, tone
- Score of 5: the writer follows all or almost all of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. In addition, the writer demonstrates a skillful ability to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations.
- Score of 4: the writer follows most, if not all, of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. There is evidence of effort made to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations. However, those efforts are not as skillful as a level-five essay.
- Score of 3: the writer follows most of the conventions. However, they do so in a formulaic way that shows little attempt to engage the audience.
- Score of 2: the writer follows most of the conventions but does not do so consistently. They may also not follow some conventions, but the reader gets the sense the writer understands the conventions.
- Score of 1: the writer fails to follow most or any of the genre conventions and of academic writing in general.

Focus: The writing presents a unified, clear stance with respect to the characteristics of the assignment. In a given essay, each paragraph relates to that stance.
Terms related to this criterion: main idea, purpose, stance, thesis statement
- Score of 5: explicit, nuanced stance. The reader feels like the writer has constructed a complex, well thought-out point.
- Score of 4: stance is explicit and/or nuanced, but not to the degree of a five. The reader may feel like some minor points are missing or that the stance could be more complex.
- Score of 3: stance somewhat clear, but may be defined in general terms (i.e. "subject A and B are a like in some ways and different in others" or "I agree/disagree with X" without giving reasons for their stance)
- Score of 2: vague stance or purpose. It may only apply to part of the piece.
- Score of 1: no clear stance or purpose.

Development: The main ideas in the writing are supported with specific, relevant information.
Terms related to this criterion: details, evidence, examples, facts, observations, statistics, testimony
- Score of 5: all ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. The reader feels like she or he has learned a lot from reading the piece.
- Score of 4: all major and most minor ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. However, the reader occasionally raises questions or wishes for more information.
- Score of 3: ideas are not developed consistently, causing the reader to want more information about some points. Ideas, in places, are clear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Some examples may not be appropriate.
- Score of 2: most ideas are not developed or are supported with inappropriate examples. The support is made up almost entirely unclear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Overall, the piece seems to have been written quickly and without the writer thinking through the ideas he or she wanted to convey.
- Score of 1: ideas are stated without any development at all.

Organization: The writing uses an overall and paragraph structures appropriate to the assignment(s).
Terms related to this criterion: coherence, cohesion, mode, patterns of development, structure, transitions
- Score of 5: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall pieces that imparts a feeling of wholeness and skill.

- Score of 4: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall piece that is effective but that may not be artful. Some slight breakdowns exist, but they are almost unnoticeable and seem more like isolated gaffes than patterns of error.
- Score of 3: the structure of the essay breaks down in some places, but holds together overall. At the paragraph level, some sentences are out of place. Some transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied among the paragraphs ideas.
- Score of 2: the structure of the essay feels rough and unclear. At the paragraph level, multiple sentences are out of place. Most of the transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied by the paragraph's ideas. The pieces seems to have been planned quickly and not revised.
- Score of 1: the writer uses an unclear or confusing overall organization. The paragraphs lack coherence; sentences are disorganized, with little or no effective use of transitions.

Grammar/Mechanics: the essay follows the conventions of Edited Academic English. This includes conventions for citing sources, regardless of the system used. An essay does not have to be perfect to receive a score of 5 in this criteria. Instead, consider whether the errors would either distract an average reader or make them doubt the writer's credibility. *Terms related to this criterion*: diction/word choice, documentation, punctuation, sentence boundaries, sentence structure, spelling

- Score of 5: errors do not detract from the essay's central focus and from the smooth delivery of the writer's ideas. Few or no errors exist, and those that appear are minor or reflect obscure rules.
- Score of 4: errors are obvious but not to the point of distracting an average reader.
- Score of 3: grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors begin to interfere with understanding the text's meaning. Patterns of status-marking error may exist (ex. sentence boundaries, verb endings).
- Score of 2: several distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult. Multiple patterns of error exist.
- Score of 1: numerous distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult or impossible.

Critical Thinking: the process of thinking that questions and making a decision about whether a claim is true or false *Terms related to this criterion:* insight, originality, evidence, logical analysis, judgment, understanding theoretical constructs

- Score of 5: paper demonstrates insight and originality of thought; has sound and logical analysis that reveals clear understanding of the issues presented in previous course work. The paper is convincing and satisfying.
- Score of 4: paper demonstrates some insight and mostly original thought of thought but some ideas are obvious and elementary; analysis is mostly sound but there are occasional lapses in logic or understanding. The paper leaves the reader somewhat skeptical and unsatisfied.
- Score of 3: paper demonstrates some original ideas but many seem obvious or elementary; analysis is generally sound but there are many lapses in logic or understanding. The paper leaves the reader vaguely skeptical and somewhat unsatisfied
- Score of 2: paper has few original ideas, most being obvious, superficial or elementary; analysis is superficial or illogical; the author seems to struggle to understand the relevant issues. The paper leaves the reader very skeptical and unsatisfied.
- Score of 1: paper has no original ideas with connections between ideas confusing and/or missing; the author clearly does not understand the relevant issues. The paper leaves the reader unconvinced.

Evidence/references: the writing uses adequate and appropriate sources throughout. *Terms related to this criterion:* sources, citation, peer-reviewed, professional, levels of evidence

- Score of 5: The author cited the work of others appropriately and adequately; works cited were of good professional quality and from a variety of sources/publication types; provided sufficient, detailed examples from the literature/sources to support his/her analysis
- Score of 4: Most sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using mostly professional quality sources; provided many detailed examples from the literature/sources to support the analysis

- Score of 3: Some sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using few professional quality sources; works cited were for the most part good quality but the score of the literature review appeared limited; provided some outside sources to support the points made in the narrative
- Score of 2: Most sources not cited &/or using mostly sources of questionable quality; provided minimal outside sources to support the points made in the narrative
- Score of 1: citations were not used or used inappropriately; the author frequently did not provide sources for information; sources used by the author were of questionable quality and the literature review was insufficient. The author did not provide any outside sources to support the points in the narrative

Revision: the writer made changes between drafts to the essay's focus, organization, development, and/or style that lead to a more successful final essay. These changes can take place at any level of the text (overall, paragraph, or sentence). Invention and planning work used to create a rough draft counts as evidence of revision.

Terms related to this criterion: addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement. (Note: The last two are not done as often, even when they are needed.)

- Score of 5: almost all of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used all four forms of revision as appropriate.
- Score of 4: Most, but not all, of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used most of the forms of revision, but may have needed to use others. (ex. the added and deleted material, but should have also rearranged it).
- Score of 3: the draft includes some revisions that make the final draft stronger, but others are needed. The writer mostly used addition and deletion, even if substitution and rearrangement was also needed. Some of the revisions may distract from the draft's quality.
- Score of 2: The draft includes few revisions, most of which have no influence on the final draft's quality. The writer may have used only one form of revision even though others are needed.
- Score of 1: the draft includes very few revisions; most either have no influence on the final draft's quality or make it worse. It seems like the writer just retyped the original draft.
- Score of 0: no evidence of revision. The writer turned in only one draft and no invention/planning work.

CDD 4275

Oral Presentation/Speaker Evaluation Rubric

Rating Key:
- 1 = unacceptable
- 2 = fair
- 3 = acceptable
- 4 = good/above average
- 5 = excellent

Rating	Item	+ = Positive/Effective 0 = Needs Work		Comments
Content				
	Analysis of Topic	Clear Purpose	Clear Central Idea	
		Relevant topic	Multi-sided argumentation	
	Supporting Material	Credible Sources	Sufficient Sources	
		Cited Sources	Appropriate visual aid	
		Varied Sources		
	Organization	Introduction	Transitions	
		Main Points Clear	Conclusions	
	Style	Defined Terms	Grammar	
		Vivid Terms	Avoids Clichés, Jargon	
Delivery				
	Engagement	Audience Awareness	Poise	
		Eye Contact	Manages anxiety	
	Body Movement	Posture	Facial Expression	
		Gestures		
	Vocal Quality	Volume	Extemporaneous	
		Tone	Articulation	
		Variety	Vocal Control	
	Fluency	Freedom from Notes	Effective use of Pauses	
		Avoids Vocal Filters	Effective Rate	
		Effective Pace		
Preparation				
	Outline	Structure	Bibliography/References	
		Annotation		
	PowerPoint/ Supplemental Materials			
Impact				
	Overall Impact	Speaker is Credible	Speech is Memorable	
		Appropriate Use of Time	Speech Accomplishes Purpose	
	Final Grade			

Appendix 14-4

Deans' and directors' yearly summary reports.

College or Division: **COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Prepared by: **SUZANNE BOUSQUET**

Date: **June 13, 2012**

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall summary of College/Division data results: (College Deans please state summary in terms of actions aimed at improving teaching and learning.)	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Universal rubrics modified by individual programs. Common assignments, readings, rating scales, contracts, checklists, etc. developed to improve consistency in teaching and learning. Program-specific instruments (e.g., pre/post surveys, content assessment instruments) yielded valuable findings regarding need for curricular and pedagogical changes. Ongoing revision of instruments shows an evolution of more targeted, program-specific assessment tools. "Real-world" experiences (e.g., simulations, speakers and educational events on campus, opportunities for participation in off-campus educational and cultural events enhance student learning.	Within programs/departments/schools: • Need for norming sessions to increase reliability of rubrics. • Need for adjunct training in program mission and assessment plan, use of common assignments, readings, etc. (330 adjuncts @ $100 per training session) • Need for program-specific tutoring (e.g., tutoring in statistic software such as SPSS/PASW). College-wide • Need workshops/in-service conferences on student writing, research and grading standards University-wide • Expand Writing Center and Speech Lab • Expand field experience and research opportunities for undergraduates • Expand speaker series and campus educational and cultural events • Increase speaker series, educational and cultural events, study abroad opportunities • Increase support for Library, IRB process	I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives III: External Partnerships IV: Attracting and Retaining Students V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars VI: Commitment to Diversity

Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Department of Communication Direct impact on teaching and learning (closing the loop): • Use of common writing/research assignment and checklist to facilitate writing • Use of plagiarism contract • Offer networking workshops to simulate real-world • Greater use of Speech Lab, use common rating scale for speech coach	Offer training workshops on components of communication (e.g., engagement, groupthink, systems theory, etc.) Continue to offer networking workshops in collaboration with Career Services Expand hours/staff of Speech Lab	I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives IV: Attracting and Retaining Students V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars
Department of English Direct impact on teaching and learning (closing the loop) • Use of common course activities • Add common methods to improve student weakness (e.g., development of synthetic conclusions) • Final research projects in required course broken down into a series of shorter assignments • Develop of peer workshops to improve student writing	Provide formal training in common activities and methods Hold norming workshops for rubric use	I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives IV: Attracting and Retaining Students V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars

Actions	Strategic Initiatives
Department of History Direct impact on teaching and learning (closing the loop): • Use of common plagiarism statement • Use of common readings • Use of common assignments • Offer writing skills seminars and PowerPoint tutorials on writing guidelines • Offer field trips and internal and external programming Continue to offer seminars to improve writing skills Expand offerings of field trips and external programming Enhance Study Abroad programming Provide additional experiences for historical/cultural exposure via hosting historical/cultural activities and external speakers	I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives III: External Partnerships IV: Attracting and Retaining Students V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars
School of Social Sciences Direct impact on teaching and learning (closing the loop): • Guide students in step-by-step creation of research proposal; rubric developed • Written assignments linked to readings • Provide additional opportunities for revisions of writing • Introduce common readings Provide training for adjuncts regarding common assignments and use of rubrics	I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives IV: Attracting and Retaining Students V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars
School of Psychology Direct impact on teaching and learning (closing the loop): • Use of common readings to facilitate concept learning • Increase use of revision process to improve writing • Use of common course assignments to improve professional skills • Increase reliance on university library and librarians to improve students information skills Provide workshops for adjunct faculty led by resident faculty on use of common assignments, common readings, use of the revision process to improve student writing, use of software (SPSS/PASW, Qualtrics) to be used in courses. Establish pool of tutors to assist students in use of discipline-based software, and "psychology review board" application process and/or develop tutorial	I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives III: External Partnerships IV: Attracting and Retaining Students

• Use of undergraduate "psychology review board" for evaluation of ethical compliance of independent research projects required of all students in required senior-level course Exit survey data indicate need for additional field experience and research opportunities for students	materials to address the need. Cultivate additional local partnerships to increase field experience opportunities. V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars
Graduate Programs Direct impact on teaching and learning (closing the loop): • Use of course blogs and practicum logs • Earlier distribution of study questions for comprehensive exams • Revised timetable for thesis completion (IRB application turnaround process found to pose delays in thesis work • Curricular sequence and pedagogical revisions	Offer norming workshops for thesis rubrics and major common assignments (annotated bibliographies, research papers, etc.) Provide additional support for Institutional Review Board to decrease turnaround time in application process. I: Accountability and Assessment II: Academic Initiatives IV: Attracting and Retaining Students V: Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars

College or Division: Nathan Weiss Graduate College

Prepared by: Steve Lorenzet

Date: June 12, 2012

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall summary of College or Division data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
• Clear theme emerging of a need to allow for sufficient flexibility to integrate program specific accreditation and assessment needs into university accreditation and assessment needs • Clear theme emerging of a need for increased administrative support • Importance of sufficient financial resources to support both student and faculty research and travel • Importance of continued emphasis on commitment to diversity • Theme emerging emphasizing the importance of sufficient technological resources and support	• Financial support for travel related to research and accreditation (for students and faculty) • Financial support needed to increase level of administrative support • Financial support to invest in current and future technology needs • Training as needed to enhance curriculum and training for students with regards to diversity	• Academic Initiatives • Financial Infrastructure • Commitment to Diversity • Technological Infrastructure • For further detail please see Strategic Plan goals listed below
Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) • Provide opportunities to develop a school vision given lack of opportunity to develop a vision in field experience • Additional emphasis in curriculum to adequately addressing new state bullying law • Students need greater opportunity to collect data or access existing data as part of their internship • Students should develop a stronger code of ethics as part of capstone experience • Students need enhanced support during dissertation advisement to understand APA style and formatting	• An adjunct that would provide dissertation support. This individual would be able to provide support to all doctoral programs. o Suggested payment of 4 credits per semester. • A consultant to work with the department to discuss the bullying law and best practices for implementation. **General Recommendations** • At least one additional computer lab on the East Campus • Finding to support doctoral student research presentations at conferences	• Academic Initiatives • Commitment to Diversity • Technological Infrastructure • Attracting and Retaining Students • Financial Infrastructure
Educational Leadership (MA) • Need for improvement in students' capability to communicate effectively with stakeholders • Need for students to strengthen capabilities in management of operations • Need to address student weakness in mobilizing community resources	• Support to conduct activities and events on campus that could lead to greater interaction with school districts, with a goal of creating additional external partnerships	• External Partnerships
Graduate Social Work (MSW) • Data collected electronically on multiple factors related to Council of Social Work Education standards for accreditation.	• Online training in assessment for adjunct faculty	• Academic Initiatives

o Data come from internship performance evaluations and class assignments
o Student performance on all measures was very high
 	
Graduate Management Studies (GMBA)
• Need for improvement in developing a three-year strategic plan
• Room for improvement in performance on Business Decision report
• Need for better developed management skills
• Room to improve presentation at end of capstone simulation
	• Improvement measures taken are focused on course revisions and do not require substantial financial support
	
	General Recommendations
	• Financial support to attend conferences for accreditation and assessment in the Business disciplines (EFMD/EPAS, AACSB)
	• Create a university-wide comprehensive program assessment handbook
	• Conduct exit interviews with graduating students
		• Academic Initiatives
		• Financial
		  Infrastructure
		• External
		  Partnerships

Advanced Studies in Psychology (PsyD)
• Program has very specific criteria in accordance with APA standards
o Student pass rates and successful completion of learning outcomes has been very high
o Room for improvement in student performance on Cultural Diversity
	• Individualized remediation plans for students
	• Teaching of Diversity will be re-examined at department retreat.
	
	General Recommendations
	• Financial support to attend professional conferences in Psychology where active participation in assessment workshops is available
	• Administrative support as the department prepares for its application for APA accreditation
		• Academic Initiatives
		• Commitment to
		  Diversity
		• Financial
		  Infrastructure

Advanced Studies in Psychology (PD) • Program has very specific criteria in accordance with NASP accreditation	• Next steps directly related to assessment data do not require specific resource allocations	• Academic Initiatives • Technological

standards

- Student pass rates and successful completion of learning outcomes is very high

General Recommendations

- Consider use of a portfolio system to archive and evaluate student learning and performance
- Financial support to attend professional conferences in Psychology where active participation in assessment workshops is available
- Administrative support as the department prepares for its application for NASP re-accreditation

- Infrastructure
- Financial
- Infrastructure

Occupational Therapy

- Students who took NBCOT exam in 2011 had an 85% pass rate. Cohort mean was 476 and national mean is 477.
  - Room to improve pass rate and cohort mean score
- Alumni survey suggests more focus needed on treatment planning, treatment techniques, and discharge planning
- Student focus groups suggest a need for more time spent on evaluation, acute care, treatment, and intervention activities
- Employer survey data suggest room for improvement in approaches to promote change and utilization of clinical reasoning skills

General Recommendations

- Next steps directly related to assessment data do not require specific resource allocations

General Recommendations

- Create opportunities to share best practices with other similar programs in the Graduate College
- Administrative support as the department prepares for its application for ACOTE re-accreditation

- Academic Initiatives
- Financial
- Infrastructure

Counselor Education

- Program has very specific criteria in accordance with CACREP

- Next steps directly related to assessment data do not require specific resource allocations

- Academic Initiatives

accreditation standards
  o Student pass rates and
    successful completion of
    learning outcomes is very
    high

Graduate Enrollment Management
- Graduate Enrollment Management
  has established several goals and
  action steps related to new student
  recruitment, enrollment, and
  graduation.
  o These goals and actions
    steps are being met
    successfully and in many
    cases with record results
    when it comes to
    enrollment data.
  o At the same time, the
    division has reached a point
    where it has outgrown its
    current level of staffing.

General Recommendations
- Tie the program review cycle and the Kean reporting
  format to program-specific accreditation, where it exists,
  and use the self-study already submitted

- Administrative support for the division as it deals with the
  outcomes of its success and the record applications and
  the record graduation, and certification applications that
  result

General Recommendations
- Establish a university-wide committee for Enrollment
  Management

- Attracting and
  Retaining Students
- Financial
  Infrastructure

College or Division: NJ Center for Science, Technology & Mathematics (NJCSTM) at Kean University
Prepared by: Laura Lorentzen, NJCSTM Executive Director
Date: June 12, 2012

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report Academic Year 2011-2012

Overall summary of College data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Close the loop assessment meetings with all NCJSTM faculty post SP12 show the need: to modify where needed certain rubrics used in specific courses in the NJCSTM curriculum for SLO measurements; to consult with TPC and ENG pertaining to student writing across the curriculum and teacher work samples/field supervisor reports; to establish minimal scores for continuing into master's year from bachelor's degree now that the new GRE general exam is released; and to strategize for ways in which computing and programming skills can be made even more accessible to our freshmen students in the major.	Continue to fund the University's subscription to Turnin.com (full package access that includes Peermark & Grademark features). Continue to fund thru the NJCSTM cost center the third party provider Princeton Review for MCAT & GRE training services. Identify where and if needed, funds for computational and programming manipulatives/softwares/equipment for enhancing core curriculum science/math labs. With present faculty and facilities, NJCSTM is poised to increase its matriculated headcount of enrolled highly qualified students, which will require a continued substantial effort in marketing and recruitment work.	II Academic Initiatives IV Attracting and Retaining students

Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
1) NJCSTM Seniors achieved an average score of 150 quantitative for the GRE general exam and a 148 on verbal. Seniors in education track options on Praxis II content exam had average score of 162. Graduate NCJSTM education track students averaged 3.5 out of 4 on	1) Continue to fund thru NJCSTM cost center the third party companies to offer to our students the test prep for standardized exams (GRE, MCAT). Move requirement for GRE from senior to junior year and establish a minimal score required for entry into master's year of five year bachelor/master program now that the new GRE is used. 2) Rubrics for assessing poster presentations, oral presentations and lab practicums used AY 2011-2012	II Academic Initiatives IV Attracting and Retaining students

graduate comprehensive exam.

2) Continue to modify design of established rubrics for STME 1603 (end of freshmen year assessment course); STME 3610 (junior course, the capstone precursor); STME 4610 (senior capstone); STME 5410-5415 (graduate biotech major project research credits) to ensure depth of scoring of particular areas of pedagogical knowledge to be measured and their alignment with program option SLOs.

3) Freshmen move from fall's ENG 1030 College Composition to spring's NJCSTM majors only GE 2024 Research & Technology, then to graduate writing course in master's year where applicable. Grammar/mechanics scores in writing for the underclassmen are subpar.

4) For NJCSTM education track students, the Kean Teaching Performance Center (TPC) handles collection of the teacher work sample and related items such as field supervisor reports.

5) The NJCSTM freshmen/sophomore core science/math curriculum is in year 8 since inception and the continued challenge is ensuring a computing and programming skill set for these underclassmen.

were found to have certain design shortcomings. Identify internal and/or external consultants/sources to work toward continued design improvement in these instruments.

3) Fall 2012 implement what was in SP12 piloted in STME 5103 (graduate scientific writing) --- the e rate/grademark feature of the University's turnitin.com subscription. Continued subscription to this site is important for pedagogical interactions and feedback between students/instructors. Consult with ENG 1030 coordinator (s) as well.

4) Consult with TPC to identify a streamlined and routine schedule and means by which NJCSTM as student major home can access the student material there housed.

5) NCJSTM faculty in consultation internally and with externally computational leaders need to identify, plan and implement a strategy to address this challenge in the core curriculum.

College or Division: College of Natural, Applied, and Health Sciences (CNAHS)
Prepared by: Drafted by P. Morreale for G. Chang's review
Date: June 12, 2012

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall summary of College or Division data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
AY 2011-2012 assessment reports identified the ongoing need for capstone rubric adjustment, based on regular data collection from pre and post assessments in supporting courses.	Continued support for professional staff and faculty to provide ongoing oversight and management to CNAHS department and division assessment process, year-round.	I Accountability and Assessment
Several programs identified the need for a baseline assessments on students entering the major, both native and transfer.	Additional resources (faculty/staff/overload) must be available for lower division (1xxx/2xxx) course(s) assessment.	II Academic Initiatives
		III External Partnerships
Exit skills, including oral presentation and capstone portfolio (resume, etc.) benefited significantly from earlier emphasis in the CNAHS curriculum offering.	Continued and increased funding in support of the use of national norms as baseline assessments whenever possible.	IV Attracting and Retaining Students
	Continued and increased support for oral presentations and professional preparation.	V Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars
External measures of CNAHS students, including national awards, graduate assistantships, summer internships, and professional employment on graduation remain strong. External accreditation or endorsements should be sought by CNAHS programs.	Support for department and division initiatives seeking external accreditation, including faculty and research infrastructure support.	

Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Biology (B.A.) – • Pre-/post-test measures developed for Fall 2012 in response to ETS exam results identifying need for more *Population Biology* content in the curriculum. • Peer tutors used to improve student learning in lab courses (BIO 3400, 3403, 3404) through review and revision support. Graduate assistant assigned to Bio 4105, 4700 for academic writing support. • Peer training on writing, presentation, quantitative reasoning and quantitative assessment rubrics provided. • Assessment of career portfolio required in Senior Capstone, which includes cover letter, resume, Thank you letter, and copy of representative student work. *Needs:* Support for continued ETS exam use, funding for peer tutors (students) and peer training (faculty and adjuncts). Earth Science (B.A.) – • Additional support needed for literature search, critical thinking, and analysis. • Inclusion of in-class courtroom experience to provide forum for earth science analysis.	Faculty and student development within CNAHS: 1. Funding for peer tutors and graduate assistants within disciplines to support student success in laboratory courses, supporting courses, and culminating capstones. 2. Funding for faculty development, particularly peer training or comparable external consultants on writing, oral presentation, quantitative reasoning and quantitative assessment rubrics specific to the sciences. Curriculum and course development within CNAHS: 1. Identification and assignment of existing professional staff and/or faculty, or new hires, to provide assessment oversight and year-round management of assessment process for each specific degree program. Each department or division should strive for external accreditation and endorsement 2. Integration of assessment efforts into department and division efforts, to include interaction with appropriate professional groups and industries.	I Accountability and Assessment II Academic Initiatives III External Partnerships IV Attracting and Retaining Students V Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars

Needs: Support for development of student research and presentation skills.

<u>Biology (B.S.) and Earth Science (B.S.)</u>–
- Developing a SELS Sr Research Class.
- Develop new sequences for SELS Bio majors (BIO 1200, 2201, 2202) and SELS Earth Science majors (GEOS 1100 and 2101)
- Use benchmark ETS National exam for freshmen and transfers (pre-, Fall 2012) and capstone (post-, Fall 2012)

Needs: Support for continued ETS exam use and faculty course development, including assessment.

<u>Chemistry (B.S.)</u> –
- Results from rubric pilot identify where revision is needed, including changes to teaching pedagogy.
- Modifications to earlier curriculum will be made to improve student preparation prior to capstone.

Needs: Support for continued faculty rubric refinement and course development.

<u>Computer Science (B.S., M.S.)</u> –
- SLOs will be identified and discussed with students earlier in the curriculum.
- Correspondence between course content and SLOs will be mapped and shared with students.

Needs: Additional clarity for supporting course and capstone process, including clear

articulation of SLOs to students and faculty.

Information Technology (B.S.) –
- Additional examples of the requirements document will be shared with students, with emphasis on how to develop and organize the document.
- SLOs will be mapped to curriculum and shared with students.

Needs: Examples of role and process of capstone work, including clear articulation of SLOs to students and faculty.

Mathematics (B.A.) –
- New rubric developed and used to gather SLO data.
- Assessment method used Fall 2011 (in-class test, multiple choice) changed for Spring 2012 (take-home test, free response), with greater data validity.
- Oral presentations received emphasis, with better student outcomes.

Needs: Support for assessment process and oversight, including review of outcomes with department SLOs.

Nursing (NURS 5900/4900) –
- Specific grading criteria needed for faculty-student discussions.
- Additional discussion of application of nursing models in projects needed.

Needs: Support for ongoing faculty review of curriculum and adjustment as needed.

College or Division: __COLLEGE OF EDUCATION__
Prepared by: __Dr. Susan Polirstok, Dean__
Date: __June 18, 2012__

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall Summary of College or Division data results	Implications for Resources needed/Budget Allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
• Comprehensive Program Reviews completed by Recreation Administration and Adult Fitness as per schedule for 2012.	• Budget needed to support accreditation efforts ($2,000 initially)	• Accountability/Assessment • Seeking new Accreditation/Academic Initiative
• Integration of NCATE/CAEPE requirements into the University Assessment System.	• No new budget dollars needed	• Accountability/Assessment • Maintenance of NCATE/CAEP Accreditation
• Data for multiple variables in the COE are routinely posted to our NCATE Webpage each semester; model of continuous program improvement in place in COE.		• Maintenance of NCATE/CAEP Accreditation • Technological Infrastructure
• Continued alignment of specific COE program rubrics with Specialty Organization Requirements and in preparation for the next NCATE/CAEP Accreditation cycle.	• Send COE faculty, Dean and Assoc. Dean to next NCATE/CAEP meeting to learn new standards and requirements for next accreditation ($7,000)	• Accountability/Assessment • Maintenance of NCATE/CAEP Accreditation

• Continue work to train University Supervisors and Adjuncts in reliable use of new assessment rubrics.	• Budget funds to train University Supervisors and Adjuncts 1X per academic year on use of new rubrics for program assessments and to ensure high quality inter-rater reliability with full time faculty across programs.	• Accountability/Assessment • Maintenance of NCATE/CAEP Accreditation
• Digital portfolios developed in graduate education and undergraduate recreation programs to archive key student assignments as a measure of student skill development and growth across individual programs.		• Accountability/Assessment • Maintenance of NCATE/CAEP Accreditation
• Increased attention to general education value of diversity as it relates to global health disparities in ID 1225 – course outline updated and multiple sections assessed using standardized AAUP written assessment (Spring and Summer 2012).		• Adaptability & Responsivity
• FTE ratio in the COE and % of courses taught by adjuncts too high – 66.4 to 1.	• Need to hire a minimum of 5 full-time faculty for next year In Bilingual Ed., ESL, Reading, Math Ed., and Special Education	• Attracting New Faculty

Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
All Initial Certification Programs • Developed survey to assess satisfaction with tutorial/remedial Praxis Programs • Train COE Program Coordinators to access ETS website to retrieve Praxis Data by Program • Data analyzed at Spring COE Retreat by program – internship, pre-professional field, competencies, TWS, inter-rater reliability • Train University Supervisors to increase inter-rater reliability with University Faculty • Contextual factors for TWS III showed most variation across supervisor ratings • All data systems in COE indicate student achievement is high	We can access this database at no additional cost. Budget to support training of University Supervisors every semester with respect to use of rubrics and inter-rater reliability with full time faculty is needed (50 Supervisors X $100 per 2 hour training X 1 training per academic year = $5,000) General Recommendation: NCATE has merged with TEAC to become CAEP (Council for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs). New Accreditation standards are being developed. Need to take 5 key faculty plus Dean & Assoc Dean to the next CAEP Conference in the Fall (estimate $7,000)	Accountability/Assessment Maintenance NCATE/CAEP Accreditation Technological Infrastructure Adaptability & Responsivity

Program Accomplishments	Budget / Resource Needs	Accountability / Assessment Areas
Advanced Teacher Certification Programs • First round of data collected on new rubrics designed to meet SPA Standards • Comprehensive Exams administered 2X each year – high pass rates • Developed Internet-based Professional Portfolio to document student progress across programs with rubric for assessment • All Rubrics refined to increase consistency and inter-rater reliability. • Grading and Observation Rubrics completed and aligned with SPA Standards	Budget to support training of Advanced Program Adjuncts once per academic year with respect to use of rubrics and inter-rater reliability with full time faculty is needed (20 Adjuncts X $100 per 2 hour training X once per academic year= $4,000)	Accountability/Assessment Maintenance NCATE/CAEP Accreditation Technological Infrastructure Adaptability & Responsivity
Spanish • Capstone and Foundation Courses revised with greater focus on analytical skills of students • Rubrics aligned with SPA Standards	Spanish Program redesign for CAEP (formerly NCATE) requires program consultant time ($1,000).	Accountability/Assessment Preparation for NCATE/CAEP Accreditation
Health & Physical Education • Addition of Fitness Requirement for graduation. • Alternative text for Motor Learning Course piloted • Increased student attendance at Praxis Review sessions on curriculum and motor learning.	Provide 5 additional training sessions for Praxis Review ($1,000 additional) for students in motor learning per semester; PE is not covered by the Plato Praxis Review Program we license to support student preparation for licensure.	Accountability/Assessment Maintenance NCATE/CAEP Accreditation Technological Infrastructure

		Adaptability & Responsivity
• Rubrics refined for each assignment; training for University Supervisors will strengthen assessment process • Identified methods to model standards-based instruction • Methodology developed that links PETE Standards with TWS. • Progression of skills on TWS from PED 2800 to PED 4610 provides opportunities for assessment across multiple courses and skills to improve overall student performance on TWS components • Two new courses created: Teaching Team Sports and Teaching Individual Sports • Contact information for qualified faculty has been provided to cooperating teachers and university supervisors to strengthen collaboration and feedback.	Training for University Supervisors in the use of revised rubrics can be part of the overall Undergraduate Supervisor Training – no additional cost beyond what was projected on page 1.	
Health Education –Adult Fitness • New assessment tool for evaluation implemented. • Graduate Student Survey to be distributed at the end of Summer II • Midterm and Final Student Evaluation Forms Updated for Spring 12 • Updated Muscle Analysis Evaluation Form for to correlate with NCSF Certification Form		Accountability/Assessment Technological Infrastructure Adaptability & Responsivity

	Accountability/Assessment Maintenance CATE Accreditation Technological Infrastructure Adaptability & Responsivity
- Added more content on muscle function to PED 4627 - Updated Internship Manual - Developed workshops to help increase student interest in Graduate Education Health Education – Athletic Training - Certification Exam 100% pass rate - Implement Graduate Student Survey in PED 4521 to increase number of student responders - All assessment rubrics revised to reflect changes in accreditation standards.	
Physical Education-Recreation Administration - Introduction of writing philosophy earlier in coursework - Initiated Portfolio Assessment Plan in Fall 2012; student will archive key assignments through the program - Revised Portfolio Rubric - Worked with Field Supervisors to develop field work evaluation forms and consistent scoring procedures - Develop online weekly reporting system for field supervisors - Therapeutic Recreation internship students need a separate internship course from REC Admin Students	Budget to support training of Program Field Supervisors each academic year with respect to use of revised rubrics and inter-rater reliability in collaboration with full time faculty is needed (10 Adjuncts X $100 per 2 hour training once per academic year= $1,000) Accountability/Assessment Seeking New Accreditation Technological Infrastructure Adaptability & Responsivity

		Accountability/Assessment Maintenance ASHA
because certification requirements differ.		
• Incorporate Global Perspectives when addressing diversity as it applied to leisure training.	Important as it relates to assessment of Gen Ed value of diversity	
• In Rec 2910, 3910, and 4700, elements of task analysis for community recreation students must be included in instruction.		
• Provide more training to field supervisors and adjuncts to reduce gap in class performance scores vs. field performance scores for students.	Can be addressed within training provided for Program Field Supervisors above.	
• Incorporate research assignment in each core course to increase student facility in oral dialogue with respect to research issues.	Important as it relates to Gen Ed assessment of oral proficiency and research familiarity	
• Reduce the number of participants in REC 4900 for Sp 2013 to provide more time for participants to practice leadership and presentation skills.	Important as it relates to Gen Ed measure of oral proficiency and research familiarity	
	General Recommendation: Evaluation of Annual Student Learning Outcomes as well completion of Program Review Cycle situates the Recreation program well for moving forward with National Accreditation. Appropriate $2,000 to pursue accreditation for consultant time and assorted fees. This will be a significant accomplishment as the REC Program has never been accredited at Kean University.	

Communication Disorders and Deafness
• Added required course in Neuroscience which improved

	Accreditation Technological Infrastructure Adaptability & Responsivity
student performance in CDD 5231 (Aphasia), CDD 5238 (Motor and Speech Disorders), and CDD 5269 (Dysphagia) • Praxis Scores high and required no action • Students who do poorly on Praxis can either join a study group or a test review class. • 2 ASHA assessments entered on SAMS as trackables • Consistent use of COE /KU thesis evaluation rubric on SAMS Systems	SAMS Data System must be modified and/or maintained in advance of upcoming ASHA Accreditation process one year from now ($2,000 for system upgrades)

College or Division: _____ College of Business and Public Management

Prepared by: _____ Kathryn Martell (Dean)

Date: _____ June 13, 2012

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall summary of College or Division data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
• Most majors in the College (all except PA) are understaffed, with student: full-time faculty ratios of 150+:1 in some majors. • Need for PhDs in Accounting is critical. • Technological needs (upgrade of labs) necessary for developing students' technology skills • High priority: upgrade of Keanwise to enforce pre-requisites and GPA requirements • Financial support to retain faculty/ encourage their scholarship • Financial support for faculty development related to learning goals (writing across the curriculum, problem solving) and advances in pedagogy generally • Financial support for development of adjunct faculty, who deliver more than 50% of the classes in the college. • According to study by HR, CBPM	• Approve new faculty lines in Accounting, Criminal Justice, Management/General Business. Hire replacement faculty in Marketing and Management. With the exception of Accounting, some of these lines can be for lecturers. • A minimum of 2 new administrative lines – 1 for School of Management, Marketing and Int'l Business, and 1 for School of Accounting & Financial Management. • Upgrade CBPM computer labs. • Upgrade Keanwise. • Financial support for faculty travel to support scholarship and faculty development related to pedagogy. • Use some of the $50,000 in library fees collected each semester from CBPM students to acquire a subscription to the Bloomberg Data Base.	• Accountability • Academic Initiatives • Attracting & Retaining Students • Attracting & Retaining Faculty-scholars • Technological Infrastructure

Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
receives significantly less administrative support than most other units on campus.		
Business Programs Undergraduate Degree Programs: BS in Accounting, BS in Finance, BS in Management, BS in Marketing • Assessment activities indicated that student learning and skill building needs improvement in communication, the utilization of business technologies, problem solving. Retention of knowledge in Accounting and Finance was also a problem. • Enrollment data indicate that advisement loads for faculty in some majors (Management, Accounting) are twice the university average, negatively impacting student academic support and retention n these areas. • A comparison of faculty size with faculty sufficiency requirements and qualifications from accrediting agency (AACSB, International) indicate a significant gap, particularly in the area of Accounting and General Business.	• Required business communications courses (ENG 3090 and COMM 3590) are taught outside the College and are taught by adjuncts. (There are 12 sections of each course taught each semester). 2 full-time instructors (net budget impact=$60,000) should be hired to manage these important courses. • Financial resources for faculty development in case teaching (related to problem solving). • Make tutors in Accounting, Finance and Operations Management accessible to students. • Testing lab and staff needed for new admissions testing (utilization of business technologies). • Purchase subscription to Bloomberg data bases (cost per year $20,000) to give students experience with "real time" data and information for problem solving. Data base would be used by 1000+ students. • Devote part of the University's writing center to professional writing. • Cap capstone course, which is writing emphasis course, at 20. (Impact=2 more sections per semester). Smaller class size also will accommodate more oral presentations . • Designate one more course in required business curriculum as communication intensive. Cap this course at 20 students. (impact=2 additional sections per semester). • To improve student advising, and advance accreditation efforts, implement a 3-year hiring plan that results in 4	• Academic Initiatives • Technological Infrastructure • Attracting and retaining Students • Attracting and Retaining Faculty-Scholars

MS in Accounting:	additional TT Accounting faculty, 1 TT Marketing faculty, 5 TT Management/General Business faculty and 3 Management/Gen Bus lecturers. (Note: these figures do not take faculty replacements into account (5 Business faculty are leaving this AY)) • Hire one additional staff person for School of Management & Marketing, and the School of Accounting & Finance to improve student services.	• Attracting and Retaining Faculty-Scholars. • Adaptability & Responsivity

- A university-wide staffing sufficiency study conducted by HR concludes that the business programs have inadequate staff support – programs supporting 2000+ students and 32 faculty are supported by just two secretaries (1 per School). A lack of administrative support reduces the level of student support services.

MS in Accounting:

- The viability of this program, (enrollment=60), rests on recruiting new faculty with PhDs in Accounting. Of the 10 courses offered in Fall, only 2 are taught by T/TT faculty, and none are taught by PhDs – student learning suffers as a result. The department, which in Fall 2010 had 4 PhDs and now has none – 3 were dismissed, and 1 left voluntarily. This is a high priority for the BS in Accounting as well (enrollments>800). Virtually all the assessment work for the MS in Accounting was done by a faculty member who was not renewed, and there is no one to assume the charter.

Criminal Justice

BA in Criminal Justice

- The department has implemented several "closing the loop" actions in

Recommendations

- High priority: recruit, hire and retain 2 TT/PhD Accounting faculty in AY 12, and another 2 in AY 13. These new hires will be offset, in part, by 2 or 3 expected retirements over the next 2 years.

Recommendations:

- Accountability &

	- Assessment - Academic Initiatives - Attracting & Retaining Students - Attracting & Retaining Faculty-Scholars - Technological Infrastructure
- Spring semester which will have should raise student performance levels in next AY: enforcing the 2.5 minimum in the major (resulting in a "de-majoring" of approximately 130 ill-performing students, enforcement of pre-requisites to ensure students have the requisite knowledge to learn advanced theory), establishment of a 4-year graduation plan.	- Currently, enforcing the GPA requirement and pre-requisites must be done by faculty by hand. This is a very laborious process. The Keanwise registration system should be able to enforce these requirements.
- Students' knowledge of one key subject area was unacceptably low. A new required Criminology course has been substituted for a Sociology course to ensure learning of these important theories.	- Budget impact = .5 FTE faculty, or 4-5 sections taught by adjuncts (previously charged to Sociology).
- Assessment of communication skills indicated that students benefitted from the "staged writing" in the capstone sequence. Assessment data did reveal that students' oral communication skills should be improved.	- Cap capstone courses (CJ 3675 and CJ 4600) at 20 to allow for more oral presentations. Budget impact-.5 FTE
- Currently, 1009 CJ students are advised by just 7 faculty members (including the Executive Director), which translates to a 144 student caseload.	- The faculty/student ratio in CJ is among the worst in the school. A stringent GPA retention policy will probably reduce enrollments by 15%, which would still leave an advisement load of over 100 per faculty member. One faculty member (could be a lecturer) should be hired in AY 12, and a second in AY 13, in order to improve the accessibility of advisement to CJ students.
MA in Criminal Justice - The program is too young to be able to assess its future needs.	- Although students technology skills were not assessed, the new required Criminology course should include a software package that the out-dated computers in the

Willis labs cannot support. Each School needs access to 1 up-to-date computer lab in our new planned location of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors.

Public Administration

- Assessment data for undergraduate program do not indicate any substantive new activities.
- The size of faculty is adequate to handle undergraduate advising.

MA in Public Administration

- There are no pressing needs for AY12. New faculty members have been hired, accreditation is still a number of years away. A potential retirement of the only full-time faculty member in Health Care will present a need for a faculty replacement in the future.

College or Division: COLLEGE OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

Prepared by: HOLLY LOGUE

Date: JUNE 12, 2012

Annual Assessment Results and Recommendations Report

Overall summary of College or Division data results	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
Assessment reports and program recommendation reports reveal consistent attention to: • improvements to teaching and learning methodologies • curricular developments and revisions • attention to and interest in innovative programming Reports appear to be lacking in evidence of clear connections to the GE curriculum (other than a few of the foundations courses) – which may point to the need for an alternative GE (an Honors GE was suggested) that might allow for wider use of interdisciplinary and collaborative learning opportunities. In every program a need persists for improved writing abilities. Reports also highlight the following trends for areas of need (not surprising):	• Faculty lines • Professional Development Support • Technology upgrades, equipment • Facilities upgrades and maintenance • Continued training/workshops in assessment, advisement, web-enhanced classes	• Accountability and Assessment • Academic Initiatives • External Partnerships • Attracting and Retaining Students • Attracting and Retaining Faculty Scholars • Commitment to Diversity • Technological Infrastructure

Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results – *in ALPHA order*	Implications for resources needed/budget allocations priorities	Strategic Plan goal(s) supported (2007-2012)
- Support for assessment (tools, training, research assistance) - Technology - Faculty/Staff - Travel Support for professional development and accreditation - Support for campus wide writing improvement initiative with sensitivity to the disciplinary needs and styles		
DESIGN - Support for new foundations curriculum and foundations coordinator position - Peripheral equipment to assure proficiency in technical design areas - Support for laptop purchase program - Support for integration of global design and sustainability within Interior Design	**DESIGN:** - Faculty lines (currently searching 4, which will return Design programs to former # of faculty following non-reappointments and retirements). - Equipment – computers, printers, cutters, scanners...)	**DESIGN:** - Accountability and Assessment (excellent participation in assessment initiatives through NASM as well as KU/MSCHE activities) - Academic initiatives - External partnerships – though not identified in the Assessment Reports, the RBSD has forged a partnership with a new program at UCVTS, which will bring new design students to Kean as sophomores (completing a year of college at UCVTS during their senior

year of HS)
- Attracting and Retaining Students
- Attracting and Retaining Faculty
- Technological Infrastructure

FINE ARTS
- Accountability and Assessment (excellent participation in assessment initiatives through NASM as well as KU/MSCHE activities)
- Academic Initiatives
- Technological infrastructure

FINE ARTS
- Equipment needs
- Faculty

FINE ARTS
- Support for departmental record-keeping, digital portfolios (computers, software)
- Adjunct faculty needed to offset reassignment of F/T Art Historian to teach GE 2025, so as to help with necessary improvements to writing
- Support for Writing across Curriculum initiative
- Foundation faculty positions have diminished -- no F/T coverage in Ceramics, Sculpture, Painting, Fibers. Though students appear to be managing in terms of portfolio and exhibition preparation, it is due to the extended efforts of the other faculty. This is not sustainable.
- Coordination of Fine Arts foundation courses requires a faculty position. Texts in foundation courses are not consistent, nor are the syllabi of multiple sections of FA 1000 (for example).
- Coordination of TWS with needs of

cooperating teachers. Workshop, meeting, some sort of formalized communication would be beneficial as well as continued support of the very important field liaison position

- Revised Art Ed curriculum points to need for faculty in Drawing, Painting
- Addition of Pre-Thesis summer seminar in Art Ed Supervision Master's program requires summer faculty salary support

MUSIC

- Distribution and completion of student surveys points to possible survey fatigue. Support needed for administrative oversight.
- Choir tour expansion (3 days to 9 days) will require budgetary support
- Music curriculum revision to include more ensemble options implies the need for faculty direction of those ensembles as well as continued support for accompanists
- Support needed for writing remediation and tutorial
- Professional Performance standards have been raised. To support this, as well as the newly AIC approved Bachelor of Music degree, attention to performance facilities is recommended, as well as increased access to the exceptional Enlow Hall

MUSIC

- Administrative assistance – Grad Assistants
- Student Travel support
- Faculty overload support or new lines
- Staff Accompanist positions
- Facilities improvements to Wilkins (list available)

MUSIC

- Accountability and Assessment (excellent participation in assessment initiatives through NASM as well as KU/MSCHE activities)
- Academic Initiatives (new degree, revised curricula)
- Attracting and Retaining students (enhanced and increased performance opportunities, new BMus degree, expanded tour)
- Technological infrastructure

THEATRE

- Though the assessment reports focused on curricular assessments, the Department of Theatre also operates a production arm, providing cultural opportunities and experiences for the Kean and surrounding communities.
- Auditory Assessment lacking. Audio laboratory would provide means of self-assessment for students.
- Theatre Design/Tech curriculum being revised so as to provide well-rounded exposure to all areas of Theatre Design and Tech. Currently there exists no faculty with experience in audio technology. This could be a shared position with the Music Conservatory, initiating new programs in sound design, sound engineering, sound production, and/or composition/scoring.
- Recruitment of Des/Tech students a priority so as to enhance and round out the production program, providing ample number of students for all design/tech courses to run in proper sequence.

THEATRE

- Equipment: Audio lab needed for improved auditory performance; body microphones for performance in larger venues – especially in musical theatre performances; computer software
- Faculty (3): Sound Design, Theatre History, Scenic and Lighting Design (anticipated retirement)
- Staff: Costume Shop Manager – production season needs to expand to provide opportunities for all students (per NAST accreditation standards) and the newly formed partnership with the UCVTS Academy for Performing Arts. To expand the production schedule, additional staff support is needed.
- Facilities: SLO#3 and #4 depend on the theatre production series for students to demonstrate full proficiency. Therefore, attention to facilities improvements is vital. VE 118-119 electrical separation, crumbling cinder block, limited dressing room space; sound and tech enhancements in Wilkins (orchestra pit lift), room for rehearsal/performance/instruction is limited to the two black box theatres, 1 costume construction shop, and 1 computer lab. Recent availability of the CSW provides some temporary relief, but the CSW is slated for demolition and re-purposing. An addition to VE is scheduled, providing a dedicated scenic construction shop, additional costume storage, and a performance studio classroom. With the added Green Lane building that will house Design, it is anticipated that some additional space in VE will be allocated to Theatre, freeing up the black box theatres as classrooms.

THEATRE

- Accountability and Assessment (100% participation in assessment initiatives through NAST as well as KU/MSCHE activities)
- Academic Initiatives (curricular revisions)
- External Partnerships (Premiere Stages and APA)
- Attracting and Retaining Students (expanded performance opportunities, scholarships)
- Commitment to Diversity (providing programming that is culturally sensitive and varied)
- Technological infrastructure

Appendix 14-5

Rubrics from the examples used in Tables 14-1, 14-2, 14-3 and also samples of rubrics aligned with Kean University SLOs that are used by graduate programs.

Mathematics: MATH 4890, Capstone Final Written Project Rubric

SLO RUBRIC FOR FINAL PAPER

	5	4	3	2	1	0
SLO 1: Use mathematics as a problem-solving tool.	Strong ability to use mathematics as a problem-solving tool.	Good ability to use mathematics as a problem-solving tool.	Some ability to use mathematics as a problem-solving tool.	Little ability to use mathematics as a problem-solving tool.	No ability to use mathematics as a problem-solving tool.	
SLO 2: Recognize connections between various topics in mathematics.	Strong evidence of the recognition of mathematical connections.	Good evidence of the recognition of mathematical connections.	Some evidence of the recognition of mathematical connections.	Little evidence of the recognition of mathematical connections.	No evidence of the recognition of mathematical connections.	
SLO 3: Demonstrate the ability to write and understand mathematical argument.	Strong ability to write and understand mathematical argument.	Good ability to write and understand mathematical argument.	Some ability to write and understand mathematical argument.	Little ability to write and understand mathematical argument.	No ability to write and understand mathematical argument.	
SLO 4: Effectively communicate mathematics via formal presentation and informal dialogues.	Strong ability to communicate mathematics effectively.	Good ability to communicate mathematics effectively.	Some ability to communicate mathematics effectively.	Little ability to communicate mathematics effectively.	No ability to communicate mathematics effectively.	
SLO 5: Use technology to explore and demonstrate mathematical ideas.	Strong evidence of the ability to correctly use technology.	Good evidence of the ability to correctly use technology.	Some evidence of the ability to correctly use technology.	Little evidence of the ability to correctly use technology.	No evidence of the ability to correctly use technology.	Not applicable
SLO 6: Do research in the selected program option.	Strong ability to do research in program option.	Good ability to do research in program option.	Some ability to do research in program option.	Little ability to do research in program option.	No ability to do research in program option.	

SPANISH: SPAN 4700: Capstone Seminar Course

Name of Faculty Member teaching: **Dr. Pablo Pintado-Casas**

Department: **School for Global Education & Innovation/ World Languages: Spanish**

Course assessed: **SPAN-4700*01:** *Capstone in Literature, Language or Culture:*
"La poesía en la encrucijada: diálogo poético entre Octavio Paz y María Zambrano"
("A poetic dialogue between Octavio Paz and María Zambrano")

Semester and year: **Fall-2011**

List SLOs being assessed (as stated on the syllabus)
*(Please indicate the relevant KU SLOs aligned with program SLOs)

For the Spanish Capstone course, the following four student learning outcomes (SLO) were assessed:

SLO1: Compare and contrast varying approaches to literary study and relate specific aspects of a literary subject to the Hispanic literary tradition.
(KU1; GE: K3, S1, S2, S4, S5)

SLO2: Examine aspects of Hispanic culture such as art, music, history, politics, economics, film, religion, or philosophy and analyze how they inform Peninsular and Latin American. Analyze the extent to which the arts, religious beliefs, historical context, cultural perspectives and/or governance has influenced one or more works of Peninsular and Latin American literature and justify conclusions.
(KU1, KU2; GE: K3, K4, S1, S2, S4, S5)

SLO3: Place individual contributions to Peninsular and Latin American culture within a context of world cultural traditions. Evaluate the contributions of Peninsular and Latin American authors within the context of world literary contributions during a similar time period. **(KU1, KU2, KU3, KU4; GE: K3, K4, S1, S2, S4, S5)**

SLO4: Improve knowledge and use of the Spanish. Demonstrate further development of linguistic and cultural proficiency and proficiency in the methods of literary analysis and exegesis (e.g., relationship between theme, intellectual issues, socio-historical or geo-cultural context). **(KU1; GE: K3, S1, S2, S4, S5)**

Describe method(s) of assessment of those outcomes (attach example of rubrics, assignments exams as appropriate)

The following methods of assessment were used:

1. Collective class blog on the life and works of Octavio Paz and Maria Zambrano.
2. Formal oral presentation

3. Composition (first and second drafts)
4. Weekly journal article reviews
5. Final research paper
6. Final exam
7. Final portfolio

[Note: Please see assessment rubrics and final exam below]

Summarize the data that you collected (attach data and/or simple charts or graphs could be included)

Written Presentation Rubric:
   Number of students: **7** /   Median: **28**   / Mean: **28.2**   / Mode: **28 and 30**
                   (30, 29, 30, 27, 28, 26, 28)

Oral Presentation Rubric (Speaker Evaluation Form):
   Number of students: **7** / Median: **45**   / Mean: **46.1**   / Mode: **45 and 50**
                   (50, 50, 47, 45, 45, 46, 40)

Main conclusions

   What have you discovered about student learning? Please indicate positive findings as well as areas for improvement.

   1. Positive findings:

   a. Through the in-depth study of the two authors covered in the capstone course, students developed critical thinking skills that enabled them to establish interesting cross-cultural connections between Mexican and Spanish culture.

   b. The study of poetry encouraged close textual reading. Students became more confident in their reading and analytical skills.

   c. The regular use of a class blog helped students discuss their ideas before class.

   d. The course portfolio required students to organize their research materials (articles, bibliographical references, personal observations) throughout the semester.

   2. Areas for improvements:

   a. In general, students struggle with the mechanic of writing a research paper (proper citation methods according to the MLA, use of appropriate peer-reviewed materials, etc.)

Recommendations for improvements

What improvements do you recommend?

In my judgment, the capstone course should include two full classroom periods at the beginning of the semester devoted entirely to the proper use of research tools. Ideally, these sessions should be held at the Nancy Tompson Library, under the guidance of a research librarian. Students rely too heavily on on-line sources without fully understanding the use of scholarly sources.

Implementations

What changes did you make or do you plan on making? When do you plan on making them? How do you plan on implementing the changes?

What resources do you need to make these changes?

When I teach the capstone course in Spring 2012, I will begin the semester with two class periods (held at the library) devoted to the use of scholarly sources. The following areas will be covered:

The proper use of electronic resources
The use of non-electronic scholarly resources
The use of specific terminology for the analysis of Hispanic literary texts

Kean University
College of Education (COE)
School of Global Education & Innovation/
World Languages: *Spanish* **program**
Fall-11: December, 2011
SPAN- 4700*01: *Capstone/ Seminar in Literature, Language or Culture*

Examen Final

Nombre: _____

Instructor:_____

I) Elija uno de los dos autores estudiados en clase y realice un breve comentario
interpretativo de su obra. Mencione cuales son sus libros mas importantes y que
importancia tienen para las letras hispanicas.
(10 puntos)

II) Que diferencias y similitudes encuentra entre la obra de Octavio Paz y Maria
Zambrano. Compare algunas de sus obras en relacion a los terminos: Lenguaje,
Pensamiento y Poesia.
(10 puntos)

III) Un encuentro final. Como podriamos realizar una aproximacion de las obras de
ambos autores en relacion a sus vidas, la experiencia poetica, la mitologia, la historia y el
siglo XX.
(10 puntos)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

Student Name: _____   Score : _____

Kean ID: _____

Course and Section: _____Instructor's name:

_____

Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	0	Total
Genre/Audience							
Focus							
Development							
Organization							
Grammar/Mechanics							
Revision							

Comments (use back if needed):

Description of Rubric: Condensed

	5	4	3	2	1	0
Genre/ Audience	Uses conventions in skillful way	Uses conventions in somewhat skillful way	Uses conventions in formulaic way	Does not follow conventions consistently	Fails to follow most or any conventions	Not applicable
Focus	Explicit, nuanced, complex stance	Explicit and nuanced, but not complex, stance	Stance defined in general terms	Vague stance	No clear stance	Not applicable
Development	All ideas developed with specific, relevant information.	Most ideas developed with specific, relevant information. Reader raises few questions	Ideas not developed consistently. Supported with vague generalization or inappropriate examples	Most ideas not developed or supported with inappropriate examples.	Ideas stated, not developed	Not applicable
Organization	Structure imparts feeling of wholeness and skill	Structure imparts a feeling of wholeness but not skill	Structure breaks down in some places, though solid overall	Structure feels rough or unclear	Structure clear or confusing	Not applicable
Grammar/ mechanics	Few or no errors exist; those present have no effect on reading	Errors obvious but not distracting	Errors begin to interfere with reading	Several distracting errors or multiple patterns of error	Numerous errors make understanding text difficult or impossible	Not applicable
Revision	Almost all revisions make draft stronger	Most revisions make draft stronger	Some revisions strengthen, but some weaken draft	Few revisions, with little effect on quality	Very few revisions; may make final worse	No evidence of revision

Descriptors for Rubric

This document contains an expanded explanation of the criteria making up the baseline and portfolio evaluation rubrics for College Composition (revised Summer 2011). Each criterion is briefly defined and linked to common terms used for it in composition textbooks. Characteristics of each level in a criterion are also included.

<u>Genre/Audience</u>: The writing demonstrates an understanding of the conventions of the genres they are writing as well as for academic writing in general. See p. 44 for the conventions of the required genres.
Terms related to this criterion: conventions, community of readers, discourse community, genre, style, tone
- Score of 5: the writer follows all or almost all of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. In addition, the writer demonstrates a skillful ability to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations.
- Score of 4: the writer follows most, if not all, of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. There is evidence of effort made to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations. However, those efforts are not as skillful as a level-five essay.
- Score of 3: the writer follows most of the conventions. However, they do so in a formulaic way that shows little attempt to engage the audience.
- Score of 2: the writer follows most of the conventions but does not do so consistently. They may also not follow some conventions, but the reader gets the sense the writer understands the conventions.
- Score of 1: the writer fails to follow most or any of the genre conventions and of academic writing in general.

<u>Focus</u>: The writing presents a unified, clear stance with respect to the characteristics of the assignment. In a given essay, each paragraph relates to that stance.
Terms related to this criterion: main idea, purpose, stance, thesis statement
- Score of 5: explicit, nuanced stance. The reader feels like the writer has constructed a complex, well thought-out point.
- Score of 4: stance is explicit and/or nuanced, but not to the degree of a five. The reader may feel like some minor points are missing or that the stance could be more complex.
- Score of 3: stance somewhat clear, but may be defined in general terms (i.e. "subject A and B are a like in some ways and different in others" or "I agree/disagree with X" without giving reasons for their stance)
- Score of 2: vague stance or purpose. It may only apply to part of the piece.
- Score of 1: no clear stance or purpose.

<u>Development</u>: The main ideas in the writing are supported with specific, relevant information.
Terms related to this criterion: details, evidence, examples, facts, observations, statistics, testimony

- Score of 5: all ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. The reader feels like she or he has learned a lot from reading the piece.
- Score of 4: all major and most minor ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. However, the reader occasionally raises questions or wishes for more information.
- Score of 3: ideas are not developed consistently, causing the reader to want more information about some points. Ideas, in places, are clear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Some examples may not be appropriate.
- Score of 2: most ideas are not developed or are supported with inappropriate examples. The support is made up almost entirely unclear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Overall, the piece seems to have been written quickly and without the writer thinking through the ideas he or she wanted to convey.
- Score of 1: ideas are stated without any development at all.

Organization: The writing uses an overall and paragraph structures appropriate to the assignment(s).
Terms related to this criterion: coherence, cohesion, mode, patterns of development, structure, transitions
- Score of 5: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall pieces that imparts a feeling of wholeness and skill.
- Score of 4: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall piece that is effective but that may not be artful. Some slight breakdowns exist, but they are almost unnoticeable and seem more like isolated gaffes than patterns of error.
- Score of 3: the structure of the essay breaks down in some places, but holds together overall. At the paragraph level, some sentences are out of place. Some transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied among the paragraphs ideas.
- Score of 2: the structure of the essay feels rough and unclear. At the paragraph level, multiple sentences are out of place. Most of the transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied by the paragraph's ideas. The pieces seems to have been planned quickly and not revised.
- Score of 1: the writer uses an unclear or confusing overall organization. The paragraphs lack coherence; sentences are disorganized, with little or no effective use of transitions.

Grammar/Mechanics: the essay follows the conventions of Edited Academic English. This includes conventions for citing sources, regardless of the system used. An essay does not have to be perfect to receive a score of 5 in this criteria. Instead, consider whether the errors would either distract an average reader or make them doubt the writer's credibility.
Terms related to this criterion: diction/word choice, documentation, punctuation, sentence boundaries, sentence structure, spelling
- Score of 5: errors do not detract from the essay's central focus and from the smooth delivery of the writer's ideas. Few or no errors exist, and those that appear are minor or reflect obscure rules.
- Score of 4: errors are obvious but not to the point of distracting an average reader.
- Score of 3: grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors begin to interfere with understanding the text's meaning. Patterns of status-marking error may exist (ex. sentence boundaries, verb endings).

- Score of 2: several distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult. Multiple patterns of error exist.
- Score of 1: numerous distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult or impossible.

Revision: the writer made changes between drafts to the essay's focus, organization, development, and/or style that lead to a more successful final essay. These changes can take place at any level of the text (overall, paragraph, or sentence). Invention and planning work used to create a rough draft counts as evidence of revision.
Terms related to this criterion: addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement. (Note: The last two are not done as often, even when they are needed.)
- Score of 5: almost all of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used all four forms of revision as appropriate.
- Score of 4: Most, but not all, of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used most of the forms of revision, but may have needed to use others. (ex. the added and deleted material, but should have also rearranged it).
- Score of 3: the draft includes some revisions that make the final draft stronger, but others are needed. The writer mostly used addition and deletion, even if substitution and rearrangement was also needed. Some of the revisions may distract from the draft's quality.
- Score of 2: The draft includes few revisions, most of which have no influence on the final draft's quality. The writer may have used only one form of revision even though others are needed.
- Score of 1: the draft includes very few revisions; most either have no influence on the final draft's quality or make it worse. It seems like the writer just retyped the original draft.
- Score of 0: no evidence of revision. The writer turned in only one draft and no invention/planning work.

SPEAKER EVALUATION FORM

Name of Speaker _____   Section _____

Student ID _____   Speech (1 or 2) _____

Key: 1=Unacceptable 2=Fair 3=OK/acceptable 4=good/above average 5=Excellent

Rating	Item	✓ = Positive, Effective 0 = Needs Work		Comments
CONTENT				
	Analysis of Topic	__ Clear Purpose __ Clear central idea	__ Multi-sided argumentation __ Relevant topic	
	Supporting Material	__ Credible Sources __ Cited Sources	__ Varied Sources __ Sufficient Sources __ Appropriate visual aid	
	Organization	__ Introduction __ Main Points Clear	__ Transitions __ Conclusion	
	Style	__ Defined terms __ Vivid terms	__ Grammar __ Avoids clichés, jargon	
DELIVERY				
	Engagement	__ Audience awareness __ Eye contact	__ Poise __ Manages anxiety	
	Body Movement	__ Posture __ Gestures	__ Facial Expression	
	Voice Quality	__ Volume __ Tone __ Variety	__ Extemporaneous __ Articulation __ Vocal Control	
	Fluency	__ Freedom from notes __ Avoids vocal fillers	__ Effective pace __ Effective use of Pauses __ Effective rate	
PREPARATION				
	Outline	__ Structure	__ Bibliography __ Annotation	
IMPACT				
	OVERALL IMPACT	__ Speaker is credible __ Appropriate use of time	__ Speech is memorable __ Speech accomplishes purpose	
	FINAL GRADE			

10

GRAPHIC DESIGN PORTFOLIO REVIEW

STUDENT _____ DATE _____

ENTRY

EVALUATOR _____

	9 A	8 A-	7 B+	6 B	5 B-	4 C+	3 C	2 D	1 F
VISUAL FORM: Composition, visual elements, principals									
VISUALIZATION/DRAWING: Drawing and sketching skills									
TECHNICAL SKILLS: Traditional art media & digital formats									
CREATIVITY: Unconventional or unique solutions									
PRESENTATION: Clear organization to show case required skills									
PROFESSIONALISM: Range of projects and mature approaches									

TOTAL

CONTINUATION

EVALUATOR _____

	9 A	8 A-	7 B+	6 B	5 B-	4 C+	3 C	2 D	1 F
VISUAL FORM: Composition, visual elements, principals									
VISUALIZATION/DRAWING: Drawing and sketching skills									
TECHNICAL SKILLS: Traditional art media & digital formats									
CREATIVITY: Unconventional or unique solutions									
PRESENTATION: Clear organization to show case required skills									
PROFESSIONALISM: Range of projects and mature approaches									

TOTAL

EXIT

	9 A	8 A-	7 B+	6 B	5 B-	4 C+	3 C	2 D	1 F
VISUAL FORM: Composition, visual elements, principals									
VISUALIZATION/DRAWING: Drawing and sketching skills									

TECHNICAL SKILLS: Traditional art media & digital formats

CREATIVITY: Unconventional or unique solutions

PRESENTATION: Clear organization to show case required skills

PROFESSIONALISM: Range of projects and mature approaches

EVALUATOR _____ TOTAL _____

Percentages %	9 A	8 A-	7 B+	6 B	5 B-	4 C+	3 C	2 D	1 F
VISUAL FORM: Composition, visual elements, principals	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####
VISUALIZATION/DRAWING: Drawing and sketching skills	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####
TECHNICAL SKILLS: Traditional art media & digital formats	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####
CREATIVITY: Unconventional or unique solutions	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####
PRESENTATION: Clear organization to show case required skills	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####
PROFESSIONALISM: Range of projects and mature approaches	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####	####

EVALUATOR _____ TOTAL _____

Criminal Justice: Senior Seminar, CJ_4600, Final Research Paper
Professor's Feedback/Grading Rubric

Student name: _____   Grade: _____

Survey/letters to editor Materials received: [ ] completed surveys & letters [ ] completed consent forms	[ ] Existing data downloaded Materials received: [ ] Copy of codebook cover sheet	[ ] Newspaper content analysis Materials received: [ ] source material/articles [ ] coded/marked up?

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION:

Final paper reads cleaner/better than proposal did?	[1] No, very few or none of the professor's comments on the proposal were fixed. [2] Some but not all of the professor's comments on the proposal were fixed. Final paper is somewhat improved from how it was written as a proposal. [3] Yes, comments by professor on the proposal were fixed. Final paper is a significant improvement over the proposal. **OR:** Both the proposal and the final paper are well-written.
Organization	[1] Does not contain all required sections [ ] [2] Contains most required sections [ ] [3] Contains all required sections [ ]
Spelling	[1] Uses many misspelled words [ ] [2] Spell checked but missed some typos or use of an inappropriate term [ ] [3] Uses correct spelling throughout [ ]
Grammar	[1] Commits frequent grammatical errors [ ] [2] Generally uses correct grammar, minor exceptions [ ] [3] Shows correct grammar throughout the paper [ ]
Sentence Structure	[1] Multiple sentence fragments, run-ons, comma-splices [ ] [2] Generally uses good sentence structure, with 1-2 minor errors [ ] [3] Uses good sentence structure throughout, offers varied sentences for good style [ ]

ANALYTIC THINKING:

Introduction, Research question/ hypothesis	[1] Confusing, fails to succinctly state research question or hypothesis [ ] [2] Research question or hypothesis can be determined from Introduction with some difficulty [ ] [3] Research question or hypothesis is clearly stated in the Introduction [ ]
Literature Review (Sources): **8 scholarly sources** are required, **6 of which should be peer-reviewed journal articles**	[1] Uses **non**-peer reviewed sources frequently [ ] [2] Uses mostly peer reviewed sources, but not the required number [ ] [3] Uses peer reviewed sources primarily [ ] Number of sources in Literature Review: ____ Number of peer-reviewed journal articles: ____
Literature Review (Content)	[1] Literature review drifts, is not succinct, is off-topic [ ] [2] Literature mainly stays on point (minor drift) [ ] [3] Literature review is tied in well with topic, little to no drift [ ]
Literature Review, other issues/problems with not following syllabus instructions	____ Over-use (more than twice) of secondary source citation? [ ]once or twice []excessive ____ Quotes too long? []once or twice []excessive ____ No page numbers listed for quote? []once or twice []excessive ____ Over the 3-page limit? []slightly over limit []excessively over limit

	___ Other problems: _____

ANALYTIC THINKING, continued:

Theory section (optional)	**If included:** [1] Theory section drifts, is not succinct, is off-topic [ ] [2] Theory section mainly stays on point (minor drift) [ ] [3] Theory section is tied in well with topic, little to no drift [ ]
Sources listed in **both** Literature Review (and Theory) section(s) AND Reference section?	[1] No, many sources appear in the Literature Review (and Theory) section(s), but are not cited in the Reference section. Or vice versa: sources cited in the Reference section are not in the Literature Review (and/or Theory) section(s). [ ] [2] Mostly, a few minor mistakes or omissions [ ] [3] Yes, consistently and correctly done [ ]
Evidence of Plagiarism	[1] Major Evidence [ ] [2] Minor Evidence [ ] [3] No Evidence [ ]
Research Design	Selected research method: _____ [1] Research method was not performed correctly. [ ] [2] Research method was *mostly* performed correctly. [ ] [3] Research method was performed correctly. [ ] **Past tense:** discussed what they **did** (rather than will do)? []Yes []No
Data Collection	[1] Data collection was not performed correctly [ ] [2] Data collection was *mostly* performed correctly [ ] [3] Data collection was performed correctly [ ] **Past tense:** discussed what they **did** (rather than will do)? []Yes []No
Sampling Strategy	Sampling strategy: _____ [1] Sampling was either not performed, or not performed correctly [ ] [2] Sampling was mostly performed correctly. [ ] [3] Sampling was performed correctly. [ ]
Statistical analyses	[1] Statistical analyses were not performed correctly. [ ] [2] Statistical analyses were mostly performed correctly. A few mistakes. [ ] [3] Statstical analyses were performed correctly. [ ]
Results section	[1] Incorrect tables included. Incorrect interpretation of tables. Research question or hypothesis is not addressed. [ ] [2] Mostly appropriate tables. Mostly correct interpretation of tables. Research question or hypothesis was mostly addressed. A few mistakes. [ ] [3] Appropriate tables. Correct interpretation of tables. Research question or hypothesis was addressed. [ ]

Discussion section	[1] Section is weak or seriously lacking. May not have returned to the original research question or hypothesis. May not have fully addressed how much support was or was not found. May have incorrectly stated the findings. Limitations of the study may be missing. [ ] [2] Returned to the original research question or hypothesis. Did not fully addressed how much support was found or not found, or incorrectly stated the findings. Limitations of study may not have been addressed. [ ] [3] Returned to the original research question or hypothesis. Addressed how much support was found or not found. Limitations of study addressed. [ ]
Formatting of Reference section	[1] No, references are improperly formatted [ ] [2] References are *mostly* properly formatted [ ] [3] References are properly formatted [ ]
Appendix, complete materials included?	[1] No, many necessary items are missing (see top of p.1). [ ] [2] Most necessary items are included, only a few missing items (see top of p.1). [ ] [3] All required appendix materials are included [ ]
Overall comprehensibility of proposal	[1] Weak, hard to understand, a lot of awkward wording throughout the proposal [ ] [2] Mostly understandable, some confusion in places, some awkward wording [ ] [3] Very understandable, well-written [ ]
Overall assessment of proposal:	[1] Fails to meet expectations [2] Minimally meets expectations [3] Meets expectations [4] Exceeds expectations

Nathan Weiss Graduate College: Department of Advanced Studies in Psychology; Doctor of Psychology in Combined and Integrated School and Clinical Psychology

SLO 3: The preparation of practitioners of school and clinical psychology who demonstrate understanding of and competency in professional standards and ethics as well as the impact and importance of issues of cultural and individual diversity on professional practice. Students will acquire and demonstrate an understanding of, and proficiency in, the following Core Competencies as defined by NCSPP guidelines:

• Diversity in Clinical Practice

• Professional Ethics

(KU 1-5; S 1-5)SLO #3 Measure #1 Professional Ethics and Diversity sections of the Assessment and Intervention Competency Exams (faculty ratings)

ACE Diversity

> Current and past material should be integrated when significant patterns are evident, which relate to the client's presenting problem and ongoing life problems. Ethnicity, culture, gender, and other individual difference or diversity variables need to be explicitly addressed here. This section will include a discussion of how culture and diversity influence the case formulation.   You should demonstrate how your knowledge, awareness, and understanding of one's own dimensions of diversity and attitudes towards others were included in the assessment. In addition, you should demonstrate how your knowledge of culture and diversity in the assessment, diagnostic formulation and treatment recommendations.

ACE Ethics

> Discuss ethical issues relating to the assessment of this case. Discuss your ethical knowledge and apply ethical decision making to a dilemma. This discussion should demonstrate an adequate level of knowledge and understanding of the APA Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct and other relevant ethical/professional codes, standards and guidelines.

ACE Grading Grid**ACE –Part B: Assessment in Clinical Settings Scoring Form**

STUDENT NAME:_____   DATE SUBMITTED:_____

EXAMINERS: _____ & _____

	Remed iation	Below average	Below average	Below Average	Average	Average	Average	Above Average	Above Average	Above Average	Exceptional
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Relationships											
Interpersonal Relationship and Rapport											
Expressive Skills											
Background Information											
Description of presenting problem and referral											
Identification of Psychological Problems											
Description of Background Information											
Assessment											
Choice of Assessment Measures											
Rationale for Choice of Assessment Measures											
Description of Assessment Findings											
Discussion of Assessment Findings											
Case Conceptualization											
Accuracy of Diagnosis											
Rational for Dix (Differential Diagnosis)											
Case Conceptualization											
Effective use of Literature for Case Conceptualization											
Treatment Plan											
Choice of Intervention											
Discussion of Evidence Base for Intervention											
Cultural Diversity											
Cultural Awareness											
Ethics											
Adherence to Ethical Standards											
Protection of Client Confidentiality											
Totals											

Passing Score = 4.0 or higher without any scores of 0
Pass with distinction = 7.0 or higher without any scores below 4

Pass with Distinction   Pass   Pass with Revisions   Fail

4.10 **Therapeutic Context**

Describe your treatment up to the number of sessions that you have chosen to present. Discuss the client's progress toward the treatment goals, including any contextual (i.e., situational or environmental) factors that enhanced or slowed the treatment process. This section will include a discussion of how culture and diversity factors influenced the treatment process. You should demonstrate how your knowledge, awareness, and understanding of one's own dimensions of diversity and attitudes towards others were included in the ongoing assessment and treatment. Thoroughly discuss issues relating to the therapeutic relationship. Specifically, discuss any therapeutic resistances or impasses in the intervention process and how you responded, as well as your stimulus functions for the client (transference), your client's stimulus functions for you (countertransference), and on-going interpersonal issues and processes in psychotherapy. Also, describe how you utilized these interpersonal processes. Also, explain your rationale for your selection of that particular hour for discussion. This information will help to place the intervention in a time and process context so that the faculty evaluators may better understand the therapeutic exchange.

ICE Ethics

4.12 **Self-critique**

You are to evaluate your intervention session in terms of the overall content, process and ethical behavior. Discuss and critique the quality of the therapeutic alliance. Any conceptual, interactional, or countertransference issues should be articulated and discussed. What strengths and competencies did you demonstrate as a therapist? What are the clinical skills that you still need to develop? Discuss ethical issues relating to the treatment of this case. Discuss your ethical knowledge and apply ethical decision making to a dilemma. This discussion should demonstrate an adequate level of knowledge and understanding of the APA Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct and other relevant ethical/professional codes, standards and guidelines. Discuss your use of and experience with supervision and consultation.

ICE – WRITTEN SCORING FORM

STUDENT NAME:_____   DATE SUBMITTED:_____

EXAMINERS: _____ & _____

	Remed iation	Below average	Below average	Below Average	Average	Average	Average	Above Average	Above Average	Above Average	Exceptional
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Clinical Documentation											
Completion											
Competence											
Relationships											
Interpersonal Relationship and Rapport											
Expressive Skills											

Background Information											
Description of presenting problem and referral											
Identification of Psychological Problems											
Description of Background Information											
Assessment											
Choice of Assessment Measures											
Rationale for Choice of Assessment Measures											
Description of Assessment Findings											
Discussion of Assessment Findings											
Case Conceptualization											
Accuracy of Diagnosis											
Rational for Dix (Differential Diagnosis)											
Case Conceptualization											
Effective use of Literature for Case Conceptualization											
Treatment Plan											
Choice of Intervention											
Discussion of Evidence Base for Intervention											
Intervention											
Choice of intervention (Evidence base)											
Rationale for choice of intervention											
Description of intervention											
Discussion of intervention											
Competence of intervention (From video and transcript)											
Cultural Diversity											
Cultural Awareness											
Ethics											
Adherence to Ethical Standards											
Protection of Client Confidentiality											
Totals											/25

Passing Score = 4.0 or higher without any scores of 0
Pass with distinction = 7.0 or higher without any scores below 4

Pass with Distinction   Pass   Pass with Revisions   Fail

SLO #3 Measure #2 Practicum and Internship supervisory ratings (specific to ethics and diversity)

Instructions: This evaluation form is designed to assess a student's developmental progress across the training process. Accordingly, the ratings are based on the readiness level of the student to function at different levels of practice. This evaluation is not a traditional performance evaluation where low scores are indicative of a poor performance. For example, if a first year practicum student receives scores of 1s this would indicate that the student is performing at the developmentally appropriate level. The chart displayed below illustrates the continuum of developmental training anchors on which student's should be rated. If you are not familiar with a student's progress in a particular domain, please put "NA" (11) in the corresponding row.

Anchors

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sample											
Sample											

Remedi- ation	Readiness for Practicum		Readiness for Internship		Readiness for Entry to Practice		Mid Career

Individual-cultural Diversity- Awareness, sensitivity and skills in working professionally with diverse individuals, groups and communities who represent various cultural and personal background and characteristics defined broadly and consistent with APA policy.

	R	Prac	Prac	Prac	Intern	Intern	intern	Prof	Prof	Prof	Mid	NA
	0	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Self as Shaped by Individual and Cultural Diversity												
Others as Shaped by Individual and Cultural Diversity and Context												
Interaction of Self and Others as Shaped by Individual and Cultural Diversity and Context												
Applications based on Individual and Cultural Context												

Ethical-legal standards-policy - Application of ethical concepts and awareness of legal issues regarding professional activities with individuals, groups, and organizations.

	R	Prac	Prac	Prac	Intern	Intern	Intern	Prof	Prof	Prof	Mid	NA
	0	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Knowledge of ethical standards and guidelines												
Ethical Decision Making												
Ethical Conduct												

5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. (KU1, KU3)

	Unacceptable		Acceptable		Exemplary	
	0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Identifies ethical/social responsibility facts (ELCC 5.2)	Does not identify ethical/social responsibility facts		Identifies ethical/social responsibility-facts		Identifies in detail ethical/social responsibility; explains underlying principles and shows understanding of all facts	
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Identifies relevant issues (ELCC 5.3)	Fails to identify the relevant issues		Identifies the relevant issues		Describes in thorough and pertinent detail all of the relevant facts	
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The administrator demonstrates with integrity Ethics in all interpersonal contacts (ELCC 5.1)	Identifies issues of integrity and ethics in all interpersonal contacts		Identifies issues of integrity and ethics in all interpersonal contacts		Provides detailed issues of integrity and ethics in all interpersonal contacts	
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The administrator models fairness, impartiality by being sensitive to student diversity, community norms, values and considerations in interactions with others (ELCC 5.2)	Does not identify administrator issues of fairness/impartiality/sensitivity to student diversity and community norms or values etc.		Identifies administrator issues of fairness/impartiality/sensitivity to student diversity and community norms or values, etc		Describes in detail administrator issues of fairness/impartiality/sensitivity to student diversity and community norms or values	
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The administrator acts ethically by decisions based on ethical and legal principles (ELCC 5.3)	Fails to identify ethical decisions based on ethical and legal principles		Identifies ethical decisions based on ethical and legal principles		Provides a detailed outline of ethical decisions ased on ethical and legal principles.	
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. What are three alternative plans of Action (ELCC 5.3)	Does not provide three alternative plans of action		Provides one or two alternative plans of action		Provides three (3) alternative plans of action that clearly present a compelling ethical justification for the plans	
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The overall ethical skills demonstrated by this student were:	0-19		20-24		25-30	

0-5 POINTS EACH QUESTION

1. _____ points
2. _____ points
3. _____ points
4. _____ points
5. _____ points
6. _____ points

Total Points: _____

Case Presentation Rubric (Counselor Education)

Student Name: _____ Section: _____ Professor Name: _____

	Lifespan SLO1	Multicultural SLO2	Counseling SLO3	Research SLO4	Appraisal SLO5	Ethics SLO6	Limits SLO7
Presenting Problem	0		0		0		
Developmental History	0						
Current Environment		0					
Counseling Approaches	0		0				
Clinical Impressions		0	0	0	0		
Multicultural considerations		0	0				
Ethical considerations						0	
Treatment Plan			0	0			
AVERAGE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

1= Does not meet standard 2=Minimally meets standard 3= Meets standard 4=Exceeds standard

SLO1: Explain the nature and needs of individuals across the lifespan. (KU1, KU2)

SLO2: Describe the impact of sociological, economic, multicultural factors, and social justice advocacy on counseling (KU1, KU

SLO3: Apply individual and group counseling theories to facilitate individual, and group counseling (KU3, KU 4)

SLO4: Interpret and utilize professional research and existing data (KU1, KU2)

SLO5: Administer appraisal and assessment instruments in counseling (KU4)

SLO6: Apply professional, legal and ethical standards in counseling (KU1, KU3)

SLO7: Identify his/her own limitations, seek supervision and participate in professional development. (KU4)

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____ Professor Signature: _____

Appendix 14-6

2011-2012 conference programs and workshops offered including the number of attendees.

November 2011-August 2012 Assessment Conferences and Workshops:

Workshop/Conference	Participants
August 8, 2012: AAC& U - VALUE Rubrics Day-Long Workshop (10am-2pm)	Over 70 faculty participated
June 30, 2012: Research and Technology and the Capstone: Drawing Connections	10 participants from 5 colleges, Library, and School of General Studies
June 27, 2012: Transition to Kean-Identify and Expose GE Student Learning Outcome-Values	9 participants from 3 colleges, NJSTM, Transfer Student Services, and School of General Studies
June 27, 2012: Discussing the Use of the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric	10 participants from 5 colleges and School of General Studies
June 20, 2012: Closing the Loop with Spring 2012 data for GE SLO – Skill 3 – solve problems using quantitative reasoning	2 participants from 2 colleges
June 20, 2012: The Use of the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric	9 participants from 3 colleges and School of General Studies
June 18, 2012: Project Excel Workshop – Assessing the special needs college student to maximize learning	20 participants from across colleges
June 14: Evaluating Student Presentations	6 participants from 3 colleges and School of General Studies
June 13 and 14, 2012: Working with Rubric Data in Excel	7 participants from 3 colleges, Transfer Student Services, and School of General Studies
June 13, 2012: Revision from College Composition to Capstone	13 participants from 3 colleges and School of General Studies
May 18, 2012: Kean Assessment Day	Over 150 faculty participated
April 2, 2012: Strategic Planning Workshop	30 UPC members and guests participated
How to design and use effective surveys: Qualtrics – Designing Surveys and Interpreting the Data Generated Intro 2/6/12, 3/7/12 Advanced 2/15/12, 3/27/12	Total of 102 participated across sessions
January 4-6: Assessment at Kean Conference	Over 200 faculty participated over 3 days
February 10 & 16, 2012: Program Review Workshops: Academic Programs – 2/16 Non-Academic Programs – 2/10	All programs and departments in the current year of program review particpated
November 17, 2011: Assessment Workshops with Consultant Barbara Walvoord	41 faculty attended from across all colleges and School of General Studies